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FOREWORD

The members of the Steering Group have found producing this Plan a challenging but rewarding task. Getting to this stage, however, is relatively simple compared with making sure the various actions identified are implemented. As we pause for breath at this important stage we need to remind ourselves that this is not the end of the hard work but the beginning.

We hope we have produced a Plan which reflects the concerns of the local community and states them in such a way that allows action to be taken. All through the process, the Steering Group have been committed to ensuring residents’ views, as expressed through the survey work, were paramount in determining what should be in the Plan. The Plan is what we believe is important to the people of Corfe Castle Parish at this moment, but it cannot hope to be a complete inventory of actions that stands immutable for all time. There may be other actions that the Parish Council and others may need to tackle and just because they are not covered in the Parish Plan will not mean that they are any the less important. In a similar vein, the Steering Group has tried to cover issues identified through the survey work that need action taken: if a topic is not mentioned in the Plan this does not necessarily mean that it is considered unimportant in itself.

Throughout the process we have been reminded time and again of our vision, which is quoted on page 3. We need to be able to get on with the job of ensuring a “vibrant, living, working and evolving” Parish. It is possible to respect and enjoy our past and our environment without becoming slaves to it. We thus can hopefully remain a real community rather than a theme park reproduction.

Roger White, Chairman
Parish Plan Steering Group, November 2004
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OUR VISION

Our vision for the Parish is one of vibrant, economically active, interlinked, balanced communities in which local facilities are sustained and enhanced and the traditional population is maintained, and which are able to evolve with time in the light of changing circumstances.

IN SHORT - A VIBRANT, LIVING, WORKING, EVOLVING PARISH

The Plan covers the administrative Parish of Corfe Castle, not the ecclesiastical parish which covers a different area.

Steering Group Members

- Roger White (Chairman)
- Juliet Glover (Secretary)
- Michael Bond
- Rita Churchill
- Ronald Gibson
- Tom Hunt
- Judith Jenkins
- Jim Rosewarn
- Frank Spooner
- Barry Stocks
- Mary Wills
- Stephen Yeoman

Doug Whyte, Jane Ellwood, Fiona Hunt, Deirdre Selwyn and Harriet Jarvis also participated in the Steering Group for part of its existence.

Membership of the Steering Group was open to all and a variety of means were used to encourage participation, as explained on page 4. Those who volunteered to sit on the Group represented a range of ages, experiences and interests, and included those who have lived in the Parish all their lives through to those recently moving into the area.

A Picture of the Parish

Lying in the centre of the Isle of Purbeck, the Parish of Corfe Castle has a population of almost 1,500, of which just over 1,000 live within the village of Corfe Castle itself, 100 within Kingston (some 1½ miles distant) and the remainder scattered around the parish. The parish, at 3,745 hectares, is the largest in the district. The whole parish is within an Area of Outstanding Beauty and the coast forms part of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage site. The parish lies within Purbeck District and Dorset County.

The National Trust has a large presence in the area, and much of the remaining parts of the parish are in the ownership of large estates. The village of Corfe Castle has a first school, several shops and pubs, a post office, library and an active Village Hall.

The area is rural though not totally isolated; the large town of Poole is about 14 miles distant, the much smaller towns of Wareham and Swanage are each about 5 miles away. All can be reached by an hourly bus service. The County town of Dorchester lies some 20 miles to the west.

As well as the traditional farming, tourism plays a significant part in the local economy; tourism-related jobs tend to be seasonal and low paid. The area has a significant number of second and holiday homes and is also a popular location to retire to. The price of housing is relatively high.

Wytch Farm, the largest on-shore oil field in Europe operates within the parish, though the field has reached its maturity and there is little employment or direct benefit to the local economy. There are no general manufacturing or offices located within the parish.
BACKGROUND TO THE PARISH PLAN

Parish Plans were announced by the Government in their 2000 Rural White Paper. They are intended to set a framework for communities to help plan their own futures and are an important element in “Community Planning”, which local authorities and other bodies are being required to undertake.

As the Countryside Agency, which has been responsible for encouraging and enabling Parish Plans, explains:\[1\]:

Parish Plans are “holistic” or comprehensive in scope. They should set out a vision for how the community wants to develop, and identify the action needed to achieve it. They can include everything that is relevant to the people who live and work in the community, from employment and playgrounds to the design of new buildings and protection of hedges and ponds. They can include any social, environmental or economic issues. It is up to the community itself to decide what is important.

Parish Plans have the potential to influence a wide range of organisations and processes which affect the lives of rural communities. They should complement and help deliver local planning policies and frameworks (although they cannot override adopted planning policy). They should influence local housing and land management strategies. They should also contribute to the way local services are managed and delivered.

A Parish Plan is a statement of how the community sees itself developing over the next few years. It:
• reflects the views of all sections of the community;
• identifies which features and local characteristics people value;
• identifies local problems and opportunities;
• spells out how residents want the community to develop in the future;
• prepares a plan of action to achieve this vision.

The Parish Plan provides a way to influence decisions by other authorities, a basis for action by the local community itself, and a means to help secure funding for local initiatives.

How the Parish Plan was prepared

Launch  Following a presentation by Simon Thompson of Dorset Community Action\[2\], the Parish Council registered its intention to prepare a Parish Plan with the Countryside Agency in March 2002. It was “launched” at the Annual Parish Meeting in April\[3\], although no volunteers came forward at that time as a result of this particular meeting. During May and June recruitment of volunteers to form the Steering Group took place via:
• personal lobbying of individuals by Parish Councillors
• a letter from the Parish Council to all local organisations and groups
• the Corfe Valley News (community magazine delivered, or otherwise available, to all households in the Parish)
• the Parish Council decided that two parish councillors should participate in the Steering Group
• to ensure that the Steering Group reflected the youth perspective, a young person was approached; she participated in several early meetings

Grant Application  By July 2002 it was felt that sufficient volunteers had come forward to ensure that the project could proceed but due to the summer holidays it did not prove possible to call everyone together for the first meeting until September\[4\]. Having prepared a draft timetable and budget for the Plan, the grant application was submitted to the Countryside Agency in November, and the grant awarded just before Christmas 2002. The Steering Group also spent this pre-grant time discussing possible consultation methods and developing a vision statement. It was also agreed at an early stage that regular articles should appear in the Corfe Valley News.

---

\[2\] The Parish Council was also addressed by Mark Sturgess, Purbeck District Council Community Planning and Design Manager, in February 2003, regarding the role of parish plans within the wider community planning process
\[3\] Progress on the Parish Plan was also reported to the Annual Parish Meetings in 2003 and 2004.
\[4\] indeed, various holiday and other commitments by members of the Steering Group at various times through the process have probably lengthened the timetable by several months in total
Work proper on the Plan was therefore able to commence in January 2003. The Steering Group concluded that the most thorough and comprehensive method for determining the community’s views would be a questionnaire survey. To ensure that the subjects covered in the questionnaire properly reflected residents’ concerns, residents were encouraged to submit “suggestions”, via a number of routes:

- By writing or emailing directly (a special email address was set up and publicised for this purpose, although no emails were received)
- 18 suggestion boxes placed in public places around the Parish.
- An exhibition “drop-in” coffee morning at the Village Hall (Saturday 22 February 2003). This took the form of a regular Saturday coffee morning (raffle, stalls with items for sale, etc) in order to attract interest, but crucially included a display on the Parish Plan and an invitation to “post-it” comments on the display boards (pictured). Approximately 100 residents attended the morning, and also several representatives from surrounding Parishes.
- Over 100 suggestion slips were collected as a result of the suggestion boxes and coffee morning.
- The Steering Group had considered the viability of encouraging comments by mobile phone texts, but concluded that this would not be cost-effective.

Informed by the suggestion slips, members of the Steering Group drafted questions under a number of topics. The questionnaire was refined over a number of Steering Group meetings and a final draft agreed in June. Parallel with the questionnaire preparation, an approach was made to the Centre for Partnership, Access and Community Education (Lifelong Learning Unit) at Bournemouth University to carry out the analysis. The Centre was commissioned to undertake the data input and analysis for the questionnaire survey. Two separate questionnaires were designed, the main one for all adults (although those under 18 were able to complete one if they wished) and one specifically for those aged 18 and under.

**The 2003 Coffee Morning**

5 in Corfe Castle - Post Office, Sweet Shop/Newsagent, British Legion Club, School, Library, Clealls, Village Hall, The Fox, The Greyhound, The Bankes Arms, The Castle Inn, St Edwards Church, Congregational Church; in Kingston - The Scott Arms, Encombe Estate Office, St James Church; elsewhere - Norden Farm Shop, Bushey telephone box
6 Questions were added to the questionnaire by the Lifelong Learning Unit to help its research into community learning needs in a rural area
Questionnaires were distributed by hand to every household in the Parish, by members of the Steering Group and other volunteers. Wherever possible, distributors were encouraged to speak with someone in the house to explain the process and when they would be collected. If this was not possible, distributors left a note with the forms explaining who had delivered them and how to return them. The questionnaires included a covering note and a phone number to call if further explanation or additional forms were needed.

Questionnaires were distributed in the last week in August and collected back by the distributors (in sealed envelopes) around the middle of September. People were also given the opportunity to “drop-off” completed questionnaires to local collection points, or send them direct to the University. 505 of the main questionnaires were returned (a 43% response rate) and 38 of the under-18s questionnaire.

The Steering Group was concerned to ensure that the research was as representative and inclusive of as many views as possible. The Centre was therefore commissioned also to undertake a number of more open-ended one-to-one interviews with people from particular groups including the elderly, youth, mothers and businesses. The Parish Council helped fund this additional work. A total of 29 adults and 14 under-18s were interviewed.

The full results of the questionnaire surveys and one-to-one interviews are contained in a separate report by the University. This was distributed in January 2004 to key partners and made available in public locations within the Parish. It was also available at the dissemination event mentioned below.

Other data relating to the Parish, from the 2001 Census and many other sources, was gathered together and refined as the project progressed.

**Feedback to the Community**

The results of the survey were reported back to the community at a second coffee morning, on Saturday 21st February 2004. This also included a displaypreviewing some of the Steering Group’s thoughts regarding the action points for the Plan. Although attendees at the coffee morning were not asked formally to provide their written comments on this, most members of the Steering Group were on hand to explain the thinking behind the proposals and listen to people’s views. This helped focus the ongoing work on the Plan.

