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| **What was the consultation about?** | Dorset Council operates a series of Children Centres and Family Hubs across its network. They provide a range of information and support for families to ensure they can access help when they need it.  Through the introduction of Family Hubs, Dorset Council is proposing a change to the network of centres and how they operate. The consultation was seeking views on the plans to develop the offer of information and support to families through these changes.  Respondents were given information about Children’s Centres and Family Hubs generally, in addition to proposed changes to 18 specific centres before answering the survey. |
| **Over what period did the consultation run?** | The consultation ran from 21/11/24 to 21/02/25. |
| **What consultation methods were used?** | The consultation was available both electronically online, in paper form (from the centres where changes were proposed) and via post upon request.    The consultation was promoted widely through both the local press and social media. The consultation had a separate communications plan and consultation plan prepared beforehand. |
| **How many responses were received overall?** | 212 overall responses were received. |
| **How representative is the response to the wider population?** | 86.8% of responses were from members of the public, 8.5% from Dorset Council staff, 0.5% from Dorset Councillors and 4.3% from other interested parties.    There were more considerably more female respondents (85%) than male (12.1%), which is higher than the Dorset population generally. Families with children aged between 0 to 5 did not dominate the responses, but did take up a large part.    87.4% of the respondents said their ethnic group was White British which is typical of the wider Dorset population.  Responses from disabled people were quite high at 15.8% compared to an approximate Dorset figure of 4.6% based on those claiming either Disability Living Allowance, Personal Independence Payments or Attendance Allowance. |
| **Where will the results be published?** | Results will be published on the council's website www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk |
| **How will the results be used?** | Results from this survey will be used to inform the next steps of the process. |
| **Who has produced this report?** | Consultation and Engagement Team, Dorset Council, March 2025 |

Background

Over the years Dorset Council, unlike many other local authorities, has maintained a network of children’s centres, recognising the importance of local community-based information and support for families.

Throughout this time the types of services delivered from the centres have changed and developed. Where services have changed there have been localised community engagement activities to ensure families were kept up to date with developments.

Despite changes all remain to be ‘designated’ children’s centres managed by Dorset Council.

With the introduction of Family Hubs, Dorset Council now have the opportunity to further develop the offer of information and support to more families and work closely with other organisations such as voluntary and community groups to make sure that families can access help when they need it in their communities.

Dorset Council wanted to hear respondents’ views about how the authority are planning to develop our offer of information and support to families across the Dorset Council area. If in agreement with our plans, Dorset Council will formally notify the Department for Education of the changes we are making to some of our children’s centres to help us offer improved support to more families.

The Consultation

The consultation survey was aimed at residents and users of the respective Children’s Centres. It asked for their thoughts on the proposed changes.

Analysis Method

Questions were considered on an individual basis for each locality and centre. Overall responses were examined, with specific responses of respondents being highlighted where appropriate.

It is worth noting the low number of responses for this consultation – especially as respondents were asked questions about the localities relevant to them.

Typically, open text comments would be coded and themed, but this was only possible for Shaftesbury Children’s Centre. The coded comments are then reported on based on the number of times those individual issues have been raised. For the other centres, the comments are shown verbatim.

Note: some figures may not sum due to rounding.

Who participated?

**A map of the united states
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**Respondents by postcode (partial). This map is not definitive and has no legal status.**

**Key:**

**0 to 5 postcodes 5 to 10 postcodes**

**10 to 15 postcodes 15 to 20 postcodes**

**20 to 37 postcodes**

The map is based on a number of partial postcodes (the first half only). Some are repeated several times, and this can be seen through the colour breakdown. This gives an indication as to how representative the split of respondents are across the Dorset Council area.

**Executive Summary**

Generally, the response rate for the consultation was low, with 212 responses. These responses are then split across the 6 localities and various centres, producing small sample sizes and making drawing conclusions difficult.

**Demographic data:**

Age of children:

* just over half (51.9% of 324 respondents) had children aged between 0 to 5
* 22.5% (73) had children aged between 6 to 10
* 17.3% (56) had children aged between 11 to 16
* 5.9% (19) had children aged between 17 to 18
* 2.5% (8) had children aged between 19 to 25 (special educational needs and disability only)

The respondents themselves:

* the highest proportion were aged between 25 to 39 (45.6% equating to 94 people)
* 24.8% (51) were aged between 40 to 49
* 12.6% (26) were aged between 50 to 59
* 15.8% of respondents (32) identified as disabled
* 85% of respondents (176) were female

**The North:**

* the North had the most responses of all the localities with 186 responses across the 3 centres
* Shaftesbury had the most responses, and the highest disagreement rate of all centres part of the consultation, with 69.7% (55 respondents) disagreeing overall with the proposals. Some examples from the feedback are:

1. many target families reside in flats with no access to open space. The current Children’s Centre offers this outdoor space
2. there isn’t enough nursery provision in the area at the moment. Concerns over this being taken away creating a 25 to 30-minute commute. Also not guaranteed spots when they already have places here. Unsustainable for parents who don’t drive. This has a domino effect on parents/care givers being able to work
3. services are valued, whether they are courses, support groups or activities. It also supports families in the area who need those free services. The area is lacking in other support services

* Sherborne and Blandford both had mixed results
* there was a signifcant level of uncertainty with the responses for Sherborne proposal with 38.5% of respondents (20) remaining neutral and 25% (13) declaring they did not know
* Blandford had the highest agreement rate in the North, with 30.9% (17 respondents) agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposals. However, 29.1% of respondents (16) remained neutral and 18.2% (10) did not know

**The East:**

* the proposals in the East included all centres receiving an ‘increased service offer from the centre’. Consequently, all the centres have very high levels of agreement
* 98 total responses across the 3 centres, with 39 on Wimborne alone
* Wimborne also had the highest overall agreement of the 3 centres, with 92.3% (36) either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposals
* Corfe Mullen had a similar level of support for the proposals, as there was 90.3% (28) overall agreement
* Upton’s agreement level was lower than the other centres in the East, but still high at 71.4% (20)
* all the centres in the East had 0% of respondents disagree with the proposals

**Purbeck:**

* unlike the North and East, there were only 60 respondents across the 3 centres. With the 60 being split it is harder to draw insights
* Swanage had the highest agreement rate of the 3 centres with 80% (16 people) agreeing overall with the proposals. 55% (11) of that figure strongly agreed. 5% (1 respondent) strongly disagreed. This is in-line with the other centres whose proposals include an increase in services, but within the same building
* Wareham had the next highest level of overall agreement at 61.9% (13 respondents). 28.6% (6) disagreed with the proposals, with 23.8% of those strongly disagreeing
* Bovington had 19 responses and 42.1% (8) agreed with the proposals overall, with 26.3% (5) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing

**The Dorchester area:**

* 49 responses across the 2 centres with a mix of results across them
* 59.3% of respondents (16) for Poundbury either strongly agreed or agreed with the proposals
* 33.3% (9) disagreed or strongly disagreed
* Broadmayne had some interesting results, with 36.4% (8) of respondents remaining neutral and 18.2% (4) declaring they did not know
* the remaining 45.5% (10) were in agreement

**Chesil:**

* the varying proposals for the Chesil area (Weymouth and Portland) resulted in a diverse – but small – response. The centres in the Chesil area had some of the lowest response rates with just 62 across all 4
* Bincombe Valley Children’s Centre had the highest agreement level overall, with 75% (12) either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposals
* 6.3% (1) strongly disagreed with a further 18.8% (3) remaining neutral
* similarly to Broadmayne, Westham had just under half of respondents 46.7% (7) remaining neutral and 6.7% (1) stating they did not know. In both cases, the proposal was ‘no change to current offer’
* contrasting to Broadmayne however, for Westham 13.3% (2) disagreed with the proposals, and 33.3% (5) agreed
* 26.7% of all respondents (4) agreed with the Mulberry proposals to relocate the services into the new Family Hub in Weymouth which will ‘offer an increased service for families’
* however, 46.7% of respondents (7) disagreed or strongly disagreed, with a further 26.7% (4) remaining neutral
* Outlooks, again with a small sample size of 16 respondents, had the lowest agreement rate of all the centres in the Chesil area
* 25% of respondents (4) agreed but 50% (8) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposals to relocate the services into the Family Hub in Portland

**The West**

* the West – excluding Bridport – had the lowest response rates of all the centres part of the consultation
* Bridport was the only centre to have 100% agreement. Of the 21 respondents, 76.2% (16) also strongly agreed with the proposals, showing a consensus of support
* Beaminster had 12 responses and these were mixed. 33.3% (4) agreed and disagreed with the proposal respectively
* Lyme Regis had a higher level of agreement than Beaminster, but was still fairly mixed across the low number of responses
* 46.2% (6) either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposals
* 15.4% (2) disagreed or strongly disagreed. 15.4% (2) were neutral and 23.1% (3) did not know

About you

**Q1: Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?**

(n-212)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Resident | 184 | 86.8% |
| Dorset Council staff | 18 | 8.5% |
| Dorset Council Councillor | 1 | 0.5% |
| Other interested party (please specify) | 9 | 4.3% |

The overall response

**The overall response**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Centre** | **Number of responses by centre** | **Percentage of total** |
| Shaftesbury | 79 | 15.8% |
| Blandford | 55 | 11% |
| Sherborne | 52 | 10.4% |
| Wimborne | 39 | 7.8% |
| Corfe Mullen | 31 | 6.2% |
| Upton (Library) | 28 | 5.6% |
| Poundbury | 27 | 5.4% |
| Broadmayne | 22 | 4.4% |
| Wareham | 21 | 4.2% |
| Bridport | 21 | 4.2% |
| Swanage | 20 | 4% |
| Bovington | 19 | 3.8% |
| Bincombe Valley | 16 | 3.2% |
| Outlooks | 16 | 3.2% |
| Westham | 15 | 3% |
| Mulberry | 15 | 3% |
| Lyme Regis | 13 | 2.6% |
| Beaminster | 12 | 2.4% |

The consultation was split into 6 localities, so respondents could pick and answer questions about the centres most relevant to them. As users could comment on more than one centre – and even locality – the 212 unique respondents led to 501 responses to the different centres, which the table and chart above show.