**Plan Formulation**

The Steering Group met on a great number of occasions to identify the issues and actions which needed to be dealt with in the Plan, based on the survey results and other data collected. Rather than break up into a number of sub-groups to look at particular topics, it was felt that a richer and more representative view would be achieved if the Steering Group as a whole discussed all topic areas, even though this meant that the process took longer than it might have otherwise.

**Draft Plan**

A draft of the plan was sent for consultation to all key partners and other organisations mentioned in action points, surrounding parishes and local voluntary groups and organisations in the parish. Residents were invited to “Parish Plan Preview” sessions on Friday 6th and Saturday 7th August 2004 in the Town Hall, where they had a chance to feedback comments on the proposals. Copies of the draft plan were also available in Corfe Castle library for the whole consultation period. These arrangements were publicised in the Corfe Valley News.

---

7 It is not possible to assess an accurate response rate as there was no lower age limit specified for the survey. The 38 questionnaires returned represents a response rate of 27% of those aged between 8 and 17 (as at the 2001 Census)

8 The Steering Group aimed to meet approximately once a fortnight during this period; more frequent meetings were not practical due to other commitments by Steering Group members. Smaller groups might have managed more frequent meetings and run in parallel, but the advantages of the Steering Group as a whole developing the whole Plan were considered to outweigh the time factor.
The consultation period closed on 27th September and all the comments received were reviewed by the Steering Group and a variety of amendments made to the text. (It has to be noted, however, that in certain instances specific detailed proposals were submitted by individuals or they disagreed with particular action points. The Steering Group did not feel able to incorporate all comments into the Plan, either because they represented an individual view that, based on the survey work, the Steering Group was not confident would necessarily be shared by a significant proportion of the population, or because they went into detail on a particular action point that would be more appropriately dealt with as activity on that particular point is progressed.)

Corfe Castle Parish Council endorsed the Parish Plan, with suggested alterations, at its meeting on 13th September 2004.

Contact with the Parish Council has been maintained throughout the process. In addition to ensuring the Steering Group included some Parish Councillors, each meeting of the Parish Council has received a report of progress (under the Agenda Item Reports of Committees and Representatives on other Bodies). Progress on the Parish Plan has also featured at the Annual Parish Meetings.

Minutes of the Steering Group meetings have been sent to Purbeck District Council (Ros Cartwright, Community Projects and Sustainability Officer), with a standing invitation to attend the meetings.

It is a specific requirement of Countryside Agency funding that surrounding parishes be involved. All surrounding town councils, parish councils and parish meetings were invited to the two coffee mornings, and also to raise any issue they felt should be covered in the Parish Plan. It is known that council or parish plan representatives attended one or both of the coffee morning sessions from Arne, Church Knowle, Studland, Swanage, Wareham and Worth Matravers (out of the 9 surrounding parishes and towns). The surrounding local councils are also being consulted on this draft plan.

**MAKING IT HAPPEN - IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW**

### Adopting the Plan

Producing the Plan is only the starting point. The various actions that have been identified have to be taken forward. Some can be achieved quickly and easily, others may take several years and a lot of money. There is already great impetus behind some of the actions identified, and the various organisations in the Parish are working to achieve their own objectives. Some of the actions in the Plan, more newly identified, will be taken forward by interested individuals in the community, including individual members of the Steering Group.

The Parish Council has been identified within the Plan to help take forward many of the actions. Whilst in many cases the Parish Council may not have the prime responsibility for achieving a particular action, the Council will need to be involved in ensuring progress is made. The Council will need to formally adopt the Parish Plan as a statement of its policy.

Both the District Council and the Purbeck Community Partnership have adopted a Protocol for dealing with parish plans. For example, the District Council Protocol states that each of the actions contained in the plan will be considered as follows:

**Endorse**: The specific recommendation will be accepted by the Council and taken into account in District Council decision making (for example in development control decisions on planning applications).

**Action/Implement**: The specific recommendation will be accepted in principle and, subject to financial, procedural or legal constraints implemented by or with the support of the District Council (for example provision of public open space, village halls, children's play equipment etc).

**Investigate**: Further information to be obtained by the Parish/Town Council or other agency may be required in order that the District Council may establish if the specific recommendation can be supported.
Support: The specific recommendation relates to a matter which is not the responsibility of the Council. However, the recommendation does support an objective of the Council and it will therefore offer support to the community by working in partnership with the service provider to achieve its implementation. (For example traffic calming/highway improvements, school provision, improvements to drainage etc).

Not Supported: The specific recommendation relates to a matter which is contrary to the policies and objectives of the Council or is beyond the powers of the Council or of the other service providers.

Acknowledge as Record of Fact: The specific recommendation is not supported but acknowledged as a record of fact identified through a comprehensive consultation process.

Other key agencies are being encouraged to adopt similar protocols, through the Community Partnership and its Parish Plan Working Party, which is co-ordinating the response to parish plans. Particular service departments at the County Council will need to consider particular actions.

Finance

Some of the actions identified can be achieved at no cost, and many by redirecting existing work programmes at no additional net cost. Many, however, will require additional funding.

There are several potential sources:

- community fundraising - local past and current projects demonstrate that considerable support can be forthcoming from the community in this respect
- Parish Council precept, including where necessary the use of “Section 137" powers
- a redirection of funding within the County Council and District Council overall budgets
- the additional funds generated through the lowering of the Council Tax discount on second homes from 50% to 10%. It is understood that the detailed mechanisms for identifying priorities and allocating finance within the County are being examined. Parish plans, as an important part of community planning, need to be fully integrated into the resource allocation process. Parish Councils should be recognised as having a legitimate role in the decision-making.
- Grants from a number of sources - that the need for, and support for, a project has been identified in the Parish Plan should act a boost to grant applications

Monitoring and Review

Although others may take the lead role in implementing particular actions, the Parish Council will have the primary responsibility for ensuring that the Plan as a whole is taken forward. It will need to draw up a review programme to ensure that each action point is being taken forward as appropriate. Although it is clearly for the Parish Council itself to decide how best to carry this out, it may be an advantage for there to be a regular Parish Plan item on the Parish Council meeting agenda. It is proposed that the Parish Council be assisted in this by the formation of a small “Review Group” of two or three. It is likely, though not essential, that these individuals will be drawn from the Steering Group. It would be appropriate for this Review Group to meet every few months, say quarterly. It is also proposed that the Annual Parish Meeting has a standing item reporting on progress with implementing the Plan.

The Parish Council is identified to implement a number of Action Points; in many cases this is in partnership with other agencies. Some Action Points may benefit from the Parish Council involving other local interested parties or individuals in the task, perhaps even with the Parish Council doing no more than setting the process in motion, as has often been the case in the past with local initiatives. It is not expected, therefore, that the Parish Council will necessarily act alone in relation to locally based initiatives (although in some cases this may be appropriate), but that it will be responsible for initiating the action.

---

9 a general power to incur expenditure for the benefit of the Parish on items for which the Parish Council does not have specific statutory powers. The current limit is £5 per elector (equivalent to almost £6,000) per annum
### THE ACTION PLAN

This table summarises all the Action Points that are discussed in the pages that follow.

The finance column indicates the additional financing that might be required, relative to the size of the organisations involved.

- £: No additional funding required from that existing
- ££: Little additional funding, normally within existing budget levels and work programmes
- £££: Moderate funding within existing funding streams; some new finance may be required, involving budget implications for the principal authorities, precept implications for the Parish Council, or from the additional finance raised through the council tax on second homes
- ££££: New project. Major new funding required, e.g. through grants. Applies especially to community based projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Bodies Involved</th>
<th>Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ho1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>District Council, Parish Council, Housing Associations</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parish Council, Corfe Castle Charity</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>District Council, Parish Council</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parish Council, Rural Housing Enabler</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parish Council, Rural Housing Enabler</td>
<td>£££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Corfe Castle Charity, Social Services</td>
<td>££££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Parish Council, Rural Housing Enabler</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>District Council, Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>District Council, Parish Council</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>District Council, Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>County Council, District Council BP</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Bodies Involved</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>County Council with Learning and Skills Council and other relevant bodies on Dorset Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>County Council First School Pre-School District Council (Dev Control) re Pre-School</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parish Council District Council County Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Community Parish Council Chamber of Trade &amp; Commerce District Council re planning, National Trust as leaseholder where relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Community Parish Council National Trust District Council Post Office Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>County Council Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Parish Council Chamber of Trade and Commerce National Trust businesses Post Office Parish Council District Council TICs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Bodies Involved</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chamber of Trade and Commerce Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>District Council Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>District Council Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parish Council District Council Chamber of Trade and Commerce National Trust Swanage Railway</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>District Council Parish Council National Trust Town Trust</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>County Council District Council Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>County Council Parish Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>County Council District Council Parish Council National Trust</td>
<td>£££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parish Council District Council Swanage Railway</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>District Council landowner</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>County Council District Council</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>£££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Bodies Involved</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr11</td>
<td>To ensure there is full access to a wide job market for residents of the Parish: a) Bus services need to be improved early and late in the day b) Potential demand for a moped loan service should be evaluated</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>County Council, Parish Council, DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr12</td>
<td>Retain the stone pavements in Corfe Castle and Kingston but with improved maintenance</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>County Council, Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr13</td>
<td>There is a need for a good all weather pedestrian route from the south end of Corfe Castle to the Square, to include provision for wheelchairs and pushchairs (but the exclusion of cycles)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1</td>
<td>Progress the sports field project phase 1 (pavilion and groundwork) and phase 2 (multi-use games area) without delay. In the longer-term investigate the possibility of further facilities adjacent to the sports field (e.g. bowls)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sports Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2</td>
<td>Encourage boules, to exploit the existing facility at the RBL Club</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>RBL Club, Sports Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3</td>
<td>Explore the possibility of making the school swimming pool available to the general public out of hours</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>School Governors, County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR4</td>
<td>Promote locally based transport to other sport and recreation facilities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parish Council, Corfe Castle Community Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR5</td>
<td>Encourage volunteer involvement in organising sporting activities and more participation in general</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sports Trust, District Council Sports &amp; Recreation Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR6</td>
<td>Walking: a) Carry out an audit of existing printed walks leaflets and the routes that are included b) Ensure the local availability of the full range of leaflets c) Produce new leaflets featuring less well known paths</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le1</td>
<td>Set up a forum for people to share ideas, to identify new activities and events, and to identify volunteers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Parish Council, Festivities Committee, Village Hall Committee, Town Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le2</td>
<td>Set up an Events Committee and consider “employing” an Events Organiser, to plan a programme of social, cultural and entertainment events</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Parish Council, Festivities Committee, Village Hall Committee, Town Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le3</td>
<td>Explore the possibility of Artsreach and Purbeck Film Festival events at the Village Hall and keep up to date with progress on the Dorset Cinemobile project</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Village Hall Committee, Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed1</td>
<td>Provide adult education classes in Corfe Castle in, especially, IT, arts/crafts and languages. Evening classes are the most likely to succeed in the first instance. Set up an organising committee to plan a programme, identify potential venues and sort out their use for classes, and seek appropriate provider(s).</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>LIFE Partnership including Bournemouth University, County Council Adult Education, Parish Council with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed2</td>
<td>Ensure that training in subjects needed to progress other aims of the Plan is available to residents of the Parish</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>County Council, Dorset Strategic Partnership, Purbeck Community Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Bodies Involved</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>County Council School Governors County Council Salisbury Diocese County Council School</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pre-School Committee Parish Council District Council (Development Control)</td>
<td>£££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Medical Practice Primary Care Trust Raglan Housing Association District Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Primary Care Trust Medical Practice</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Village Hall Committee</td>
<td>£££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Friends of the Surgery Volunteer Forum Parish Council</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Parish Volunteer Forum</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>County Council Social Services Primary Care Trust Parish Volunteer Forum</td>
<td>£££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dorset Police</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dorset Police Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dorset Police Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>County Council Parish Council</td>
<td>££</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Parish Council with volunteers</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>Page</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bodies Involved</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En6</td>
<td>Additional plastics recycling capacity is required in the West Street car park mini-recycling centre</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| En7  | Dog Fouling:  
a) More dog bins are required, over a wider area  
b) More visits by the dog warden, as directed by the Parish Council, would be welcomed | 35 | Parish Council  
District Council  
Parish Council | ££  
£ |
| En8  | Public Toilets:  
a) Continue to press for longer opening of West Street car park toilets  
b) Repair and refurbish the East Street toilets as soon as possible | 35 | Parish Council  
lobbying District  
Council  
District Council | £  
££ |
| Co1  | The Corfe Valley News is a vital communication source and must be maintained, delivered to all in the Parish and free at point of delivery | 36 | Corfe Valley News  
Parish Council and the community in general | £ |
| Co2  | Encourage more use of the Advertiser and Purbeck Gazette to communicate information to residents. Delivery and availability should be monitored | 36 | Parish Council  
Parish organisations | £££ |
| Co3  | Consideration should be given to developing a local community website | 36 | Parish Council with the community | £££ |
| Co4  | Provide a new noticeboard for Kingston | 36 | Parish Council | £££ |
| Yo1  | Develop use of school swimming pool out of school time, for children | 37 | School Governors  
County Council  
Youth Club | £££ |
| Yo2  | Develop a sports club for youngsters to offer a wide range of sports and “movement-related” activities (e.g. dance) | 37 | Sports Trust  
County Council (Youth Service and Culture and Community Planning Officer) | £££ |
| Yo3  | The decision whether to proceed with skateboarding facilities in Corfe Castle should be reviewed | 37 | Parish Council | £££ |
| Yo4  | Develop an indoor “Meeting Point” for young people, to include facilities such as café and IT facilities | 38 | Parish Council  
County Council Youth Service  
Youth Club | £££ |
| Yo5  | Make more positive use of Minnie to provide a demand responsive regular service for young people to surrounding facilities. This requires legal and other potential obstacles to be investigated and funding sought to enable free use | 38 | Corfe Castle Community Bus | £££ |
| Yo6  | Improve liaison between the youth club and Parish Council through regular meetings  
Explore the demand and support for a Youth Council amongst the young people of Corfe Castle | 38 | Parish Council  
Youth Club  
Youth Club | £££ |
| CR1  | Investigate the possibilities and practicalities of developing a Community Resource Centre to offer a range of facilities, either as a standalone venue or as a “virtual” centre using existing venues | 39 | Parish Council  
Village Hall Committee  
Town Trust | £££ |
| CR2  | Investigate the practicalities of employing a Community Worker (preferably from the local population) to help with the “staffing” implications of the Parish Plan Action Plan | 39 | Parish Council  
DCA | £££ |
| CR3  | There is a need for a Parish Volunteer Forum and Co-ordinator to encourage volunteer activity (of all sorts) and match volunteers to needs | 39 | Parish Council with assistance of VOLNET | £££ |
| CR4  | Restore and refurbish the Town Hall | 39 | Town Trust | £££ |
PROBLEMS, ISSUES, ACTIONS

Based on the research outlined in the Appendices (the questionnaire survey, qualitative interviews, and data collection), the Steering Group have identified a number of issues and possible actions. Without repeating in great detail the research carried out for the Plan, each section outlines the issues raised and, in bold, the suggested action points.

HOUSING

1.1 Arguably one of the most, if not the most, critical issues facing the Parish is the lack of affordable housing. The difficulties facing local residents in finding somewhere to live are sufficiently well known and well documented not to need detailed analysis here. The District Council has noted that Purbeck was recently identified (in Joseph Rowntree Foundation research in 2003) as having the greatest disparity between income to house prices of anywhere outside central London. The problem is perhaps even more acute in Corfe Castle Parish than the District as a whole. House prices locally are higher than in the District as a whole and it is suspected wages lower. Also worthy of note is the much higher proportion of owned houses that are owned outright, and also the much higher proportion of house sales that are cash purchases (almost three quarters of all purchases). The local housing market is clearly distorted by these factors.

1.2 The Parish Housing Needs Register, which has been operating since 1986, has consistently indicated between 30 to 40 actual and potential households needing accommodation within the Parish; a summary of the register is given in the Facts and Figures section. Although there are no restrictions as to who may submit details to the Register, a substantial proportion of those on the Register have a very strong connection with the Parish and are in severe housing need. Although many on the Register over the years have been successfully housed in Corfe Castle, there are still several on the Register who have been searching for local accommodation for many years. The Register is now a joint venture between the Parish Council and the Corfe Castle Charity. There is a distinct benefit in this arrangement as those in housing need tend to approach the Charity to be housed. Although the Register, on an ongoing basis, is therefore likely to be a good record of those in housing need, there is no room for complacency and it is felt that regular publicity needs to be given to the Register to ensure that everyone who is in housing need is identified.

1.3 Over the past few years, the social housing stock in Corfe Castle has been increased through the Hollands Close and Abbots Cottages developments, and it should increase further with the forthcoming Raglan development. Comparison between the 1991 and 2001 Censuses suggests that this increase was offset to a certain extent by right-to-buy and sales of private rented property. There is no doubt that there will be a continuing need for new affordable housing provision in the Parish.

1.4 The questionnaire survey revealed that the most popular option in terms of new development would be affordable housing for people to own (72% of those replying), the next most popular (at 31%) was housing association housing. This clearly indicates that the local community supports the need for more affordable housing, although the difference between the two figures may suggest a degree of suspicion from some in the community over the selection of tenants; it must be said, however, that by and large the two recent social housing developments have worked well and been successful in housing people from the Housing Needs Register. The community’s preference for affordable housing to own needs to be noted as a valid aspiration, but it is recognised that this may be difficult to achieve given the level of house prices in the Parish, even with a shared ownership scheme. It is likely that the most practical way for more affordable housing to be provided will be through housing association housing to rent. Nevertheless, the Steering Group feel that, perhaps, self build could be an

---

10 e.g. PDC Housing Strategy and PDC Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing
appropriate route to low cost ownership for a few, although the cost of the land would be the
determining factor and this would need to be resolved through considerable public or private subsidy.
Although 49 questionnaire respondents supported self build and 42 build and train, very few, if any, of
those will be those actually needing accommodation at the moment. The real demand, therefore, for
self build amongst those that are in current housing need needs to be investigated, to see if it is a
practical option worth pursuing.

Point Ho1 There is a continuing need for affordable housing in the Parish

Point Ho2 Maintain the Parish Housing Needs Register and ensure continuing publicity is given to it,
especially for those not currently living in the Parish [Parish Council/Corfe Castle Charity]

Point Ho3 The preference is for affordable housing for locals to own, but recognising that it may be
impractical to achieve a sufficiently low price level (even with shared ownership schemes)
there is a need to continue to seek housing association housing to rent

Point Ho4 The potential demand for self-build as a route to low cost ownership should be investigated
[Parish Council/Rural Housing Enabler]

1.5 Whilst the Parish Housing Needs Register indicates a continuing need for the “traditional” 2 or 3 bed
house (and indeed larger houses) it also reveals a significant unmet need for smaller units, for single
people or couples. These include couples living on their own and beyond child-bearing age, but more
significant numerically are the number of single people on the Register. These vary from people still
having to live with their parents into their thirties and forties, to those recently separated or divorced
(where the need often arises suddenly). In some cases their need will be permanent, in others
temporary for a year or two until they find their feet. Whilst the forthcoming Raglan development has
recognised this need in including some 1 bed flats, there remains the need for further flexible and
affordable single persons’ (and couples’) accommodation. This could take the form of 1 bed flats (or
“1½ bed” to recognise that the separated/divorced may need some space for visiting children and for
guest accommodation). It should also be noted that the Housing Register often records young
couples forced to live apart with their respective families due to the shortage of suitable affordable
housing; although the smaller units described above may not be viewed as ideal in these
circumstances (as the couple may need rehousing once they start a family), more small affordable
units would increase the opportunities for young couples start their life together earlier.

1.6 Equally, however, and perhaps more affordability, in the case of single people this could also take the
form of bedsit units or shared houses (which would suit especially the need for temporary “emergency”
accommodation). Additionally, residents could be encouraged to think about taking in lodgers, which
would especially, though not exclusively, be useful for meeting short-term temporary accommodation
needs. The Parish Council should promote the idea to residents and repeat the exercise of several
years ago of trying to establish a register of houses taking or prepared to take lodgers. The tax
advantages under the “Rent-a-Room” scheme should also be promoted.

Point Ho5 In addition to general family housing, a range of smaller units should be provided for single
people and couples. In addition to 1 or 1½ bed units, the possibilities for bedsits and
shared houses should be explored, either through conversion of existing suitable
properties or new-build [Parish Council/Rural Housing Enabler]

Point Ho6 Local residents should be encouraged to take in lodgers and a register of available and
potential lodgings be developed [Parish Council]

1.7 Over 27% of the Parish population is aged 65 or over, higher than both the District as a whole (22%)
and the County (23%). The proportion aged 75 or over, the proportion of pensioner only households
and the proportion of pensioners living alone all show a similar pattern. Over 200 people of
pensionable age in the Parish have a limiting long-term illness (a similar proportion as elsewhere in
the District and County as a whole). 166 residents provide unpaid care (though not necessarily to the
elderly), of which 48 do so for 20 or more hours a week.