The North (Shaftesbury, Blandford, Sherborne) and the East (Wimborne, Corfe Mullen and Upton) were the two localities and centres with the highest number of responses. Shaftesbury in particular was 15.8% of the overall total, demonstrating local interest in this specific centre.

It is worth noting that it is difficult to draw conclusions due to the low number of responses - especially the centres with fewer than 20 responses. The basis of the analysis will be taken on the number of responses with the North going into more detail as there is more data to work from.

**The proposals at a glance**

Across the localities there were a variety of proposals, ranging from services increasing, to services relocating. From looking at the data, there were 3 scenarios that showed a consensus or pattern.

**Proposals that include an increased offer of services from within the same building**

The first is the centres whose proposals included an increased offer in services within the current building. In this case, and as can be seen from the chart, the agreement is unanimous across the 6 centres. The agreement is as follows:

1. Bridport – 100% agreement
2. Wimborne – 92.3% agreement (0% disagreement)
3. Corfe Mullen – 90.3% agreement (0% disagreement)
4. Swanage – 80% agreement (5% disagreement)
5. Bincombe Valley – 75% agreement (6.3% disagreement)
6. Upton (Library) – 71.4% agreement (0% disagreement)

**Proposals that include an increased offer of services but relocating to a different building**

For Outlooks, Poundbury and Wareham the proposals also included an increased offer in services, but it would involve relocating to a new building (in all cases moving to a nearby Family Hub). This change in building – despite the increase in services – has affected the level of agreement for the proposals. Especially when looking at Outlooks:

1. Wareham had 61.9% of respondents in agreement, but 28.6% disagreed with the proposals. 23.8% of that total strongly disagreed, too
2. Poundbury had 59.3% of respondents in agreement, but 33.3% disagreed
3. Outlooks had 25% of respondents in agreement, with 50% disagreeing

This highlights that, even though the venue is identified and may provide more in provision, there is clearly concern for the facility moving.

**Proposals that – in some cases – may include an increased offer of services, but involves relocating to an unknown building**

Bovington, Mulberry and Shaftesbury all have slightly different proposals, but the common strand connecting them is that all (some in Shaftesbury’s case) services could move to an unknown building.

Bovington has the highest level of agreement of the 3 centres, with 42.1% of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing. 26.3% of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed, 21.1% remained neutral and 10.5% did not know.

The proposal for Mulberry would include an increase in services offered, but it would be provided at a new venue, which is not yet confirmed. Unlike in the previous 2 scenarios, this is the first centre with a proposed increase in services that has a considerably higher number of respondents disagreeing with the proposals. 46.7% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, with just 26.7% agreeing overall. A further 26.7% remained neutral. The unconfirmed nature of the proposal has potentially had an impact on respondents’ level of agreement.

Shaftesbury’s proposals involved some services relocating to local community venues which are to be confirmed. This has the highest level of disagreement across all centres with 69.7% of respondents either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

**The North Locality**

**Sherborne Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the North? - Sherborne Children’s Centre**

(n-52)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 3 | 5.8% | 23.1% |
| **Agree** | 9 | 17.3% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 20 | 38.5% |  |
| **Disagree** | 4 | 7.7% | 13.5% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3 | 5.8% |
| **Don't know** | 13 | 25% |  |

Looking initially at the overall response for Sherborne, the results are mixed. 23.1% of respondents (12) either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposals, compared to 13.5% (7) who disagreed or strongly disagreed. 38.5% (20 respondents) were neutral and 25% (13) did not know.

One reason for such a mixed response could be that respondents were able to respond to all centres in a given locality. Shaftesbury – as the report will detail later – was considerably the most contentious of all the centres. It is possible that some respondents only wanted to comment on Shaftesbury, and so did not know enough about Sherborne or the proposals to express a definitive opinion.

Respondents who identified as disabled (13) exceed this trend further, with 61.5% (8) remaining neutral and a further 23.1% (3) declaring they did not know. No respondent agreed with the proposals too.

When looking at the data amongst respondents based on their children’s ages, the data is almost in-line with the overall:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0 to 5** | | **6 to 10** | | **11 to 16** | |
| **Strongly agree** | 2.5% | 25% | 9.7% | 25.8% | 0% | 15.4% |
| **Agree** | 22.5% | 16.1% | 15.4% |
| **Neither** | 35% |  | 35.5% |  | 38.5% |  |
| **Disagree** | 7.5% | 10% | 9.7% | 22.6% | 0% | 15.4% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2.5% | 12.9% | 15.4% |
| **Don't know** | 30% |  | 16.1% |  | 30.8% |  |

**Base: Children aged 0-5 years (n-40), 6-10 years (n-31), 11-16 years (n-13)**

Parents whose children were aged 0 to 5 or 6 to 10, agreed with the proposals at a rate of 25% (from 10 respondents) and 25.8% (8) respectively. A couple of differences between the two however, are that parents whose children are 0 to 5 (40 respondents) had a lower level of strong agreement (2.5%), but also had lower levels of overall disagreement at 10% (4).

Respondents with children aged 11 to 16 (13), had a lower level of overall agreement than both the other age groups, and also the average, with 15.4% (2) in agreement.

Interestingly, both the 0 to 5 (40 overall) and 11 to 16 (13) age groups had a higher percentage of respondents remaining neutral or answering ‘don’t know’ than the average at 65% (26) and 69.2% (9) respectively.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sherborne open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Sherborne children’s centre is a brilliant place. It provides a great location for groups and easily accessible.  [redacted] attended the Messy Mites group for the past two which my little boy loves.  It’s run by knowledgeable, kind and approachable people.  Also with the cost of many things going up it makes going to baby groups expensive so I also appreciate that it’s a free group. |
| Agree | Relieved this vital service will continue albeit under different management. My toddler attends weekly. |
| Agree | More support for nww parents.  Offer under 1 support e.g. baby sensory, baby massage and under 1 groups to help new families. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | As long as the center offers a good offer to local groups |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Have used the children centre for the group that runs on a Tuesday. More groups would be a great idea. As there not many groups in Sherborne. The lady that runs the group is lovely. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | As long as groups still run free as only free access for gamilues |
| Disagree | It does work well as it is, however investment is needed to equip a room with soundproofing and video conferencing so that family meetings can be held. This would enable family conferences to be held in Sherborne and families would be more comfortable and more relaxed as they have not had to travel to Sturminster, an expensive and time consuming journey into unfamiliar territory to a meeting they are unlikely to be looking forward to. Meetings in the local community would facilitate face to face participation by more agencies including health and education, breaking down barriers. |
| Disagree | Can’t comment as we don’t use it, it’s to far away |
| Strongly disagree | Currently 0 support in the Sherborne are for families with children aged 5 years plus |

**Shaftesbury Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the North? - Shaftesbury Children’s Centre**

(n-79)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 3 | 3.8% | 8.9% |
| **Agree** | 4 | 5.1% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 11 | 13.9% |  |
| **Disagree** | 10 | 12.7% | 69.7% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 45 | 57% |
| **Don't know** | 6 | 7.6% |  |

As shown in the data, Shaftesbury has a high level of disagreement when compared to the other centres, but also generally. 69.7% of respondents (55) disagreed overall, with 57% (45) those strongly disagreeing. The numbers of ‘don’t know’ and neither agree nor disagree responses were also considerably lower, potentially showing that respondents felt vehemently about the proposals.

Respondents who identified as disabled (16) levels of disagreement were slightly below the average at 62.5% (10), but again, 56.3% (9) strongly disagreed.

There is a curious observation found within the children’s age groups data again, too.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0 to 5** | | **6 to 10** | | **11 to 16** | |
| **Strongly agree** | 6.2% | 10.8% | 0% | 0% | 4.8% | 14.3% |
| **Agree** | 4.6% | 0% | 9.5% |
| **Neither** | 9.2% |  | 12.8% |  | 9.5% |  |
| **Disagree** | 10.8% | 72.3% | 15.4% | 87.2% | 4.8% | 71.4% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 61.5% | 71.8% | 66.7% |
| **Don't know** | 7.7% |  | 0% |  | 4.8% |  |

**Base: Children aged 0-5 years (n-65), 6-10 years (n-39), 11-16 years (n-21)**

Generally, there is a high level of disagreement across the 3 age groups, as with the overall data. The 6 to 10 category however is especially high at 87.2% (34 respondents) overall disageement. 71.8% (28) of that figure is respondents that strongly disagreed too, showing a clear shared consensus. This shows a possibility respondents with children within this age group feel there is a lack of provision available, made uncertain by proposals that cannot confirm the logisitics of the new offer at this time.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

**Organisation Response – Shaftesbury Town Council**

“Shaftesbury Nursery/ Children’s Centre is currently managed by Dorset Council. It is noted that DC is committed to this provision and have no plans to close or reduce the service.

On the contracting out of the operation of the nursery, there is not an issue with this in principle.

There would however be an objection to Dorset directly awarding this contract to SAST. How does DC establish that they are the best provider? It would seem prudent to see the contract offered openly to other nursery providers in the town, of whom we have a couple, as well as SAST. STC insist on an open process being run.

On the relocation of other services out of the nursery building, has a case been made that it is best, or necessary, to separate nursery provision from other family services? There may be benefits to co-location, however STC has not seen it established why the provision should be separated.

If there is reason to this (e.g. Building not big enough), then STC insists that the family services are relocated within Shaftesbury. It would be strongly opposed to move family services out of the town given our very poor transport links.”