1.8 Corfe Castle has a number of dwellings specially for the elderly, operated by the District Council and
the Charity. Although these are sheltered, anyone needing to move on to a care home has to move,
at least, to Wareham or Swanage. Not only does this mean that they have to move away from their friends and support, but also in some instances this means that people are staying in their own home longer than they might otherwise do. This undoubtedly causes some strain on themselves and their carers. If they were able to move to a care home within the Parish this would also free up sheltered accommodation, for which there is generally a waiting list.

1.9 There is a case to be made for a small care home to be provided in Corfe Castle and it is very much the case that a level of care beyond the current sheltered housing is needed within the Parish. The Corfe Castle Charity has started to investigate the practicality of developing such a home, perhaps in partnership with a specialist provider. Although this may in reality be a long-term ambition it is, given the Charity’s local experience and resources, a more viable proposition than in many other similar communities. Taking account of the various statistics noted above together with local knowledge, it is possible that there would be sufficient demand for at least 10 - 12 beds. The precise level of care that it would be possible and appropriate to provide within such a development is clearly an issue that would need to be resolved.

1.10 It is noted elsewhere in this Plan that care in the home is an important issue. If a care home is a viable proposition in Corfe Castle, the possibility of offering an outreach care service to people in their own homes in the Parish could also be investigated as part of the package, to complement the care-in-the-home services already operating in Corfe Castle.

1.11 It is also worth noting that a greater number of smaller open market houses might enable some elderly homeowners who are finding it difficult to manage their present large house to downsize locally and thus remain independent. Whilst the Planning Authority will not be in a position to force developers to build housing of a particular type or size, this is an issue that could, with benefit, be taken into account when considering the few applications (given the limited development opportunities remaining in the Parish) that are likely to be forthcoming for private sector housing development in the coming years.

Action Point Ho7 The Corfe Castle Charity should be supported in investigating the practicality of providing a care home in Corfe Castle. (This could be linked with a care-in-the-home service operating out of the care home) [Corfe Castle Charity/Social Services]

1.12 A major pre-requisite to providing more housing of any sort is land. It is clear that, notwithstanding the very limited development opportunities within the settlements of Corfe Castle and Kingston, the commercial value of the land within the settlement boundaries is more likely to preclude new build social housing there, though not impossible if the land can be secured at a reasonable rate. Rural exceptions sites are, however, more likely to be the norm in the future. These may lie just outside the settlement boundary (as with the forthcoming Raglan development) and there are distinct advantages from siting housing development in such a way that it is effectively part of Corfe Castle. However, the Steering Group feels that given the scarcity of suitable possible sites, and the vital need for more affordable housing, development elsewhere, such as Norden or Kingston (i.e. on the bus route) or perhaps even further afield, should not be ruled out. It should be noted especially that with the reconnection of rail to Wareham, Norden will have both bus and rail access - a local version of the accessibility corridor promoted at the strategic planning level. It is noteworthy that in the questionnaire survey, although more people favoured limited development within Corfe Castle and Kingston (56%), still a quarter agreed with “new development even though it may mean building outside the village boundaries”. Given that this question related to all new housing, not purely affordable housing, it seems that there could be significant support for a wide search area for suitable sites. 59% of respondents also favoured “redevelopment of old property”, which of course need not always lie within the villages themselves. Wherever the sites may lie, however, a great deal of preparatory work needs to be carried out to identify and bring forward suitable sites; the more proactive the Parish can be the more likely we are to achieve further successful schemes. There may be some merit in undertaking a Parish-wide “site survey” or as a minimum drawing up a list of potential candidates for sites.

Action Point Ho8 There is a need to, proactively, identify and bring forward a range of affordable housing sites - some sites outside Corfe Castle village, particularly though not exclusively Norden and Kingston, may be appropriate as well as in Corfe Castle [Parish Council/Rural Housing Enabler]

∗ ∗ ∗
EMPLOYMENT

2.1 There is a limited range of employment opportunities within the Parish. Many of the jobs are related to tourism, low-paid, part-time and seasonal. Self-employment is higher than elsewhere in the District and County, and a far greater proportion of people work from home. Land based employment also features strongly as would be expected, although numerically it is not so significant. Unemployment is not a serious problem in itself, rather the issue is the range and type of jobs available locally. Someone seeking a full-time factory or office job needs to look outside the Parish. (In the questionnaire survey 24 people worked in Swanage, 27 in Wareham, 18 in Holton Heath/Hamworthy/Poole and 72 further afield.) Employment opportunities outside the Parish (Poole, Wareham, Swanage, Dorchester, etc) will remain an important and significant feature of the local labour market. The need for better transport to employment is noted elsewhere (Tr11).

2.2 Whilst it would be unrealistic to suggest that a major restructuring of the local employment market could be achieved, it would clearly be of benefit if a variety of more local employment opportunities could be encouraged. In the questionnaire survey by far the type of job that people felt was in short supply locally was full-time employment, especially for school leavers. The survey suggests that industrial, information technology and outdoor work such as conservation activities would be appropriate, providing a complement to existing jobs.

Action
Point Em1 Full-time, year round employment within easy reach should be encouraged [District Council/Parish Council]

Action
Point Em2 Seek provision, especially, of industrial, IT and outdoor conservation jobs [District Council/Parish Council]

2.3 Clearly one way in which local employment can be encouraged is the provision of sites and premises, and the Steering Group feels that a more proactive approach in identifying opportunities and approaching land owners could bear fruit. This would need to be carried out as a partnership between the local knowledge of the Parish Council and the expertise of the District Council. There are potential sites where the Rempstone Barns redevelopment could be replicated, such as at Blashenwell. The Old Milk Factory, to the east of Corfe Castle Station and currently occupied as craft studios, remains in the Local Plan as an employment site (SS48); redeveloped it would provide more and a greater range of employment opportunities than at present. There are other accessible sites in the Parish where other larger scale employment could be developed, such as Norden and (post BP) Wytch Farm, covered more specifically below

Action
Point Em3 Identify possible employment sites within and near parish and work with landowners to bring forward schemes of all sizes [District Council/Parish Council]

2.4 The Steering Group is conscious that the planning permissions at the various BP sites in and near the Parish (Furzebrook, Furzey Island, Wytch Farm, etc) require complete restoration back to their original condition once operations cease. Whilst these may or may not be considered suitable employment sites thereafter, the Steering Group feels that at least the possibility should be considered, especially as these sites provide some employment currently. (Although Furzebrook is not in the Parish, the Steering Group hopes that it is not being too presumptuous in identifying the LPG depot as a particularly important resource as it has potentially direct rail access to the national network). If suitable uses can be identified and agreed in advance, then existing potentially useful infrastructure and facilities (for example a roadway, jetty, a particular building, etc) can be retained. Even if an
employment use is not considered appropriate, such facilities might be needed for other uses, such as community, educational or leisure.

**Action**

**Point Em4** The appropriate future uses of the BP sites in the area should be considered and agreed before restoration, so that particular infrastructure and facilities that will be useful for the agreed future use can be retained within the restoration programme [County Council/District Council/BP]

2.5 On a more general level, B1 uses\(^{11}\) are suitable within the built-up areas of the Parish, and planning applications should be looked on favourably. Neither the historic amenity of the villages (i.e. Conservation Areas) nor residential amenity should be viewed as absolute barriers. (It is noted in particular that the Corfe Castle Conservation Area is drawn widely, and includes modern residential areas as well as the historic core of the village.) These factors need to be balanced with the need for local employment. Some employment uses can be envisaged that would not unduly harm historic or residential amenity.

**Action**

**Point Em5** Planning applications for appropriate, non-intrusive, employment uses within the Local Plan settlements in the Parish should be looked on favourably. Although such uses need to be treated sensitively, location within a Conservation Area or residential area should not be viewed as necessarily inappropriate [District Council]

2.6 For those currently seeking work the questionnaire survey identified lack of appropriate experience, training and qualifications as one of the barriers to taking up employment. The Steering Group feels that one way in which school leavers might be enabled to work locally and develop a skill would be through apprenticeships, and that local businesses could be targeted and encouraged to think along these lines and be helped through the process. There are a number of businesses within the ward (105 registered for VAT in 2004) and although many of these businesses may not be appropriate for an apprenticeship if, say, just 10% offered an apprenticeship this would represent a significant opportunity for local school leavers. The County Council has noted that it could provide advice and information through its Modern Apprenticeship Scheme, and also via work experience for students within the County Council itself.

**Action**

**Point Em6** Promote the apprenticeship scheme locally and work with individual businesses to set up apprenticeships [County Council with Learning and Skills Council and other relevant bodies on Dorset Strategic Partnership]

2.7 Another barrier to taking up employment for those currently seeking work, identified in the questionnaire survey, was the lack or cost of childcare. Additionally, a much greater number than those actively seeking work also answered that they would find childcare facilities useful. Most of these respondents were women, confirming the need for improved childcare as a means of facilitating employment, especially full-time, for women in the area. 44 respondents identified the need for childcare for pre-school children, for school pupils after school (42) and during the holidays (44)\(^{12}\). There are already some after-school activities arranged by the school but these are somewhat limited by resources, and these only apply to first school age children. As might be expected, far fewer in the questionnaire survey would need weekend provision, although even here there might be sufficient numbers to justify a more limited arrangement. In the case of pre-school children, the capacity of the Pre-School\(^{13}\) is limited by its temporary accommodation (it currently only operates in the mornings) (see Action Point Ed4). Once in permanent accommodation, and also in the case of school age provision, the facilities exist locally and the issue is one of funding and organisation.

---

\(^{11}\) defined as office, R&D or light industrial uses of a nature that could be carried out in a residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, smell, etc

\(^{12}\) It must be borne in mind that the questionnaire response rate for people with children of school and preschool age was lower than expected. Although it has not yet been possible to analyse individual questionnaires in detail, comparison between the questionnaire results and the census for numbers of children in households suggests that the actual demand for childcare could be considerably higher than indicated by the questionnaire survey - perhaps as much as double

\(^{13}\) more colloquially known as the Nursery School
**Action Point Em7** More pre-school and school-age childcare is needed to widen employment opportunities for parents; principally through the operation of the pre-school on a full-time basis, and increasing the range of after school and holiday activities locally [County Council/First School/Pre-School/District Council (Development Control) re Pre-School development]

2.8 Another pre-requisite (especially, though not exclusively, for IT related companies) is the availability of Broadband, and the Steering Group had identified the need to press for it to be introduced locally. Due to the efforts of Purbeck Broadband and an effective local campaign, the Corfe Castle exchange was enabled for Broadband on 28th July 2004. The Action Point previously drafted has therefore already been achieved! All that is need on this front now, perhaps, is to ensure that information about the availability of Broadband is readily available to those employers and businesses that might not otherwise be aware that Broadband has reached Corfe Castle.

**Action Point Em8** Publicise the availability of Broadband in the Parish [District Council]

2.9 Viewing the Parish Plan as a whole, it is clear that there are several Action Points which have been designed to have a dual objective - their primary objective as stated, but also in providing additional employment opportunities. In order to allow locals access to these jobs there may be the need to promote training opportunities in these specific topics.

**Action Point Em9** Pursuing the other objectives in the Plan will provide some local employment opportunities. In some cases there is a need to target training in these sorts of topics to enable local people to compete for the jobs; in other cases the employment will be a more casual part-time activity. In particular, the following have been identified with the potential to provide some local employment: Ho7 (Care Home), Em7 (Childcare), To3 (Tourist Information Point) and Le2 (Events Organiser)

**SHOPPING**

3.1 Although the questionnaire survey shows that most residents do their main food shopping elsewhere than Corfe Castle, it should be noted that for 8% of the population (a not insignificant figure) Corfe Castle is their main source (generally these are older and/or those without a car). A lot of people do, however, use Corfe Castle for top-up shopping. Although the number and variety of “local service” shops (described, albeit inadequately, thus to distinguish them from the more specialist, tourist related shops) have declined over the years, those that remain represent a valuable resource to the community, and it is important that nothing is done to jeopardise their viability. The Post Office is used by most of the people in the Parish (84% in the questionnaire survey) and is a vital resource, not only in terms of the “Post Office” services it provides, but as the only local banking facility, and as a “community resource point”.

**Action Point Sh1** Encourage awareness of the importance of supporting local shops amongst residents [Community/Parish Council/Chamber of Trade & Commerce] and act favourably towards supporting local shops and businesses [District Council re planning, National Trust as leaseholder where relevant]

**Action Point Sh2** Ensure continued support for Post Office as part of the above and that any activities to enhance its facilities and keep it viable are supported [Community/Parish Council/National Trust/District Council/Post Office Ltd]

---

14 selling of community charity items and tickets for events, post box for Corfe Valley News, events calendar, etc
3.2 In order to be able to support the shops in Corfe Castle people need to be able to park nearby for short periods. There are a number of free one-hour parking spaces in the Square and West Street which would be sufficient if there were a steady turnover of vehicles. However, they tend to be occupied for long periods by visitors, residents and, it must be admitted by some businesses themselves. In the questionnaire survey, this was by far the most often quoted problem with parking (mentioned by 57 out of the 173 answering this question, i.e. 33%). The County Council has responded to some extent to the Parish Council's requests for stricter enforcement of the one-hour parking, but the problem remains a significant one. In addition to the increase in central car park capacity for locals covered in Tr7, measures need to be taken to ensure that the one-hour on street parking is kept available for its proper purpose to allow short visits (mainly by locals) to the centre of the village to visit shops, etc. This might be achieved by more regular and comprehensive enforcement, but other means (e.g. charging, parking permits) might need to be considered to complement this.

Action
Point Sh3 The County Council should investigate more effective means of enforcing the short-stay on-street parking in Corfe Castle [County Council/Parish Council]

3.3 The lack of a cash machine in Corfe Castle has been an issue for many years and there have been unsuccessful attempts by the Parish Council and others to find a provider that will install one. Three-quarters of the questionnaire respondents stated that they would use one if available. Visitors are constantly asking where there is a cash machine and local businesses express the concern that either visitors do not have sufficient cash on them to make all the purchase they would like, or having left the village to find a cash machine will not return. The situation had improved to a certain extent by the National Trust taking card payments at the Castle (so that visitors are able to keep the cash they have for other purposes). Also, the Post Office now offers cash withdrawal for Alliance and Leicester, Barclays, Lloyds TSB, cahoot, smile and Co-operative Bank customers. However, customers of other banks can only withdraw cash if they have a “Basic” account with their bank, not the ordinary current account that most people will have. Post Office Ltd should be lobbied to accept current account cards for all banks. It is suspected that many people, especially visitors, do not know of the range of banking facilities available at the Post Office, and the Steering Group feels that this could be better publicised. This service is clearly only available when the Post Office is open and other means of widening cash availability in the village should continue to be pursued.

Action
Point Sh4 Improve the availability of cash in the village:
   a) Continue to seek provision of a “24/7” cash machine [Parish Council/Chamber of Trade and Commerce]
   b) Encourage the introduction of cashback arrangements in shops and pubs [Chamber of Trade and Commerce/National Trust/businesses]
   c) Publicise availability of cash withdrawal at the Post Office, via notices Corfe Valley News and tourism literature [Post Office/Parish Council/District Council/TICs]
   d) Lobby Post Office Ltd to accept current account cards for all banks [Parish Council]

3.4 Responses to the questionnaire survey suggest that a regular market would be popular with residents. It would clearly also be a popular attraction for visitors. The Steering Group does have some reservations regarding the practicality of such an idea, in terms of difficulties of finding an adequate site, whether it would be commercially viable, and in terms of its potential impact on existing businesses. Nevertheless, it is an idea that might warrant some further thought and investigation, initially involving gauging the views of local businesses. It may also be possible to test the water with one-off events during the summer.

Action
Point Sh5 Investigate the views of local businesses regarding a regular or occasional market and the practicalities involved [Chamber of Trade and Commerce/Parish Council]

---

15 A more considered, holistic car parking strategy for the village (Tr5) may also help in this respect.
3.5 There appears from the questionnaire survey to be some support for a fast food outlet in Corfe Castle. It is not clear whether there would be sufficient local business for such an enterprise to be commercially viable as a completely new start-up, though as an adjunct to an existing catering establishment the overheads might be sufficiently low. As a significant proportion of the local population would appear to welcome the idea, if a viable proposal does come forward it should be supported. The Steering Group feels also that if the “community resource centre” proposal (CR1), mentioned later, becomes a reality it could incorporate some sort of fast food element on certain evenings.

**Action**

**Point Sh6** If a viable proposition for a fast food outlet comes forward this should be supported [District Council/Parish Council]

---

**TOURISM**

4.1 The questionnaire survey reveals that almost all residents (94%) agree that tourism is important to the economy of the Parish, but equally many of them (64%) feel inconvenienced by it. Indeed, when asked the open-ended question “What is the worst thing about living in the Parish?” fully a half answered “visitors” or “tourists”, the most popular answer even above “traffic” (although a more positive attitude was evident in the qualitative one-to-one interviews). Given this general picture the Steering Group considers that the Parish Plan should not identify the need for any new tourist attractions or the need for more publicity to attract visitors, but that the focus should be on managing existing visitors better. For one of the premier tourist areas of the County, some feel that the attention to visitor management is perhaps a little laissez faire, or at least not brought together in a unified way. Some of the particular issues are covered elsewhere in the Plan in more detail (Tr5 re parking, SR6 re footpaths), but car parking and routing of visitors, for example, would benefit from a more co-ordinated approach. The issue of coaches in Corfe Castle (set-down, turn-around and parking), also, remains to be resolved.

**Action**

**Point To1** There needs to be better local management and co-ordination of tourism, and its impact on the area [District Council/Parish Council]

---

4.2 There would be benefit, therefore, in the formation of a local Visitor Management Group, to develop and implement a visitor management strategy for Corfe Castle. Such a Group would need to include, at the least, the Parish and District Councils, Chamber of Trade and Commerce (or representatives from local businesses), the National Trust and Swanage Railway.

**Action**

**Point To2** Form a local Visitor Management Group to manage and monitor tourism to develop, implement and keep under review a visitor management strategy for Corfe Castle [Parish Council/District Council/Chamber/National Trust/Swanage Railway]

---

4.3 The Steering Group has noted that the provision of information for visitors to Corfe Castle is somewhat dissipated. The Castle View National Trust Visitors’ Centre, the Museum and the Library all provide an element of information to visitors. Castle View does a good job regarding the National Trust’s interests, but resources, space and its “off-centre” location preclude a more universal role. The Library, although the official Tourist Information Point, is “off-centre” and not open all the time, but is also not a location that many visitors would actually think of going to. There is some merit in

---

16 There have been experiments in offering take-away food from pubs in the past
considering a centrally located, staffed tourist information point, to help visitors get the most out of Corfe Castle and the surrounding area, whilst at the same time helping manage their presence. It could be that the “community resource centre” proposal (CR1) could include this tourist information role. Existing premises that might offer some potential include the Town Hall, the Robing Room\(^1\) and the Fudge Shop\(^2\), although in all cases it is recognised that use in this capacity would need to be reconciled with their current uses.

**Action Point** To3 Investigate the practicality of a staffed tourist information point, including the identification of potential locations and how it would be funded and operated [District Council/Parish Council/National Trust/Town Trust]

### TRANSPORT, TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PAVEMENTS

5.1 In the questionnaire survey “Traffic” was considered to be the worst thing about living in the Parish by 122 respondents, representing a quarter of all who replied. A substantial majority (66%) of the population in the Parish agree with the need for a bypass compared with 18% who disagree. 80% of respondents identified the volume of traffic as a problem. When comparing cars and lorries, respondents to the survey viewed lorries as the greater problem.

5.2 The A351 through Corfe Castle is the main artery for south Purbeck, carrying an around 10,000 vehicles per day, of which some 8,000 represent through traffic. A significant proportion of the traffic consists of goods vehicles, which have a much greater impact than the equivalent number of cars. Almost all traffic related to activities in south Purbeck has to pass through Corfe Castle. Concerns over through traffic relate to the overall volume of traffic, the speed of that traffic and the particular issue of goods vehicles. The particular historic nature and physical layout of Corfe Castle leads to the following associated serious impacts: the closeness of the traffic to buildings, a difficult to negotiate right-angle bend at the Bankes Arms, severance of the community by traffic on the A351, the effect of heavy traffic passing very close to historic buildings and the general impact of noise and pollution. These effects are felt not only by residents and businesses, but also by the ½ million visitors to the village each year. There is also the direct threat to the historic fabric of the buildings themselves.