**General comments**

The comments have been coded and themed, which is available below. The full comments can also be found verbatim in the appendix. In summary, with some notable points/concerns raised:

* many target families reside in flats with no access to open space. The current Children Centre offers this outdoor space
* there isn’t enough nursery provision in the area at the moment, with concerns over this being taken away creating a 25 to 30-minute commute. Also not guaranteed spots when they already have places here. Unsustainable for parents who don’t drive. This has a domino effect on parents/care givers being able to work
* services are valued, whether they are courses, support groups or activities. It also supports families in the area who need those free services. The area is lacking in other support services

**Coding – most common themes/most mentioned topics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comment | Number of times mentioned |
| Concern of losing the central hub/ centre in this part of the north/Shaftesbury Centre | 24 |
| The centre is a crucial part of the community/provides invaluable support to families (including free support) | 23 |
| Nursery/childcare provision is valuable/needed | 21 |
| Physical hub is needed in good location due to poor transport links/difficult for those who don't drive | 16 |
| Centre is ideally located | 8 |
| Shaftesbury is a growing population. Services should be extended/more support needed | 7 |
| Do not take away centre until alternative/appropriate venue is identified and in place | 5 |
| Information isn’t clear/ insufficient | 4 |
| Outdoor space is available at centre | 4 |
| North has a lack of services and support for families | 3 |
| Centre has supportive staff | 3 |
| Centre suitable for staff/ concern for staff | 3 |
| Concern other centres would not offer same quality of provision | 2 |
| Shaftsbury always first to have thing cancelled | 1 |

**Blandford Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the North? - Blandford Children’s Centre**

(n-55)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 8 | 14.6% | 31% |
| **Agree** | 9 | 16.4% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 16 | 29.1% |  |
| **Disagree** | 4 | 7.3% | 21.9% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 8 | 14.6% |
| **Don't know** | 10 | 18.2% |  |

Of the 3 centres in the North, Blandford has the highest agreement rate, with 31% (17 respondents) agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposals. 21.9% (12 respondents) disagreed overall, and similarly to previous centres in the North, the higher percentage (14.6%) strongly disagreed.

It is worth noting that a fairly high number of respondents were unsure or did not know about their stance on the proposal for Blandford. The figures are lower than Sherborne, but it still comprises of a large number of the respondents of which 29.1% (16) remained neutral and 18.2% (10) did not know.

15 respondents that answered the Blandford question identified as disabled. Generally, the level of agreement for these respondents was in-line with the average, but 26.7% (4) disagreed overall, which is higher than the general level of 21.9%.

Looking at the breakdown of respondents based on ages of their children, there are some differences in agreement again, which can be seen in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0 to 5** | | **6 to 10** | | **11 to 16** | |
| **Strongly agree** | 7.1% | 23.8% | 17.2% | 37.9% | 5.6% | 16.7% |
| **Agree** | 16.7% | 20.7% | 11.1% |
| **Neither** | 31% |  | 41.4% |  | 27.8% |  |
| **Disagree** | 7.1% | 23.8% | 0% | 6.9% | 0% | 44.4% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 16.7% | 6.9% | 44.4% |
| **Don't know** | 21.4% |  | 13.8% |  | 11.1% |  |

**Base: Children aged 0-5 years (n-42), 6-10 years (n-29), 11-16 years (n-18)**

Those responding with children aged between 6 and 10, had the highest level of agreement, with 37.9% (11) either agreeing or strongly agreeing. This stands out with the level of disagreement too, with just 6.9% (2) strongly disagreeing. This is much lower than the average level of disagreement across the general response.

The other notable difference is that resondents with children aged between 11 and 16 had a disagreement level almost double over the average. 44.4% (8) strongly disagreed with the proposals. This, coupled with the 6 to 10 data, suggests that the current provision offered at Blandford may be a better experience for the middling group, but as the children age, this drops and dissatisfaction becomes more apparent.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Blandford open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Agree this needs to be kept open as an excellent site for vulnerable families with school on site etc and library is too small |
| Strongly agree | Agree this building needs to be retained to continue its important work with families with purpose buoy play area and sensory tent slo g with training venue. With good access for parking and disabilities |
| Strongly agree | There needs to be more services and groups providing speech and language support for preschool aged children in this area. |
| Strongly agree | Can’t comment don’t use as don’t drive but I agree to keep it as a children center if it’s purpose built like Shaftesbury |
| Strongly agree | Please retain these vital services for the surrounding rural communities |
| Agree | No changes |
| Agree | Children's centres are vital for young families in Blandford. Provision should be extended, to enable more children and families to receive support. |
| Agree | Only that we really need to increase nursery places available in Blandford and unfortunately the children’s centre were unable to offer a place due to staff shortage |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Some good offers. Offer should continue into 1st year of education, so that parents and carers can be better informed on what support their child could/should be getting. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | I don’t agree that blandford and Shaftesbury should merge it’s not going to solve any staffing issues if anything it will push staff members further away I believe |
| Neither agree nor disagree | From experiencr of family members little or no support for children with additional needs |
| Disagree | I think the current site of the Blandford children’s centre would be a perfect site for the school Next door to use (Archbishop Wake. The 2 buildings always used to be connected when it was a middle school.  I think Blandford library is an excellent site to have all the family hub facilities in as I remember it has a vast basement which would be perfect for the children’s library and other family rooms. It does however need a lift and more toilet facilities. |
| Disagree | There needs to be more groups across different days and more structure to the groups that currently offered. The under 1s group has no set structure and is often down to the parents to organise activities not the staff that work there. |
| Disagree | I had my [redacted] and live in Blandford. I have found it difficult to find out about groups and support running at Blandford children's centre, and have struggled to find local opportunities to meet other mums and build a support network locally. I've had to attend groups in the wider area or pay for local groups. I would like to see:  - clearer and more accessible information about what's on at local children's centre  - more options for groups for babies at children's centre |
| Disagree | Do not use this nursery |
| Strongly disagree | Please oh please keep Blandford children’s centre groups. It’s so crucial to young families. There’s not much in Blandford for them and this is such a great support network and vital asset to Blandford. It would be soo devastating to lose the baby and children classes. Please keep Ito and running how it was. |
| Strongly disagree | Whilst I have no experience of the provision for children under the age of 5, I am acutely aware of the lack of provision of social support and outreach provision for small rural communities in Dorset.  North Dorset would hugely benefit from a very regular mobile drop in service for families with children from 0-18 in rural settings. Providing advice, guidance, monitoring, appointments services, activities, skills and education and collection of data and information to support future targeted services. Rurally based children have very little social support and social education outside of school, leading to lower career opportunities an increased poverty whilst being in an evermore economically challenging environment. |
| Strongly disagree | If they need more facilities then you need to find them not condence the problem of lack of spaces fo two towns into one hopping that the problem will go away and you can save some pennies in the meantime. |
| Strongly disagree | There is no additional offer of anything in the north of the county. We have the worst transport, the least leisure facilities, the highest council tax yet no extra support for families in these proposals |
| Strongly disagree | It is important to keep due to hosting essential services such as Speech & Language. |
| Strongly disagree | I believe that the Children's Centre is extremely helpful for me and all 3 of my children. We often have appointments there. |
| Did not answer | I feel that it would be helpful to offer support to families with children over 5. The space is really good and includes a sensory room. It would be nice if the space could be used by families of children with SEN and young carers outside of school hours. |

**The East Locality**

**Wimborne**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the East - Wimborne**

(n-39)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 21 | 53.9% | 92.4% |
| **Agree** | 15 | 38.5% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 0 | 0% |  |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0% | 0.00% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0% |
| **Don't know** | 3 | 7.7% |  |

For Wimborne, and as already established much like the other centres in the East, there was a very high level of agreement for the proposals. Of the 39 respondents who answered this question, 92.4% agreed with the proposals, with 0 disagreeing. Respondents who identified as disabled (4) shared this consensus too, answering the question with 100% agreement for the proposals.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Wimborne open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Working well as a Family hub offering a wide range of services that are easily accessible to the local community |
| Strongly agree | As Wimborne has already changed from a Children's Centre to a Family Hub I do not understand we this included in the consultation however Wimborne Children’s Centre has been very supportive over the years and is a very important to the residents of Leigh Park |
| Strongly agree | Wimborne hub is a friendly and welcoming space for appointments and classes for you and baby. It’s an asset to have it so close to where I live. |
| Strongly agree | Wimborne is an incredible hub, so increasing the services will only improve it further |
| Strongly agree | I think it's a great idea that the age group has been extended to 25 years. |
| Agree | The centre has different activities each week with different crafts. The support is amazing when I have any concerns or questions. |
| Agree | The centre has been very helpful for us and my son, with plenty of facilities that have aided my child's growth and development and it's nice that everyone is made welcome. |
| Agree | Would help extending the age range. We love toddler group and I also attend another group here. We love the Family Hub. |
| Agree | I like the different spaces. It's great there are toilets for small children and a good outside space. Also useful to have the food bank here. |

**Corfe Mullen Children's Centre (Library)**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the East - Corfe Mullen**

(n-31)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 22 | 71% | 90.4% |
| **Agree** | 6 | 19.4% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 1 | 3.2% |  |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0% |
| **Don't know** | 2 | 6.5% |  |

Similarly to Wimborne, respondents answering on the proposals to Corfe Mullen had a unanimous high level of agreement, with 90.4% (28) either strongly agreeing or agreeing with the proposals. Of the remaining, 3.2% (1) respondent neither agreed nor disagreed and 6.5% (2) did not know.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Corfe Mullen open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Excellent groups and sessions are run here and an invaluable asset to the local community. More activity workers are needed to support sessions, and funds to update the building and equipment. |
| Strongly agree | Excellent joint working model with a library and services for the wider community involving Health visitors , and activities for children |
| Strongly agree | I have attended the Under Ones and Under Twos sessions at Corfe Mullen with my children. I have found the groups to be very supportive and don’t know how I would have coped without them. Myself and my child have found friends for life and the advise I have received has been invaluable |
| Strongly agree | We would love to see more sessions for young children at Corfe Mullen. It’s a great centre. |
| Strongly agree | Friendly staff and a wonderful community resource and hub. |
| Strongly agree | Please do more groups for younger children and during the school holidays. |
| Strongly agree | Fantastic centre and staff. |
| Strongly agree | Please provide more support and staff for the Corfe Mullen outreach base. They run wonderful sessions and do so basically on their own. They should have more activity workers and support from managers. |
| Strongly agree | Please keep the children’s centre in Corfe Mullen, it’s much needed for families. |
| Strongly agree | We love the Children’s Centre! |
| Agree | Excellent Rhyme Time! |
| Agree | More groups for toddlers please! |
| Agree | We love the centre :) |
| Agree | Corfe offers fantastic toddler group - we’d like more groups and activities in the holidays please. |
| Agree | We love the baby group on Mondays. Could we please suggest more sensory sessions for babies. |
| Don’t know | Great resources and place to meet other mums |
| Not answered | [Redacted] runs a fantastic baby group. |
| Not answered | We love our Childrens Centre and the groups they run! |
| Not answered | I’ve not attended this place |

**Upton (Library)**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the East - Upton**

(n-28)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 16 | 57.1% | 71.4% |
| **Agree** | 4 | 14.3% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 2 | 7.1% |  |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0% |
| **Don't know** | 6 | 21.4% |  |

While lower than the previous two centres in the East, respondents still had a high level of agreement for the proposals in Upton. 71.4% (20) either strongly agreed or agreed. Interestingly, although the level of agreement is around 20% lower than Corfe Mullen, again there were no respondents who answered they disagreed. 21.4% of respondents (6) did not know, and 7.1% (2) neither agreed nor disagreed.