5.3 The quality of life of residents of Corfe Castle is seriously degraded by the amount and type of through traffic experienced, as is the enjoyment of visitors to one of the primary tourist destinations in the County.

5.4 The nature and severity of the problems caused by the through traffic in Corfe Castle has been fully recognised by Ove Arup\(^3\). Their report concludes (in paragraph 3.5.2) that: “the Corfe Castle proposal gives rise to the greatest number of positive outcomes [of the rural schemes]. The negative outcomes that are assigned to the proposal are as a result of the risk of inducing more traffic to the disadvantage of public transport and the adverse ecological consequences [of the bypass].” In other words, the problem of through traffic in Corfe Castle scores highly positive; it is particular aspects of the bypass as previously proposed which brings in the few negative scores. There were few other schemes evaluated which scored as consistently highly on the indicators that represent measures of impact of through traffic on the community. This suggests that, of those communities involved in deleted road schemes, the existing problems in Corfe Castle rate as amongst the most serious in the County.

---

\(^{17}\) the upper floor of the Town House, above the post office

\(^{18}\) between Dragons Bakery and The Greyhound

\(^{19}\) in their “Appraisal of Transportation Proposals” December 1997 (commissioned by the Structure Plan Joint Committee to evaluate the road proposals in the plan).
5.5 Following the deletion of the bypass from the Structure Plan, current proposals relating to the Corfe Castle area focus on shifting journeys to alternative modes (i.e. reconnection of the rail to the mainline, improved bus services, cycle provision and interchange facility at Norden Park & Ride) and managing the through traffic (i.e. the Corfe Castle Speed Management Project). This approach has been confirmed in Buro Happold’s recently issued Purbeck Transportation Study. Considerable doubts have been expressed locally that such an approach will have a sufficient impact to make a significant difference to traffic in Corfe Castle. The effectiveness, therefore, of each element of this approach should be monitored, evaluated and kept under review by the County Council. In any case and of fundamental importance, self-evidently none of these measures will do anything to address the problem of goods traffic.

5.6 A solution to diverting the large volumes of traffic from the centre of Corfe Castle will have to found and the continuing need for a bypass cannot be ignored, even if only in the long term. The Parish Council should ensure that the case for Corfe Castle to be bypassed continues to be put. It is not considered appropriate, however, that this Parish Plan should recommend a route; not only did the questionnaire survey indicate a variety of views (reflecting the earlier variety of opinion locally when the route was being actively pursued), but more critically a fresh look at the route would need to be made within the context of environmental and traffic considerations prevalent at the time, possibly many years in the future.

5.7 In the meantime, the speed management work, which the County Council has informed the Steering Group is still undergoing detailed design, will go a little way to helping the local community cope with the traffic.

- **Action Point Tr1** The effectiveness of the various Local Transport Plan proposals affecting the Corfe Castle area should be monitored, evaluated and reviewed on an ongoing basis, and a solution to removing the bulk of goods vehicles from Corfe Castle be pursued [County Council/District Council/Parish Council]
- **Action Point Tr2** The Parish Council should continue to press the case for Corfe Castle to be bypassed [Parish Council]
- **Action Point Tr3** The speed management works for Corfe Castle should be progressed as soon as possible [County Council]

5.8 Outside Corfe Castle village, the questionnaire survey particularly highlighted problems in Sandy Hill Lane. For a narrow road, with high banks in places and heavily overgrown, it is relatively heavily trafficked by vehicles, cyclists and walkers. In its current state it is extremely dangerous to all users and a great concern, especially, to residents who live along it. It ideally requires, for example, more frequent verge maintenance starting earlier in the year, refuges for cyclists and walkers and warning signs. Whilst it is understood that some of the verges are designated wildlife verges, it is hoped that a detailed study might reveal some practical measures that
could be taken to alleviate the problems. Cycling in the Parish is almost exclusively a leisure activity by visitors to the Parish and, other than the difficulties along Sandy Hill Lane, it did not feature at all in residents’ concerns. The Steering Group do not feel it appropriate, therefore, to initiate any other actions relating to cycling in the Parish Plan itself even though it clearly is something that the District and County Councils may wish to develop as part of a wider picture.

**Action Point Tr4** Continued efforts need to be made to help resolve traffic conflict and verge maintenance on Sandy Hill Lane [County Council/Parish Council]

5.9 Corfe Castle has a fair amount of car park capacity for a village of its size, but parking remains an issue for many. A third of respondents in the questionnaire survey indicated that they had parking problems, and a similar number suggested further areas that could be used for parking. The main problem for residents is short-term parking to visit shops and businesses in Corfe Castle (covered in Sh3), and lack of off-street parking for many properties. There is also a degree of conflict in the way in which the various car parks in Corfe Castle are managed (pricing, opening, etc) which means that they are not necessarily being used effectively. The Steering Group feels that a parking strategy is needed for Corfe Castle, which resolves these conflicts, identifies further parking capacity and clearly distinguishes between parking for residents and parking for visitors. This needs to be carried out in considerable detail and cover more than co-ordinating visitor parking in existing car parks. The proposed working party to review parking issues in South Purbeck is welcomed, but may not have a wide enough remit (for example in terms of looking at residents’ parking) nor be sufficiently focused on Corfe Castle to allow the detailed review necessary; it can clearly form an element of the work but cannot be relied on for the whole.

5.10 Although not an issue that came out of the survey work and therefore not addressed by the Steering Group, in adopting the Parish Plan the Parish Council has required that specific reference is made to the need to accommodate coach parking within such a strategy, to include provision for dropping off, turning round and collecting for both tourist coaches and school buses.

**Action Point Tr5** There is a need for an overall detailed parking strategy for Corfe Castle, to include considerations of capacity, location, type (residents/visitors), management, access, pricing and provision for people with disabilities. Because many properties do not have off-street parking, a parking strategy needs to include providing adequate residents’ parking in addition to better co-ordination of visitors’ parking. Coach parking should also be addressed (to include provision for dropping off, turning round and collecting by tourist coaches and school buses) The South Purbeck Parking Review working party can complement this work but is unlikely to be able to cover the full range of issues [County Council/District Council/Parish Council/National Trust]

5.11 Included within such a review would need to be the following, none of which are new ideas. The Norden Transport Interchange (the so called “Park & Ride”) should be designated the main car park for visitors to Corfe Castle and the wider area, which requires it being open on a full-time basis, improvements to signage and a shuttle service into Corfe Castle; it may also benefit from further extension. Management of this vital resource also needs to be via a partnership approach, that includes the Parish Council.

5.12 Car parking capacity for locals (i.e. short-term parking) and residents (i.e. “overnight” parking) needs to be increased by the development of further car parks specifically for these purposes. Suitable sites could be to the rear of Springwell Close and on the coal depot by the station.

**Action Point Tr6** Extend the times and periods when the Norden Transport Interchange is open, continue to examine the possibility of a shuttle service into Corfe Castle, improve signage. Consideration should be given to extending it. A partnership approach to its management, that includes the Parish Council, should be adopted. Parish Council/District Council/Swanage Railway]

---

20 funded by subsidy or possibly via the parking fee in true park and ride fashion
Action
Point Tr7  Provide additional parking capacity for short-term parking reserved for locals shopping in
Corfe Castle. One possibility would be adjacent to the playing field to the rear of Springwell
Close [District Council/landowner]

Action
Point Tr8  Relocate the coal depot to release for parking, including reserved residents’ parking
[County Council/District Council]

Action
Point Tr9  Retain the low first hour charge in the West Street car park for locals [District Council]

5.13 Approximately two-thirds of respondents to the questionnaire survey do not use any form of public
transport at least once a month or more. 85% of households have one or more cars. For residents of
Norden, Corfe Castle and Kingston there is a reasonable bus service (although there are concerns
over cost and withdrawal of the evening service) and 98 respondents in the questionnaire survey
(20%) uses the bus at least once a month. There are parts of the Parish that are not served by public
transport (principally the Underhill area and Rempstone/Bushley) but potential demand for a dial-a-
ride/shared taxi service would appear to be low, with only 28 respondents in the questionnaire survey
(6%) thinking they would use it monthly or more often. Given the relatively high level of accessibility to
the ordinary bus network for residents in the Parish (83% live within a reasonable walking distance, as
defined by them, of a bus stop) and the low potential demand for dial-a-ride suggested by the
questionnaire survey, it is unlikely that a Parish based dial-a-ride scheme would be viable. It is also
worth noting that a recent approach by a member of the Parish Council to other councils in the
Purbeck area, to determine the level of interest in a wider based dial-a-ride scheme, solicited very little
response. It does not seem appropriate, therefore, for the Plan to focus on dial-a-ride, but merely
suggest that if a viable scheme comes forward that it be supported in principle and investigated.

Action
Point Tr10 Should a viable Dial-a-Ride/Shared Taxi scheme be put forward it should be supported
[Parish Council]

5.14 It has already been noted that the major employment market for the Parish covers a wide
area from Poole to Dorchester, but employment opportunities are restricted for some residents by
problems over transport. In the questionnaire survey problems with transport were identified as
the greatest barrier preventing people taking up employment or training. The timings of early and
late buses, and co-ordination with other routes and the train, need to ensure that journeys to and from
work can be achieved reliably, especially for those needing to get to work early in the day and leave
work late in the day. In particular, the withdrawal of the evening service Monday to Thursday has
affected the ability of certain individuals to continue in their job, and should be reinstated as soon as the
subsidy situation permits.

Action
Point Tr11 To ensure there is full access to a wide job market for residents of the Parish:
   a) Bus services need to be improved early and late in the day [County Council]
   b) Potential demand for a moped loan service should be evaluated [Parish Council/DCA]

5.15 As noted earlier, outlying parts of the Parish have no access bus services at all. To complement
improvements to public transport, consideration could be given to setting up a moped loan service
locally, using the Parish Transport Grant. The potential demand for this should be investigated.