It is worth noting that Upton has 28 overall responses, compared to 39 from Wimborne.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Upton (Library) open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Again a good use of a shared space with activities for under 5's when the Library is not in use |
| Strongly agree | The current under one sensory for residents is great- it’s one of the few affordable classes and isn’t selective on our age or home scenario. It’s been invaluable to meet local mums-and expansion of services would be even better. I understand groups for certain people such as low income or young mums are important- but raising children is hard for everyone and it would be really great if there continues to be support and groups available for all parents/children - thanks. |
| Not answered | I’ve not attended this place |

**Purbeck Locality**

**Swanage**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Purbeck? – Swanage**

(n-20)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 11 | 55% | 80% |
| **Agree** | 5 | 25% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 1 | 5% |  |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0% | 5% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1 | 5% |
| **Don't know** | 2 | 10% |  |

Before discussing the data, it is important to clarify that there were only 20 respondents to this question, so it is difficult to draw firm conclusions.

However, of those 20 respondents, the agreement level was particularly high, with 80% (16) agreeing with the proposals. 55% of the overall total also strongly agreed, which as previously clarified, is in-line with other centres with proposals to increase the offer of services within the same building.

5% (1 respondent) strongly disagreed and their comment can be seen below. This was mainly in reference to the consultation method and the information available relating to it. 10% (2) did not know and 5% (1) remained neutral.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Swanage open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | We need more face to face services in Swanage - not everyone is on line and it's a long way to Wareham or Poole. Lovely building and people! |
| Strongly agree | This is much needed is Swanage |
| Strongly agree | [redacted] Breastfeeding Support Group at Swanage children's centre [redacted] and find it invaluable. It would be lovely if it ran for a longer period of time but I understand that there are other groups that need to use the space too. It is SO important to have this resource, especially for new mums. Under 1s is run here also, but I (and a lot of my mum friends) were really disappointed to find that under 2s no longer existed here as all our children turned 1 within the same term, and we would have loved to continue a group like the under 1 group as we all loved it on a Monday morning and the children had a lovely time and it was good for their sensory development, especially for those parents not trained in sensory play (luckily I personally am). It would be really nice to bring back under 2s. |
| Strongly agree | The development Trust which now runs the old Children's Centre has made great progress in reinvigorating the local offering for families and residents and I would like DC to provide as much statutory support as possible; midwifery, early help, social care, specialists groups such as The Freedom Programme run by DAIT (with DC funding please). There is also more than enough space to host multi agency meetings such as TACs, CPCs where client/service user participation is required. Please build on the excellent work of the Development Trust and help support them in reaching as many people as possible in Swanage who require support, assistance, intervention. |
| Strongly agree | I was not aware that the children centre has now changed to 25 years, more advertising needed on what they can offer |
| Strongly agree | It would be good to increase services for pre school children-musical activities, play activities |
| Agree | A generic comment that renaming centres as family hubs is discriminatory against those who live alone or do not have children. If the service is to be developed then “community” hubs or similar would be a better and more inclusive title. |
| Agree | Must make sure that there is a protection of the existing services, as 0-5 is such a hugely important age range.  Breastfeeding support, 0-1 club, and health visitor clinics are absolutely critical and cannot be disrupted by trying to add more stuff in.  It feels like the expansion to 0-25 will actually mean a reduction in each age range, and whilst it looks like more overall, it will lead to a reduction in the existing services.  The drop-in nature of the existing services is also absolutely essential and cannot be disrupted. It’s only a minor exaggeration to say these services are life-saving. They certainly feel like they are to new mums and dads, when GP services are so limited and it’s so difficult to get help elsewhere.  Protect health visiting and breastfeeding support services above everything else!  As a mum to a 1.5yo, accessing support in two localities, I can’t tell you how important the existing services were. |
| Agree | It is exciting about the plans for the whole site however i worry that the use of the space for family activities will alter and that the areas left for the family activities will not be as nice or family friendly as the current space (large room at rear of the children's centre building).  I also wonder what the 'increased service offer from the centre' really means? As far as i'm aware, nothing has changed delivery wise for families over the last few months since designated a family hub. |
| Strongly disagree | How on earth are you quantifying or qualifying your proposed use? How can you consult without a proper CBA as part of your shared info, I have to strongly disagree as you are not consulting effectively |

**Wareham Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Purbeck? - Wareham Children's Centre**

(n-21)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 7 | 33.3% | 61.9% |
| **Agree** | 6 | 28.6% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 1 | 4.8% |  |
| **Disagree** | 1 | 4.8% | 28.6% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 5 | 23.8% |
| **Don't know** | 1 | 4.8% |  |

Similarly to Swanage, there is a small sample size for this question with just 21 respondents.

Although not as high as the previous centre, the agreement level is high here too. 61.9% of respondents (13) either strongly agreed or agreed with the proposals and 28.6% (6) disagreed overall or, mostly in this case (23.8%), strongly disagreed.

4.8% (1) remained neutral and another 4.8% did not know.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Wareham open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | As a [redacted] I use the new family hub on Wareham regularly. We have a [redacted] group every other week. This provides a great space to get together, network and do larger group activities. It also allows the children we look after to socialise in a larger group. The resources at the hub are good and there is a good selection of toys for the children to enjoy. |
| Strongly agree | More services |
| Strongly agree | I sincerely hope this will not affect my current childcare provider which is very close to the centre? If anything I hope you are working closely with Focus Nursery School to give them the opportunity they deserve to expand their services and childcare funded offer. As far as I’m aware they are the only place that provides funded care in the area that is free from any charges compared to the others near by all wanted to charge me extra fees on top of their entitlement. They are such a wonderful little setting that really have been pushed to deliver their offer due to land, building and funding available to them. They are such a dedicated nursery that have been a part of Wareham for many years (I believe since 1994?).  More support to groups that are in situ should be explored and not invite others to bid for tenders. |
| Agree | I'm really impressed with the new range of services being offered by the Wareham family hub. Please continue this vital work. |
| Strongly disagree | I think it's disappointing that the wareham children's centre has not remained part of the family hub as the wareham family hub is very youth focused (physically, the environment) and therefore does not feel like a suitable place to deliver services for young children and their families.  Its a shame the children's centre couldn't be linked to the family hub and remain a facility for the younger children. |
| Strongly disagree | It’s a huge shame that the wareham centre was closed and the growing together under 1s group was moved to a different day and different location. We had built such a great community of mums, dads and babies and now that’s been lost. It’s especially disappointing considering our babies would have been growing up together in the same school years etc. |
| Strongly disagree | It is such a shame that wareham childrens centre has closed - i attended under 1s until it's closure in October.  Relocation of this under 1s group was to wareham library which is not a comparable setting and range of activities & space.  Parking in central wareham is also difficult, especially with access to baby car seats and prams.  Family hub is not great for parking either - i attended the FAB feeding group and would find it difficult to park amongst school & leisure centre users. Buggy access into this building is also not the easiest & isn't full of childrens activities like the childrens centre was.  As I note in the below section, Under 1s as a group has been great to meet parents and babies of similar age - often at other groups there are much older children which can be intimidating and at times hazardous to much younger babies play. In the early months it was such a confidence boost to get out of the house.  Health visitor drop in clinic for weighing babies - these seemed to vanish on closure of the childrens centre with no communication of replacement service. I attended these sessions monthly until they stopped. |

**Bovington Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Purbeck? - Bovington Children's Centre**

(n-19)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 5 | 26.3% | 42.1% |
| **Agree** | 3 | 15.8% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 4 | 21.1% |  |
| **Disagree** | 1 | 5.3% | 26.3% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 4 | 21.1% |
| **Don't know** | 2 | 10.5% |  |

As with the previous centres in Purbeck, Bovington Children’s Centre has a small sample size with just 19 respondents answering the question. It is important to mention that it is difficult to determine firm conclusions from this data.

Compared to the 2 other centres in the locality, Bovington has a lower level of agreement, but interestingly, a lower level of disagreement than the proposals in Wareham. 42.1% of respondents (8) either agreed or strongly agreed and 26.3% (5) disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Another difference is that Bovington has a higher number of respondents that remained neutral, or did not know. 21.1% (4) did not agree either way, and a further 10.5% (2) did not know.

As part of the proposal, some of the services would be relocated to a community venue, which will ‘offer an increased service for families’. Wareham had a similar proposal, but the services are to be moved to a new Family Hub, which is a known quantity, unlike in this case. As one of the comments alludes to below, one respondent felt it was difficult to agree either way without having more information around the new centre and what it will offer. That uncertainty may have resulted in the 31.6% of respondents answering as they did.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Bovington open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | more services |
| Neither agree nor disagree | It is difficult to comment on this as there is no mention of what the new facility will look like and what will be offered there. |
| Strongly disagree | Bovington children’s centre is a great space for babies, especially those who are getting mobile. My son has just started crawling and I love that we have a safe space for him to explore with other babies when we go to the under ones group (we had to move to this group after [redacted] day was changed). If you move the group to another location, the set up won’t be as good for young children with the facilities and activities they need. |
| Strongly disagree | Bovington children centre is a lovely little building perfect for the baby groups that it provides. |
| Strongly disagree | I have attended the Under 1s group at bovington childrens centre since October - the building is perfect for the session with a wide array of play stations in an open plan format, allowing the babies. This group is really well attended and we all love how it us setup for the range of ages.  Under 1s as a group has been great to meet parents and babies of similar age - often at other groups there are much older children which can be intimidating and at times hazardous to much younger babies play. In the early months it was such a confidence boost to get out of the house. |

**Dorchester Area**

**Poundbury Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Dorchester? - Poundbury Children’s Centre**

(n-27)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 4 | 14.8% | 59.3% |
| **Agree** | 12 | 44.4% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 2 | 7.4% |  |
| **Disagree** | 5 | 18.5% | 33.3% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 4 | 14.8% |
| **Don't know** | 0 | 0% |  |

Poundbury Children’s Centre had the most responses of the centres in the Dorchester area, but it is still a relatively small sample size and so caution should be taken when attempting to find conclusions and a consensus.

The proposals for Poundbury were for the building to no longer be used by Dorset Children’s Services and, instead, for services to be moved to the new Family Hub in Dorchester. This would ‘offer an increased service for families.’

Looking at the data, 59.3% of respondents (16) either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposals as outlined above. 33.3% (9) disagreed or strongly disagreed. For more context into the reasoning for the responses, the comments have been left below verbatim.

4 respondents who answered questions on Poundbury identified as disabled, and their responses were slightly different to the average. 75% (3) agreed or strongly agreed, and 25% (1) person strongly disagreed with the proposals.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Poundbury open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | I quite like the location of the Family Hub in Dorchester. The library is more central. |
| Strongly agree | The new Family Hub is in a good location, with good amenities. |
| Agree | There has been nothing here for years, hopefully the family hub in Dorchester is able to provide needed services |
| Agree | Haven't used these facilities |
| Agree | I like that the Family Hub is in Dorchester Library because now I used the local facilities and the promimity to town is useful. |
| Agree | Great to have Family Hubs in the library. Would be good to have free parking, as they used to have this in Poundbury. Increasing services is important as the need is great. Having clear Family Hub basis for support is important. |
| Agree | Dorchester Library is a more centralised location than Poundbury Children's Centre. |
| Agree | I really like the Family Hub in the library. The location is good. |
| Agree | The new Family Hub is in the heart of town, people can tie things in with the town, the parking is good. |
| Agree | The Family Hub is better being part of the community in a public space. The building is accessible to all unlike Poundbury Children's Centre. I love that the books are all around. |
| Agree | It would be nice for the Family Hub to have some 'hang out' space. |
| Agree | Much better location at the library and also easier access with young babies/children, however you do now have to pay for parking.  FAB used to operate from the Poundbury Children's Centre, will they continue to operate from the library? This is a vital group for breastfeeding support.  Are the library classrooms being made more private? Just thinking if babies are being weighed/having hearing tests or you are receiving breastfeeding support you would want a private room and not to be overlooked by people in the library. |
| Agree | Poundbury is less accessible than is Dorchester town centre which is served by easier rail and bus link, and importantly walking. |
| Disagree | I used this Centre when my children were younger and really appreciated the free parking directly outside of the building. |
| Disagree | Compared to the new hub the children’s centre had a more ‘homely feel’ where families could pop in as there were always staff present. I feel families miss being able to access a washing /drying machine for free.  The garden is also missed as well as the ease of parking for families and room users. Contact visits were able to take place with many of the families using the kitchen facilities . |
| Disagree | I drive from outside of town. Free parking at the Poundbury CC would have been a bonus. |
| Disagree | Children's Centres offer a one-stop family friendly space for workers and families to meet and ararnge groups that focus on issues relevant to them. Although these issues can be done in a lot of places, having a child friendly space that has outdoor access is needed. |
| Disagree | I used this Centre when my children were younger and really appreciated the free parking directly outside of the building. |
| Strongly disagree | Why is this going where are Dorchester families to go to for support Boradmayne is too difficult to get to.  Why can't part of the library be used as a hub, it has great facilities and plenty of room |
| Strongly disagree | You do not outline what the increased services there are within the new family Hub.  It is hoped that the building is not going to be turned in to housing or flats rather than being used for families in the locality.  The Dorchester Opportunities Group are possibly looking for premises so this could be allocated to them. |

**Broadmayne Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Dorchester? - Broadmayne Children’s Centre**

(n-22)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 3 | 13.6% | 45.4% |
| **Agree** | 7 | 31.8% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 8 | 36.4% |  |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0% |
| **Don't know** | 4 | 18.2% |  |

As with several of the centres, Broadmayne Children’s Centre has a small sample size of 22 respondents, so it is difficult to draw firm conclusions.

There are some notable figures when analysing the data for this centre. No respondent disagreed with the proposals, and yet, only 45.4% (10) either agreed or strongly agreed.

Of the remaining respondents (12), 36.4% remained neutral and 18.2% did not know.

The proposals for Broadmayne were ‘no change to current offer’ and so perhaps as there was no fundamental change, respondents did not feel able to confirm one way or another.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Broadmayne open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Agree | I think Preschool provision is an essential part of the Broadmayne Children's centre. |
| Agree | Haven't used these facilities |
| Neither agree nor disagree | I didn’t use this Centre. |

**Chesil Locality**

**Bincombe Valley Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Chesil? - Bincombe Valley Children’s Centre**

(n-16)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 8 | 50% | 75% |
| **Agree** | 4 | 25% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 3 | 18.8% |  |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0% | 6.3% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1 | 6.3% |
| **Don't know** | 0 | 0% |  |

There were just 16 respondents to this question, and so the data for Bincombe Valley Children’s Centre should be interpreted with caution.

Across the other centres where the proposal has been to provide an ‘increased service offer’, the pattern has generally been a high level of agreement. This appears to be the case here too, as of the 16 people that did respond, 75% (12) either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposals. 6.3% (1) strongly disagreed, with 18.8% (3) remaining neutral.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Bincombe Valley open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | I believe this is the most important centre and plays a crucial role within the community |
| Strongly agree | Pleased to see services are planned for children/ young people upto age 18 - some families need support with children and young people over the age of 5 - especially since the cutting of youth services and youth centres |
| Agree | Good parking! |
| Strongly disagree | Buncombe Children's Centre is an established children's centre that the community have come to rely for support |

**Westham Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Chesil? - Westham Children’s Centre**

(n-15)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 1 | 6.7% | 33.4% |
| **Agree** | 4 | 26.7% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 7 | 46.7% |  |
| **Disagree** | 2 | 13.3% | 13.3% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0% |
| **Don't know** | 1 | 6.7% |  |

It is important to note that Westham Children’s Centre had a small sample size of 15 respondents for this question.

The data for Westham Children's Centre is very different to that of Bincombe Valley, and some context may be able to explain why. Bincombe’s proposals included expanding the range of services offered, whereas Westham’s proposals indicated that there would be ‘no changes to current offer’.

Much like with Broadmayne, which had a similar proposal, where over half of respondents were unsure or did not know how to answer, Westham responses mirrored the uncertainty with 46.7% (7) remaining neutral and 6.7% (1) declaring they did not know. As there was no fundamental change, respondents may not have felt able to confirm one way or another.

Of the remaining respondents, 33.4% (5 people) agreed or strongly agreed with the current offer, and 13.3% (2) disagreed.

Looking at the responses from those that identified as disabled, 25% (1) disagreed, 50% (2 people) remained neutral and 25% (1) did not know. This is higher than the average of the overall response.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Westham open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Westham children centre was a lovely established children's centre that was in the heart of westham with enormous footfall from the community and school it is a shame that it no longer provides the same activities and support groups that it did |
| Neither agree nor disagree | It's a shame to lose this space that was a Children's centre but it is being very well used for local families in education. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | I note that there is no provision for either Wyke Regis or Chickerell, despite these areas having a sizeable population. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | I didn't know there was a westham cc and I live in Westham, though my child is [redacted] so not in their age bracket. |
| Disagree | Again need support for children/young people over the age of 5 |
| Don't know | I answered 'don't know ' as it looks like the support in this centre has already gone and I think it is important to also offer that |

**Mulberry Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Chesil? - Mulberry Children’s Centre**

(n-15)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 0 | 0% | 26.7% |
| **Agree** | 4 | 26.7% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 4 | 26.7% |  |
| **Disagree** | 5 | 33.3% | 46.6% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2 | 13.3% |
| **Don't know** | 0 | 0% |  |

It is important to note that Mulberry Children’s Centre had a small sample size of 15 respondents for this question.

26.7% of all respondents (4) agreed with the proposals to relocate the services into the new Family Hub in Weymouth which will ‘offer an increased service for families’.

However, 46.6% of respondents (7) disagreed or strongly disagreed, and comments have been left on the next page detailing why respondents answered this way.

The remaining 4 respondents overall (26.7%) remained neutral.

Respondents who identified as disabled had a disagreement level higher than this, too. 75% (3) disagreed with the proposals.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mulberry open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Agree | Can we make this building available to the community and/or other DC services before selling it off. |
| Agree | This seems a bit small as a family hub so it makes sense to move. It's in a good spot but is a bit small and has no advertising board or name sign so families can find it. |
| Agree | I love this CC but if it's going to offer more services I can see more space is needed. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Mulberry is the only Children's Centre I know of. As a resident it would be good to know as soon as possibly of the new Weymouth and Portland building. I know of the other areas but not the locations of the children's centre. |
| Disagree | Dingley's Promise centre should open for children with SEND |
| Disagree | The location is critical to allow those non-drivers to access it. Weymouth covers quite an area ...  I note that there is no provision for either Wyke Regis or Chickerell, despite these areas having a sizeable population. |
| Disagree | Hard to comment as I don't know where the new centre will be. I used this a few times when my twins were babies and found it helpful. I worry parents of young babies and toddlers won't be able to access the help they need.  [redacted] researcher and know how vital early help and support is for so many families. I hope the family help hubs will increase this, not reduced it. |
| Disagree | What services/ support for families with children over 5 |
| Strongly disagree | [redacted] many local students who cannot or refuse to attend school regularly for a variety of reasons. Seeing these students in the home is often unworkable and I believe is detrimental to the goal of assisting the young people to go back into an educational setting. Libraries are also not ideal - the mulberry centre has been a wonderful place to use - if it has to move please ensure rooms will still be available for tuition. |
| Strongly disagree | Mulberry children's centre is the central hub for Weymouth and Is enormously supportive of families and children enabling young children and families to thrive and develop. I'm not sure there is another appropriate centre that can deliver what the Mulberry Centre dwlivers |
| Did not answer | Currently a lack of parking in this building and a high number of children/parents wanting to use thr space so a larger venue, increased parking and increased staff is desired. |

**Outlooks Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in Chesil? - Outlooks Children’s Centre**

(n-16)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 0 | 0% | 25% |
| **Agree** | 4 | 25% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 3 | 18.8% |  |
| **Disagree** | 7 | 43.8% | 50.1% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1 | 6.3% |
| **Don't know** | 1 | 6.3% |  |

It is important to note that Outlooks Children’s Centre had a small sample size of 16 respondents for this question.