5.16 30% of respondents in the questionnaire survey (especially the elderly) said they were personally
inconvenienced by the uneven stone pavements while over a half of all respondents expressed
concern. However, far fewer (only 15%) would wish to see them replaced by tarmac. Whilst an
important feature of Corfe Castle and Kingston, therefore, they do need constant monitoring and
repair. It is clear that the local community’s view is at variance with the County Council’s view as to the adequacy of the maintenance regime and the Parish Council will need to continue to press the case. In addition to being uneven, the pavements are narrow in places and suffer from pavement parking, which particularly affects wheelchairs and pushchairs, as does the lack of dropped kerbs in some places. There remains the need, therefore, for a decent pedestrian/wheelchair/pushchair route to be available from the further reaches of Corfe Castle village into the Square, avoiding the stone pavements; this should be designed if possible to prevent use by cycles (or if not possible, consideration given to a cycleway segregated from the footpath).

**Action Point** Tr12 Retain the stone pavements in Corfe Castle and Kingston but with improved maintenance [County Council/Parish Council]

**Action Point** Tr13 There is a need for a good all weather pedestrian route from the south end of Corfe Castle to the Square, to include provision for wheelchairs and pushchairs (but the exclusion of cycles) [Parish Council]

SPORT AND RECREATION

6.1 The inadequacy of sporting facilities in the Parish has been recognised for a long time, both locally and within the context of the District Sports and Recreation Strategy. Better sports facilities would clearly also have health benefits for the local population. The sports field, off West Street in Corfe Castle, was leased from the National Trust by the Parish Council some years ago and drainage installed, with the intention of it being developed into a multi-use facility but facilities remain basic, with no changing facilities. This has limited the development of the sports clubs. The Corfe Castle Sports Trust has now been established in order to progress the scheme and thereafter oversee the management of the facility (and in the longer term the Trust might feel in a position to oversee the development of sport as a whole within the Parish). The sports field development involves a pavilion, works to the pitch and a multi-use games area that can be used for a variety of sports including tennis, five-a-side football and netball, etc. Planning Permission was obtained in December 2000. Work has been progressing on funding, including fundraising and seeking sources of funding, and an application has recently been submitted to the Football Foundation.

6.2 The questionnaire survey revealed a generally low participation rate currently, clearly reflecting the lack of facilities\(^{21}\). A greater number, however, expressed the view that they would play for local sports clubs if the facilities were provided. Perhaps also of note is the number of people currently playing tennis (most of whom are over 45), and who would clearly use local courts when provided. Furthermore, the number of qualified coaches (13) in the response and the number who would be prepared to become involved in local coaching (8) is reassuring. There is considerable support within the Parish for the sports field development, evidenced both by the questionnaire survey (half the respondents agreed that they would like to see it established, far more than any other sporting facility) and in the degree of financial support that local residents have already given the project. There is now every will to make this happen quickly.

6.3 There are, unfortunately, physical limitations to generally expanding the sports field into the adjacent fields (in terms of hedgerow loss and electricity lines to the south, and to the north landform and possibly archaeological objections). Whilst, therefore, a generally larger field is not achievable, it is possible in the field to the south to envisage low-impact use for a separate sporting use which is nevertheless able to use the pavilion. Given the age profile of the Parish, the Steering Group suggests that a bowling green could be a popular option, though clearly the suitability of the field and the real demand would need to be investigated.

**Action Point** SR1 Progress the sports field project phase 1 (pavilion and groundworks) and phase 2 (multi-use games area) without delay. In the longer term investigate the possibility of further facilities adjacent to the sports field (e.g. bowls) [Sports Trust]

---

\(^{21}\) and also the age bias in response rates
6.4 There are few other facilities for sport in the Parish. Some activities are possible at the Village Hall, such as badminton and short mat bowls. One facility which already exists is the boule pit at the RBL Club. It has an enthusiastic following, but as a facility already existing it could be promoted more within the local community to bring more people into the sport.

**Action**

**Point SR2** Encourage boules, to exploit the existing facility at the RBL Club [RBL Club/Sports Trust]

6.5 The questionnaire survey identified that a swimming pool would be the second most popular recreational facility after the sports field improvements. It is highly unlikely that the building of a full-sized pool from scratch would be viable or justified on cost grounds, though the existence of the pool at the school cannot be overlooked. It is small, designed for children, and only currently available for school use. It might nevertheless be popular as a social “splash about” if opened for the general population out of school hours. Legal, health and safety, security, management and financial issues would need to be investigated, but the Steering Group feel that this is certainly an option that should be looked at, especially as this has happened in the past.

**Action**

**Point SR3** Explore the possibility of making the school swimming pool available to the general public out of hours [School Governors/County Council]

6.6 It has to be recognised that access to most sports facilities that are not already available or planned will require travelling to surrounding towns. The withdrawal of the Thursday evening Leisure Bus to (amongst other destinations) the Purbeck Sports Centre, reportedly through lack of patronage, is noted and it is not clear whether there is sufficient overall demand for such a service in Corfe Castle. However, the Steering Group consider that further consideration could be given to a local based solution that is more tailored (in terms of price, timings and locations) to local residents’ requirements. It is suggested elsewhere in this Plan that the possibility of developing the use of Minnie the Bus on a more regular and formalised basis should be investigated (Yo5).

**Action**

**Point SR4** Promote locally based transport to other sport and recreation facilities [Parish Council/Corfe Castle Community Bus]

6.7 The key to much of sports development in a small community will be the number and range of suitable volunteers to help run the activities. The questionnaire survey indicated that there are a number of qualified coaches and a greater number of people (45 responses) who would be prepared to help with the organisation of local sports clubs. Efforts need to be made to identify these people and “recruit” them. The proposed “Volunteer Forum” (CR3) could play a role in this. On a more general level, given the health and social benefits of sport and recreation, the aim should be to increase participation levels amongst the population as a whole. The opening of the new sports field facilities will provide a useful trigger for this.

**Action**

**Point SR5** Encourage volunteer involvement in organising sporting activities and more participation in general [Sports Trust/District Council Sports & Recreation Development]

6.8 Walking is a very popular pastime for residents, with 85% of respondents in the questionnaire survey saying they walk in the surrounding countryside. It is clearly also a popular activity for visitors. If nothing else, it should be encouraged for its health benefits. The Parish has a well developed rights of way network, and in the questionnaire survey most people felt that footpaths and bridleways were adequate in number, well maintained and adequately
signed (though there was slightly less universal agreement on the latter two points). However, almost three-quarters of those answering the particular question felt there should be more printed maps and guides available, and this was a more popular option than guided walks (which would still, however, appear to be fairly popular). A number of leaflets and guides are available, though there is no overview of the full range available. Existing leaflets, also, will tend to feature routes along the more popular, well known paths. It is suggested that new leaflets giving routes that encourage people onto the less well trodden paths will not only help to “spread the load” and encourage residents and visitors to explore more, but also may help keep the paths better maintained.

Action
Point SR6 Walking: [Parish Council]

a) Carry out an audit of existing printed walks leaflets and the routes that are included
b) Ensure the local availability of the full range of leaflets
c) Produce new leaflets featuring less well known paths

◊ ◇ ◇

LEISURE

7.1 The Parish has an active culture of leisure, as the list of activities and organisations in the Facts and Figures section demonstrates. These not only allows people to follow or discover particular interests, but also help with social contact and help generate a sense of community. Most of these activities and organisations have arisen spontaneously resulting from the particular interests of someone prepared to get them up and running, and “the authorities” trying to organise something officially is not necessary and indeed less likely to succeed. Sometimes, however, an unfocussed interest within the community to get a new activity going may need a helping hand. There may be some merit in setting up a forum for people to get together to see what support there might be for a suggested new leisure activity and identify others of a like mind. The questionnaire survey also suggested that there are a number of people in the Parish prepared to volunteer to help with leisure activities and events and such a forum would help identify these volunteers. The forum could take a variety of forms, and probably a mixture of all, including meetings at the Village Hall, an open forum in the Corfe Valley News and perhaps an element of the community website if this were to be implemented (Co3).

Action
Point Le1 Set up a forum for people to share ideas, to identify new activities and events, and to identify volunteers [Parish Council/Festivities Committee/Village Hall Committee/Town Trust]

◊ ◇ ◇

7.2 One-off events provide entertainment and a sense of community, and a number already take place through the year, organised by various local organisations or commercially. The questionnaire survey revealed a demand for more concerts and films (receiving support from around a third of the respondents), and other events such as dinners, picnics, visiting theatre could be envisaged. There is no one organisation that has responsibility for putting together a programme and making the arrangements, though the Festivities and Village Hall Committees might provide something of a focus. Artsreach and the Purbeck Film Festival are two possible partners, and progress with the Dorset Cinemobile project should be kept under review (given the apparent support for concerts and films). There is a case to be made for not only an Events Committee but perhaps, given the time and experience that needs to be available, an Events Organiser, who might need to be paid a small fee for their time, out of the profits from the events.

Action
Point Le2 Set up an Events Committee and consider “employing” an Events Organiser, to plan a programme of social, cultural and entertainment events [Parish Council/Festivities Committee/Village Hall Committee/Town Trust]

Action
Point Le3 Explore the possibility of Artsreach and Purbeck Film Festival events at the Village Hall and keep up to date with progress on the Dorset Cinemobile project [Village Hall Committee/Parish Council]

◊ ◇ ◇

^{22} to complement, not displace, the Double Act performances
EDUCATION AND LIFE LONG LEARNING

8.1 Although many of the local activities and clubs have a learning element to them, formally organised learning opportunities are virtually non-existent in the Parish. The questionnaire survey indicates that many of the Parish residents have undertaken learning in recent years, predominantly through adult education classes, and also that there would be a great interest in adult education sessions in Corfe Castle (almost 40% of respondents expressed an interest). From the questionnaire responses, the most popular time would be in the evenings, although there may also be a demand for mornings and afternoons. The most asked for subjects were IT, arts/crafts and languages, although the full range of subjects mentioned shows wide and varied interests amongst the population.

8.2 There are a number of possible venues, all within Corfe Castle, that might be appropriate. Their suitability and capacity for different activities, and their availability, would need to be established. Two venues that appear to be underutilised at present are the school (see Ed3) and the Town Hall, which, following the proposed restoration and refurbishment, would provide a suitable venue for classes of 15-20 (CR4). Also, appropriate providers would need to be sought.

8.3 As with events, the Steering Group feels that a local organising committee is needed to provide the impetus to sorting out these issues. This would fit in with Bournemouth University’s suggestion for a small local task group to take forward in the Parish the LIFE (Learning is for Everyone) Partnership “roll-out” of the community outreach learning programme to rural areas.