Outlooks Children’s Centre’s proposals have the highest disagreement rate of all the centres in the Chesil area. Half the respondents (50.1%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, compared to 25% of respondents (4) agreeing. For the centres whose proposal was to move to a new facility (or Family Hub in this case), Outlooks has the highest disagreement rate.

Of the remaining responses, 18.8% (3 respondents) remained neutral and 6.3% (1) did not know.

The reasons have been explained in the further comments section, but the uncertainty of users having to move to a new building appears to be one of the reasons for the disagreement level.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outlooks open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Agree | As a resident it is a shame to see the decline in use of Outlooks Children's Centre - It was 18 years ago a thriving children's centre with daily activities for families to use. I regularly attended Outlooks over 7 years and accessed so much support and things to do with my children.  There was excellent provision from fantastic staff and a very warm welcome there.  I understand however that things change and Sure Start is no longer an option. I hope that by relocating to the Family Hub at Portland Hospital there will be more provision for families and children to access lots of activities and sessions and we will see a good offer of support from the organisations involved. It is great to see local VCS organisations inputting on these decisions - they do know their local families well and understand the challenges living on Portland bring. |
| Agree | Can we make this building available to the community and/or other DC services before selling it off. |
| Agree | Such a shame to lose outlooks, but it's so old, I am sure newer facilities will be great. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Again, location matters. Underhill or Tophill? Either way it will make it challenging for some people to access it.  I note that there is no provision for either Wyke Regis or Chickerell, despite these areas having a sizeable population. |
| Disagree | Dingley's Promise centre should open for childrenw ith SEND |
| Disagree | As above, hard to agree/disagree without knowing new location |
| Disagree | Same again - no support/help to families with children over 5 |
| Strongly disagree | Outlooks is the only children centre on the island and Is enormously supportive of families and children enabling young children and families to thrive and develop. |

**West Locality**

**Beaminster Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the West? - Beaminster Children’s Centre**

(n-12)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 2 | 16.7% | 33.4% |
| **Agree** | 2 | 16.7% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 3 | 25% |  |
| **Disagree** | 1 | 8.3% | 33.3% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3 | 25% |
| **Don't know** | 1 | 8.3% |  |

The centres in the West have the smallest samples sizes of all, and so even more caution should be taken when attempting to draw conclusions.

From the 12 respondents, the overall consensus is split in agreement. 33.4% (4) either agreed or strongly agreed, and 33.3% also disagreed or strongly disagreed. 25% (3) answered neutrally and 8.3% (1) did not know.

Those who are disabled went against the overall response average with 50% (2) in agreement and 25% (1) strongly disagreeing.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Beaminster open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Needed |
| Agree | What is on offer from the Pout Bridge Project is fantastic. I imagine funding from local authority to keep this going is a wise decision |
| Disagree | Disappointing there is no offering but I could perhaps see the upside would be low |
| Strongly disagree | You need to offer a Childrens centre/ family hub here. Prout bridge is great, but a charity and can only offer a limited service to limited numbers of families. Due to there being very limited services already in this part of Dorset you must offer families here more. |
| Strongly disagree | The area needs a centre providing support for families of young children. Whilst i recognise the importance of youth facilities it should not extinguish the needs of families with young children therefore i propose a compromise whereby the building is funded to provide both services. |
| Strongly disagree | I can see that Dorset council values family/children's centres; at a time when 40% of children are living in poverty and SEND incidence is increasing, they are essential. Young families will find their nearest centre is now Bridport with inadequate public transport. The most needy will be the hardest hit. Some of the worst poverty is in rural hamlets and villages. Can there be some outreach at least? |

**Lyme Regis Children’s Centre**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the West? - Lyme Regis Children’s Centre**

(n-13)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 4 | 30.8% | 46.2% |
| **Agree** | 2 | 15.4% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 2 | 15.4% |  |
| **Disagree** | 1 | 7.7% | 15.4% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1 | 7.7% |
| **Don't know** | 3 | 23.1% |  |

The centres in the West have the smallest samples sizes of all, and so even more caution should be taken when attempting to draw conclusions.

There is more of a consensus for Lyme Regis than the previous centre in Beaminster. 46.2% (6 respondents) were in agreement with the proposals of relocating services to St Michael’s Primary School.

15.4% (2) did not agree, 15.4% remained neutral and 23.1% (3) did not know.

Those who are disabled had a much higher agreement rate at 75%, though this is being drawn from 3 respondents.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lyme Regis open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Needed |
| Agree | If there's a need for childcare provision then this is probably a good idea - but should be charity or local authority, not profit making. |
| Disagree | It depends whether the partial service can address local needs |
| Strongly disagree | I don't use or visit lyme regis but it seems that if this service is limited already then more must be done. |
| Don't know | The Centre is an important part of the community. It's very frustrating not knowing if it is staying open or closing. [redacted] the stay and play session weekly and caring for a child with additional needs, any change is very hard for them to deal with. This Centre has got to a state where the windows and doors do not work as they should. I really feel it needs sorting and to remain open for the wider community to access. |
| Don't know | This is really the only facility in the area for young children and I think it's awful that the Children's Centre has been allowed to get in the state it's in. Fire doors should be able to be opened, children didn't have access to the outside area. [redacted] with additional needs who needs places like this open. Also look after other children and they love going to play at the centre. |

**Bridport**

**Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to Children's Centre buildings in the West? – Bridport**

(n-21)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Total** | **Percent** |  |
| **Strongly agree** | 16 | 76.2% | 100% |
| **Agree** | 5 | 23.8% |
| **Neither agree nor disagree** | 0 | 0% |  |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0% |
| **Don't know** | 0 | 0% |  |

Although there were only 21 respondents for Bridport, it is notable that it is the only centre that had 100% agreement on the proposals. In addition to that, 76.2% were strongly in agreement, highlighting the general feeling amongst users.

**Q: If you have feedback on a specific centre, please provide details below**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Bridport open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | Needed |
| Strongly agree | I feel that this would be of benefit to families. As a parent of a 5 year old and not being familiar with local services etc I feel that this will be a helpful resource to families who may not be aware of local support etc. I attended the old children's centre to attend a parenting group and it was a great resource |
| Strongly agree | The centre in Bridport is a wonderful resource and should be utilised more. I would be keen for links with 3rd sector in the community to expand further and allow it be become a real 'hub' for the wider and marginalised sections of the community |
| Strongly agree | Great supportive hub for all three of my children [redacted]. Offers weight clinic, play groups and provides space for extra groups SENCO based for my [redacted]. |
| Strongly agree | We would be lost without the Children's Centre. |
| Strongly agree | I am so glad the children's centre is open and active in Bridport. It's a very valuable resource. |
| Strongly agree | Vital for families with young children for the development of the kids and support for parents. |
| Strongly agree | The children's centre provides a great safe place for children and families to come. They offer support and help for all ages and backgrounds. |
| Strongly agree | Keep it the same, we love it. |
| Strongly agree | keep it the same, it's great. |
| Strongly agree | Families in Bridport: .. so many need support with raising children, whilst struggling to find sufficient work in a seasonal, low pay economy.  Child raising skills, practical ideas for things to do with children, how to manage money, branch of Credit Union, AND being seen by people who use services offered to be the Champion for their needs in the face of those responsible for -making at local and national level. |
| Strongly agree | I am fully in agreement with preserving and extending provision here, especially early years, because there is a clear impact still being seen from Covid. |
| Agree | Very disappointing in the breastfeeding support offered or lack of |
| Agree | It is good you will offer an increased service here but you also need to match that elsewhere and not just in the biggest towns. |
| Agree | Offer more to the community and highlight what is on offer many so not know. Bring back a weekly baby group. Offer better joined up services with schools. |

**Demographic Data**

**Please select your age group**

(n-206)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Under 18 | 2 | 1% |
| 18 to 24 | 10 | 4.9% |
| 25 to 39 | 94 | 45.6% |
| 40 to 49 | 51 | 24.8% |
| 50 to 59 | 26 | 12.6% |
| 60 to 64 | 11 | 5.3% |
| 65+ | 8 | 3.9% |
| Prefer not to say | 4 | 1.9% |

**What are the ages of your child/ren?**

(n-324)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| 0 to 5 | 168 | 51.9% |
| 6 to 10 | 73 | 22.5% |
| 11 to 16 | 56 | 17.3% |
| 17 to 18 | 19 | 5.9% |
| 19 to 25 (Special educational needs and disability only) | 8 | 2.5% |

**What is your sex?**

(n-207)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Female | 176 | 85% |
| Male | 25 | 12.1% |
| Prefer not to say | 6 | 2.9% |

**Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth?**

(n-206)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | 199 | 96.6% |
| No | 0 | 0% |
| Prefer not to say | 7 | 3.4% |

**The Equality Act 2010 describes a person as disabled if they have a longstanding physical or mental condition that has lasted or is likely to last 12 months; and this condition has a substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. People with some conditions (cancer, multiple sclerosis and HIV/AIDS for example) are considered to be disabled from the point that they are diagnosed. Do you consider yourself to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010?**

(n-203)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | 32 | 15.8% |
| No | 163 | 80.3% |
| Prefer not to say | 8 | 3.9% |

**If you said yes to the previous question, please state the type of disability which applies to you.**

(n-44)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) | 2 | 4.6% |
| Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) | 13 | 29.6% |
| Autistic Spectrum Conditions | 10 | 22.7% |
| Blind | 0 | 0% |
| Dyscalculia | 1 | 2.3% |
| Dyslexia | 11 | 25% |
| Dyspraxia | 1 | 2.3% |
| Deaf | 0 | 0% |
| Hearing loss | 7 | 15.9% |
| Long term health condition | 9 | 20.5% |
| Mental health issues | 13 | 29.6% |
| Physical impairment | 3 | 6.8% |
| Sign Language User | 0 | 0% |
| Visually impaired | 0 | 0% |
| Medical conditions | 2 | 4.6% |
| Mobility issues | 4 | 9.1% |
| Learning disability | 0 | 0% |
| Specific learning differences | 1 | 2.3% |
| Wheelchair user | 1 | 2.3% |
| Prefer to use another term (please specify) | 0 | 0% |

**What is your ethnic group?**

(n-207)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| White: British | 181 | 87.4% |
| White: Irish | 4 | 1.9% |
| White: Gypsy | 0 | 0% |
| White: Irish Traveller | 0 | 0% |
| White: Other | 6 | 2.9% |
| Mixed: White and Black Caribbean | 1 | 0.5% |
| Mixed: White and Black African | 1 | 0.5% |
| Mixed: White and Asian | 2 | 1% |
| Mixed: Other | 1 | 0.5% |
| Asian or Asian British: Indian | 1 | 0.5% |
| Asian or Asian British: Pakistan | 0 | 0% |
| Asian or Asian British: Chinese | 1 | 0.5% |
| Asian or Asian British: Other | 2 | 1% |
| Black or Black British: | 0 | 0% |
| Arab | 0 | 0% |
| Other ethnic group | 1 | 0.5% |
| Prefer not to say | 6 | 2.9% |

**What is your religion or belief?**

(n-203)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Buddhist | 1 | 0.5% |
| Christian (including Church of England, Catholic, Protestant and all other Christian denominations) | 73 | 36% |
| Hindu | 1 | 0.5% |
| Jewish | 1 | 0.5% |
| Muslim | 0 | 0% |
| Sikh | 0 | 0% |
| No religion | 98 | 48.3% |
| Other religion or belief (please specify if you wish) | 6 | 3% |
| Prefer not to say | 23 | 11.3% |

**What is your sexual orientation?**

(n-203)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Heterosexual or Straight | 168 | 82.8% |
| Gay or lesbian | 2 | 1% |
| Asexual | 1 | 0.5% |
| Bisexual | 5 | 2.5% |
| Other | 2 | 1% |
| Prefer not to say | 25 | 12.3% |

**Have you previously served in the UK Armed Forces?**

(n-206)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes, previously served in Regular Armed Forces | 5 | 2.4% |
| Yes, previously served in Reserve Armed Forces | 2 | 1% |
| No | 196 | 95.2% |
| Prefer not to say | 3 | 1.5% |

**Are you currently pregnant or have you been pregnant in the last year?**

(n-203)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | 42 | 20.7% |
| No | 159 | 78.3% |
| Prefer not to say | 2 | 1% |

**Are you currently legally married or in a registered civil partnership?**

(n-206)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Total | Percent |
| Yes | 113 | 54.9% |
| No | 83 | 40.3% |
| Prefer not to say | 10 | 4.9% |

**Appendix – Shaftesbury open comments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Shaftesbury open comments** | |
| **Agree or disagree with the proposal** | **Comment** |
| Strongly agree | This is a service which is required for working parents to ensure that something is local to support working. |
| Strongly agree | [redacted] goes there on a Wednesday loves the toys and staff so friendly and helpful . |
| Strongly agree | Shaftesbury childrens centre has been a massive support for myself and my family. There isn’t much other support in the area and the fact it is next to the main primary and a nursery means that families can get the support they need easily |
| Agree | Amazing childcare provision and wonderful support from all the staff for my family.  I’m hoping that there will be more spaces allocated to allow my youngest to do more days once my eldest goes to primary school |
| Agree | I think the Children's Centre should be retained in Shaftesbury as it is a clear base for North residents to seek support.  I agree that some services should also be located in other locations as the towns in the north are greatly spread out. Services need to be increased with support. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | The information shared is not clear about whether there will be a maintenance, extension or reduction in services. I would assert that with the growing population in Shaftesbury that an extension of easily accessible support services are very necessary.  I had to select neither agree or disagree for the above reason. |
| Neither agree nor disagree | Shaftesbury Nursery/ Children’s Centre is currently managed by Dorset Council. It is noted that DC is committed to this provision and have no plans to close or reduce the service.  On the contracting out of the operation of the nursery, there is not an issue with this in principle.  There would however be an objection to Dorset directly awarding this contract to SAST. How does DC establish that they are the best provider? It would seem prudent to see the contract offered openly to other nursery providers in the town, of whom we have a couple, as well as SAST. STC insist on an open process being run.  On the relocation of other services out of the nursery building, has a case been made that it is best, or necessary, to separate nursery provision from other family services? There may be benefits to co-location, however STC has not seen it established why the provision should be separated.  If there is reason to this (e.g. Building not big enough), then STC insists that the family services are relocated within Shaftesbury. It would be strongly opposed to move family services out of the town given our very poor transport links. |
| Disagree | It should remain at the children center. It's accessible and great place for all |
| Disagree | My concerns are for the groups that are run by the Activity and Parenting Workers. They are a valuable service for families in Shaftesbury. The Children's Centre is ideally located and has parking. The attendees of the group often go on to attend the nursery and primary school.  My other concern is for the council staff who work from the centre. The staff are ideally located to support parents and children in the community. The office space and training room meet the requirements of staff. |
| Disagree | The Children's Centre was an invaluable support to me when my child was small. We attended various offerings at the centre and without it would have been very isolated as an older first time mum. There was a good level of support on offer and my child benefitted from the various activities she undertook there. Even when she was with a childminder she still attended events at the centre. |
| Disagree | Shaftesbury Children's Centre was an amazing start for my daughter when covid meant I was a new mum with no support having missed out on antenatal classes and early baby groups. It gave me confidence and a safe space to allow my children to start socialising. It allowed me to meet my support group of mums with children my daughters age. The consistency of venue and knowing where everything was really helped. The staff have been so lovely and supportive. The advice was there when I needed and offered in a non judgemental way. I am aware extra assistance was given to others and made such a difference to the child's life.  The nursery provision is so needed in the area especially with increased funding available to parents. |
| Disagree | It's totally unclear what you mean by the text in the proposed changes for Shaftesbury. Do you plant to stop those services? Or stop all services from that center except childcare/early years? This center could be a real hub for Shaftesbury parents. [redacted] breastfeeding support group there in January. A health visitor clinic would be of great use too. |
| Disagree | The Children's Centre at present is ideally located close to residential areas and the largest primary school in Shaftesbury. It provides easy access particularly for families who do not drive or wish to walk or cycle and has built good relationships with the local schools and the nursery in the same building.  It is really important for families to have one central place to go to for help and support and to be able to build relationships with the staff there.  We have attended courses at the Children's centre when our children were small and they had organised for our youngest to be cared for within the nursery while the course was going on. Moving services away from this site will make it harder for this type of arrangement to be put in place and this may become a barrier for some families (it would have been for us)  Of course a lot would depend on the location of the other suggested site and what facilities they have. To move the services out of Shaftesbury altogether would significantly disadvantage a lot of families. |
| Disagree | Important central.hub for the community.  Excellent space to run community/outreach groups.  Huge amount of experience in running groups and offering outreach and early intervention. |
| Disagree | Worried that if it is relocated to other community venues that it won't be as easily accessible or the current service won't be able to be available. I rely on these groups to get out of the house and meet other mums. |
| Strongly disagree | Understand needs for education of under5 but don’t take away the children center until a good community venue is identified as they currently offer much more than 0-5 today my [redacted] saw camhs there and my children have benefit from the great advice and outdoor play area for families without gardens along with great non bias groups that support families that can’t pay in the community as the family hub is too far in sturminster and once again the north of north will have no face venue to hold groups in future ensure it doesn’t disappear before a new venue with same access and outdoor space available to ensure child in north of north don’t suffer with poor transport links and no children center in Gillingham or Shaftesbury it should be a family hub with everything in place before changing its current one |
| Strongly disagree | I’m genuinely in favour of more education but we cant not lose the only children center in north area of north until its been resited in an appropriate building or new community building being built in Allen road where a family hub can offer everything already offered to a very vulnerable area with more vulnerable families coming with new social housing where they are only flats. It needs to have storage and free to families groups that offer specialist support and learning with appropriate outdoor space to run events as we don’t want to loose a fantastic building in our community that is used by o er a 100 families this year to just an office base that is not good enough for the families in north |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury Children's Centre currently acts as a crucial base for many types of family and community support in the area. I regularly attend groups and courses there and appreciate the importance of having a purpose made space that can facilitate this kind of provision for local families. My concern, if the Children's Centre were to close, is that other less suitable locations would not offer the same quality of provision and that the wider community would suffer as a result. If Dorset Council do plan to re-locate the service and support that is currently offered at the Children's Centre, it would be imperative that there be no interim 'lull' period and that any planned alternative be operational immediately, to avoid local families suffering a detrimental decline in support and resources. |
| Strongly disagree | I feel in Shaftsbury there should be a family hub/children centre and not just a office or digital offer as more and more families especially our target families live in flats and do not have access to their own transport, have no access to open space and face to face support which a base at Shaftsbury could still offer. The nearest family hub would be Sturminster newton or Blandford and only a digital or library base support in Shaftesbury and Gillingham. |
| Strongly disagree | It's so important within a community to have a space such as Shaftesbury Children's Centre, that is well resourced and tailored towards offering support and opportunities to local families. Having a base, where people know they can come when they need support, is also a big part of what such a space offers.  If the Children's Centre is no longer to be used, it is imperative that an alternative space be secured, that allows this essential service to continue it's work effectively. |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury has always been the poor relation when it comes to family services in north Dorset. It’s always the first place to have things cancelled, and when queried, you are told to go to Sherborne or Blandford which doesn’t work without transport and isolates parents.  Similar to the situation with health visitors and breast feeding support |
| Strongly disagree | The North has a lack of services and support for families. More support across the area would reduce the pressure on schools to support families with things like parenting issues, benefits support, housing, health visiting support. |
| Strongly disagree | The provision of a weekly playgroup for my toddler has been an invaluable source of support over the past two years.  If this service was to transfer to Blandford into a more centralized hub, it would be a huge loss for the Shaftesbury family community.  Having to travel 30 minutes in the car to Blandford each way with a young child as a new mum would be a really daunting prospect.  Please keep crucial services local. |
| Strongly disagree | Worried as use a lot as free and great room and outdoor space for family without a garden there is no community space currently for them to go to. So this would be a worry as I can get advice from family worker and free groups and childcare all in same site they compliment each other all other community ate church led in Shaftesbury and very clicky |
| Strongly disagree | The children's centre is used for family time for residents and would be detrimental to children and their families whom use this space the closest one is then over 6 miles away from shaftesbury which is a lot for some families to be able to commute to with school aged children within the area |
| Strongly disagree | I don't think this would be helpful for families living in the area. In fact I feel this would be extremely detrimental to the families and people living here.  Therefore I strongly disagree with this change. |
| Strongly disagree | This is completely unacceptable, it's hard enough to find childcare as it is due to lack of places that are provided and can take over a year to secure a spot for a child and now you want to shutdown and merge it with another one that's over 25mins away which will not only effect family's like mine who rely on this service so we can afford to keep food on the table and a roof over our heads but all your hard workers you have working there as well.  On top of this you have attempted to sneak this through without discussing it with Shaftesbury town Council who wouldn't have agreed to it, these actions are exactly what I have come to expect from the current Dorset Council we are stuck with.  If you were to force this through you would need to guarantee spots for all familys and children currently relying on this service with absolutely no change to their hours and if you can't guarantee that then you need to just chuck this idea in the bin, bite the bullet and just build the extension to the primary school that it needs as it's going to need it soon anyway and penny pitching now won't stop that from happening later. |
| Strongly disagree | Love the Shaftesbury Children Centre, its current location is perfect for us and many parents and caregivers to commute to in order to drop off and pick up our children. We would be struggle massively to find another childcare provider if this was to move. As there isn’t enough in this area |
| Strongly disagree | With [redacted] children at this nursery, the children's center is vital to our family and others.  I'm unsure how you can even see this being a good idea . With funding now being more avaliable the services are strecj as is in Shaftesbury let alone reducing that to 1 nursery for the whole town. If anything it should be expanding. Or you should be offering another.  Even without the nursery side of things the children's center has provided a hub for important meeting also meeting parents and attending valuable courses. |
| Strongly disagree | Children centre must stay in Shaftesbury. The only reason you are moving to Blandford is because you don't won't to run it yourselves but a private company. This must stay in Shaftesbury as there very limited provision |
| Strongly disagree | Even though my children do not attend the Children’s Centre I think it is ridiculous to propose integration with Blandford. It is difficult to find childcare locally, this is one of only 2 providers in the town which accepts under 3s, and the other is fully subscribed. It making all those families go to Blandford would be a 40 minute round trip, twice a day, which is wholly unsustainable for many working parents. The council should be looking at making more investment and places available locally (in Shaftesbury or feasibly drivable distances), not less. |
| Strongly disagree | This center provides vital support for my family. I would not be able to work full time from home as the main earner in my family without the childcare they provide for my [redacted] son. I only have one family member in the area that can help with childcare and my husband also works full time. Without the Shaftesbury Children’s Center I would not be able to work and this would have devastating consequences for my family |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury Children's Centre is amazing and a true credit to the town and local community. The staff are wonderful and brilliant at what they do. If they were to close it and relocate it to Blandford that would be a massive mistake and a travesty. Many parents rely on them for child care in Shaftesbury to be able to work to support their children with food and a roof over their heads, especially single parents like myself. To close this Centre would be detrimental to me and many others. You will be a monster if you close this Centre and absolutely disgusting behaviour and should be condemned if you go through with the relocation!! |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury Children’s Centre is one of the few settings in Shaftesbury to offer wrap around care for children 0-4 years. Considering the number of new houses being built in Shaftesbury and so close to the Childrens centre it seems absolutely ludicrous for it and it’s services not to be there.  What about parents who don’t drive, how are they to get to Blandford ? |
| Strongly disagree | My child attends nursery in Shaftesbury Centre and we would like to keep him there until he starts school [redacted]. Without nursery support I would have to likely give up work as it would not be feasible to drive to blandford and unlikely to get into other nurseries. My child feels comfortable at Shaftesbury and is growing in confidence there. I feel this would be a devestating loss to Shaftesbury. |
| Strongly disagree | This centre was a godsend for us during Covid - our nursery closed down and this one welcomed us as key workers with open arms. A lot of people in Shaftesbury do not drive and it would be appalling to move this beloved service elsewhere. My daughter is [redacted] now and no longer uses the nursery but I feel strongly about this as she attended previously. |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury children's center has been the nursery for my [redacted (multiple)] children for the last 10 years my daughter stated there when she was [redacted] and currently my [redacted] year old attends there, my children our from a [redacted] and Attending this setting is what they need and thrive from as this Children center and saff do not judge them for there culture values we our Accepted where as other settings I previously sent my oldest child to wouldn't allow her on there books becasue she [redacted].  This children center should not be moved to Blandford there is no adequate Transportation for the family's who can not drive to allow children to get to the facilities as well as having other children in the local primary schools and secondary in Shaftesbury it would not be manageable, Children from Shaftesbury would drop off the educational map and this would cause the most distressed on family as I know first hand if your child is not in a nursery setting you will be threatened with social services input for neglecting your child's educational needs. I strongly suggest this change does not take place, as if this did my youngest who is currently [redacted] would not be able to attend a nursery and Shaftesbury is the one I want him to attend when he starts at 2. |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury children's centre and nursery is a very well used and much loved resource in our area.  It supports many families and young children in various ways (nursery, baby and toddler groups etc)  It's perfect for many of us who don't drive and will not be able to just use another children's centre.  The staff are all incredible, the locations perfect.  I have 2 children who have previously used this nursery and another planning to use it very soon |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury children’s centre is very much loved and appreciated and in a great location for everyone. Would hate to see it go |
| Strongly disagree | This centre is vital to Shaftesbury. The groups are very supportive and many parents rely on the nursery for childcare. There aren’t enough childcare providers in the area as it is so to take another one away would be ridiculous. |
| Strongly disagree | The Childrens centre side of Shaftesbury children’s centre nursery has helped so many children and families just this past year over 1,000 parents and families got help from the family workers so it would be a shame for the nursery and all the parents in Shaftesbury to lose this.  the centre delivers a lot of support with advice/guidance /Garden for families /groups/contacts/Camhs / Parenting courses / family workers Etc and support to the Nursery at times. |
| Strongly disagree | Keep Shaftesburys children’s centre in Shaftesbury the amount of single mothers that either don’t have cars or have means of getting there children and to the nursery if it changes and merges to blandford will be catastrophic just think of all the children that are going to be affected and the rise it could potentially lead in the later years of these children’s life having to miss out on important social learning skills childcare placements are already so far and few between are you really going to make the situation worse by taking away a nursery |
| Strongly disagree | Relocating what already is a scarece resource is illogical. Shaftesbury parents need choice for nursery settings. I just don't understand how parents are supposed to manage working if childcare is reduced further. Surely we should make it easier for people to work not harder? It is very short sighted. We have more and more houses being built with no supporting increase in infrastructure. It is madness. |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury children's centre nursery is an amazing asset to the town.  So many parents whose children attend the primary school attend the nursery.  It's honestly a fantastic. Im not sure what I would do with out it. My son attends the setting while I work, with out the setting I don't think I would have been able to return to work. |
| Strongly disagree | 1st time attending childrens 0-5 group. Lovely having somewhere to bring my toddler right on our doorstep!  I don't drive and this centre is within walking distance for us. This centre is essential for my child and I for his development and my own mental health. |
| Strongly disagree | We love having a fun and friendly environment on our doorstep to meet new families and access all relevant info and support. |
| Strongly disagree | I think it would be a huge loss to Shaftesbury if the Children's Centre was to go. There isn't enough nurseries in Shaftesbury as it is, many are full until 2026. The groups are also very important for adults and children to attend. |
| Strongly disagree | Shaftesbury Children's Centre is such a valuable resource and provides loads of support. I've been visiting/using the Children's Centre since my eldest was a few months old [redacted] and through the groups, have had lots of support and made some great friendships. |
| Strongly disagree | The levels of deprivation in Shaftesbury have grown significantly over the past 20 years so I feel it’s really important that families are encouraged and able to access support services. There are poor public transport access links from Shaftesbury to other parts of Dorset so it’s highly unlikely lower income families will travel to either Blandford or Sherborne. Shaftesbury which is on the periphery of Dorset, has almost non existent public transport access to facilities to the north to access services in either Wiltshire or Somerset. In my view Dorset Council should be investing more resource into family support services in this locality rather than less. In my view support families who are struggling is vital to help young people grow into responsible citizens who respect their communities. The reduction in funding for early help services has in my opinion contributed to an increase in anti social behaviour. |
| Strongly disagree | The children centre is a really great place to come with my children it allows me to have the opportunity to see people when I am limited with family in the area and transport.  My children get to attend the really fun free HAF days at the centre  Knowing there is a place that is open should I have any questions or concerns about anything |
| Strongly disagree | North Dorset always seems to be left with reduced services during cuts. As a first time mum due later this year I looked forward exploring the services at the Shaftesbury children's centre to meet other local mums since moving to the area and socialising my baby. Being walking distance from my house is perfect, if you move the services to a different centre you are cutting off Shaftesbury residents as they will either find it too far to drive or not have access to transport. |
| Strongly disagree | It would make it difficult for people to get to as the bus routes aren't very good and not everyone drives. The Children's Centre also hosts courses such as the Freedom Project and Pattern Changing, Speech & Language etc. |
| Strongly disagree | I have been attending to groups there and have both been extremely helpful. |
| Strongly disagree | Without this Centre, parents would struggle to get the correct support. It always best to have face to face contact to ensure people feel valued and supported. If this support wasn't in place, this could leave vulnerable people open to abuse, poverty. |