**Action Point Ed1** Provide adult education classes in Corfe Castle in, especially, IT, arts/crafts and languages. Evening classes are the most likely to succeed in the first instance. Set up an organising committee to plan a programme, identify potential venues and sort out their use for classes, and seek appropriate provider(s) [LIFE Partnership, including Bournemouth University, County Council Adult Education, etc/Parish Council with the community]

8.4 It has already been noted in the Employment section that training in certain topics could help achieve some of the actions in the Parish Plan. Whilst it may not be viable to offer specialist training locally within the Parish, the availability of accessible and affordable training, in for example the personal care services (elderly and child), is important in pursuing other aims of the Plan. Publicity and advice about training opportunities needs to be improved.

**Action Point Ed2** Ensure that training in subjects needed to progress other aims of the Plan is available to residents of the Parish [County Council/Dorset Strategic Partnership/Purbeck Community Partnership]

8.5 The school is not only a valuable and well-respected educational resource in its own right but it is also, in drawing pupils from a wide area, an important focus for the community, including outlying parts of the Parish and other surrounding parishes. Its work with parents and the wider community is noted. As with any rural school, the school roll will vary from year to year, but in general there are few surplus places in most years. The Steering Group feels that there is a strong case for retention of the school within any reorganisation of schools in the Purbeck area.

8.6 The school also represents a potential valuable resource to the wider community. There is a case, as already noted, for making the swimming pool available outside school hours. (It is worth noting that having the pool at the school ensures that virtually every child in the Parish can swim by the age of 8 or 9.) The hall is used on occasion (and is the regular venue for yoga classes), especially when the Village Hall is not available, but perhaps it remains underutilised. It is a potential venue for adult evening classes, for example. Legal, health and safety, security, management and financial issues would need to be investigated, but the Steering Group feel that this is certainly an option that should be looked at.

8.7 Should, for whatever reason, the County Council consider closing the school at any time in the future it would be essential that the site and building be retained for community use. It is understood that, as a

23 the largely self-taught opportunity for IT with the free computers in the library is noted, but clearly more structured IT classes would be popular

24 see, for example, OFSTED report
church school, the diocese may continue to have some control over the ownership of the site. The position would need to be fully clarified if consideration was being given to closing the school.

8.8 The Parish Council has asked that the Parish Plan makes specific reference to the health and safety issues involved in the school buses dropping off, collecting and turning in the vicinity of the school, in particular the use of the Castle Inn car park.

**Action Point Ed3** Corfe Castle First School:

a) Retain the school [County Council]

b) Maxmise use of school and its facilities by the wider community [School Governors/County Council]

c) If at any time consideration is given to closing the school it should be retained for community use and not sold for private development [County Council/Salisbury Diocese]

d) Resolve health and safety problems associated with school buses dropping off, collecting and turning [County Council/School]

9.1 Following the change of GP in 1999, circumstances were such that it was necessary for a new surgery to be provided. Since then the practice has been operating out of temporary portakabin accommodation adjacent to the Village Hall. Although it has been not been unusual for a change in GP in Corfe Castle to also involve a change in surgery (6 GPs over the last century occupied five different surgeries), the demands of today’s health system requires a purpose built surgery, for which the site capacity within Corfe Castle is limited. Nevertheless, the site to the rear of West Street, was identified for housing association development, the surgery and nursery school, and has been progressed, albeit faltering, through planning permission and site acquisition. This has been a long and painful process, but it is hoped there is now light at the end of the tunnel.

9.2 During that time, and despite the temporary accommodation, the number of patients registered with the practice has increased. 60% of respondents in the questionnaire survey were registered at Corfe Castle, and many others have indicated that once the future of the practice is guaranteed with a permanent surgery building they would consider registering locally.

25 which it is not felt necessary or appropriate to go into further here
Action
Point SM1 The new surgery should be progressed as a top priority [Medical Practice/Primary Care Trust/Raglan Housing Association/District Council]

9.3 The questionnaire survey indicated considerable demand for additional health-related services to be provided locally, such as chiropody, dentistry and physiotherapy. The design of the new surgery building is such that “visiting” medical services will be possible and should be encouraged.

Action
Point SM2 The new surgery building should be viewed as more than just a surgery but a mini “Health Centre” with additional local “visiting” medical services [Primary Care Trust/Medical Practice]

9.4 It is worth noting that once the practice is able to move from the Village Hall site, the extension site will be freed up for its original purpose, to allow the expansion of the Village Hall. This will assist other aims of the Plan in providing a greater range of rooms and facilities.

Action
Point SM3 Once the surgery is in its permanent accommodation, the Village Hall will be in a position to progress expansion plans [Village Hall Committee]

9.5 In terms of other services for the frail and elderly, the questionnaire survey indicated considerable support and need for a car service for hospital appointments and other trips. There is already a limited service in relation to the surgery available through Friends of the Surgery, but its scope is limited principally by lack of volunteers. Yet 26 people in the survey indicated they would be interested in volunteering for such a service, and the true figure is likely to be higher than this taking into account the response rate for the questionnaire. There is a need for a campaign to more positively identify these potential volunteers and build on the current scheme, to include other surgeries and visits to hospital.

Action
Point SM4 There is a need for a comprehensive volunteer driver scheme for visits to hospital, all surgeries at which residents are registered and for medication delivery. More volunteer drivers need to be recruited [Friends of the Surgery/volunteer forum/Parish Council]

9.6 The questionnaire survey indicated in several topic areas the willingness of residents to volunteer to help in the community. In addition to the volunteer drivers, there are clearly residents who would be prepared to help with the elderly (39 people in the questionnaire survey), with young children (22) and youth (16). There is clearly a willingness within the community to do more, but the mechanisms to identify volunteers and match them to needs need to be developed. The proposed “Volunteer Forum” (CR3) could play an important role in this.

Action
Point SM5 Residents should be encouraged to come forward in a voluntary capacity to help with the social needs of elderly and young people in the Parish [Parish Volunteer Forum]

9.7 According to the 2001 Census 20% of residents in the Parish had a long-term limiting illness or disability. Over half of the population over retirement age (numbering 203) had a limiting long term illness. 166 residents provided unpaid care (though not necessarily to the elderly), of which 48 did so for 20 or more hours a week. This is a similar picture to elsewhere in the County and there is clearly a need for support to help people in their home and their carers. The questionnaire survey suggests strong support for more provision of this kind (260 respondents (over 50%) agreeing that this was needed). Although the questionnaire did not ask whether the individual had a specific need for care in the home, the similarity in numbers between the questionnaire results and the Census data (and bearing in mind that a higher proportion of the elderly answered the questionnaire than younger people) suggests that many of those answering this question reflected a personal need in their answer. Local care-in-the-home services have grown very quickly indicating a significant need. This should be built on. Further care-in-the-home services could operate in conjunction with the care home identified earlier in the Plan (Ho7), and should certainly feature as an element in the more detailed
assessment of practicality. There is also possibly scope for more voluntary action\(^\text{26}\) (given the number of questionnaire respondents saying they would be prepared to help with the elderly, and the apparent difficulty in recruitment of staff expressed by the County Council) (SM5), which might be facilitated through the availability of training in personal care (Ed2). Better publicity for existing support services may also help.

### Action

**Point SM6**  
There is a need for increased provision of care-in-the-home service for the elderly and disabled. This could operate in conjunction with a care home if proceeded with, or through better organisation of local volunteers, with appropriate training [County Council Social Services/Primary Care Trust/Parish Volunteer Forum]

\* \* \*

### CRIME

10.1 The Parish has a low reported crime rate and the results of the questionnaire survey are somewhat surprising in as much as almost a quarter of respondents stated that they had been a victim of crime within the Parish (including burglary from home or outbuilding, theft of or from a vehicle and vandalism). Many of these will have been small-scale and unreported. It is of note that also a quarter of respondents were very or somewhat concerned at becoming a victim of crime and a further 31% were a little concerned. The most often quoted reason for this by far was the lack of visible police presence. Also of interest, however, was that a third of people expressing concern did do because of the personal experience of others, while almost a quarter stated it was because of media reports. Although the crime rate is low, and the general level of fear of crime is probably low relative to other parts of the country, there is clearly a widespread feeling of unease over the lack of visible police presence. It is acknowledged that the Police have made efforts to respond to the call for more “community policing”, but despite the various initiatives, and notwithstanding the limited resources available to the Purbeck Section, the Police appear to need to do more on the ground to convince the local population that they are safe and that they are getting value for their Council Tax that is spent on policing. 60% of respondents in the questionnaire survey asked for greater police presence on foot, a far greater percentage than any other option. The view of the Steering Group is that the usual plea, “the bobby on the beat”, would therefore do a lot to reassure people. Some regular, and random, visible police presence on foot, preferably of a named and familiar officer would go a long way to dealing with the general feeling of unease that a proportion of the population have about crime. It may be a matter of perception more than reality, but people would get used to seeing someone around and this would reassure them that the police were really taking an interest in the community. Because of the nature of different officers, the profile of the Community Beat Officer has been limited in recent years and there has been some confusion over who at Swanage Station has that role. It is understood that PC Dave Cox is again available to take that role, but given the resources available to the Police locally in terms of uniformed officers, it might be that a Community Support Officer would need to take this role (a quarter of respondents in the questionnaire survey agreed that more community wardens were needed). In commenting on the draft Plan, the Police acknowledged these concerns, whilst stressing that crime and disorder problems in the area were low relative to other parts of the country. The Steering Group were assured that, within the constraints imposed by needing to direct limited resources within the Purbeck Section to where they are most needed at any one time, patrols within the Parish will be undertaken by regular officers and especially the Police Community Support Officers.

**Action**

**Point Cr1**  
Some regular (but random) police presence is needed on foot, of a named officer, possibly a Community Support Officer [Dorset Police]

\* \* \*

10.2 Residents might feel more reassured if they felt that there were better lines of communication between themselves and the Police. Despite initiatives such as the Community Support Vehicle and the South Purbeck Task Group, the general perception is still that it is difficult to get hold of the police, especially “in real time”. The Steering Group has no specific suggestions on this matter, but it is clearly an issue to which further thought needs to be given.

\(^{26}\) It is understood that the County Council Library Service is in the process of developing its Home Library service for those who are housebound; there could clearly be a role for local volunteers for this as part of the wider volunteer activity in care-in-the-home identified in this Action Point
Action Point Cr2 Seek more reassuring lines of communication for residents with local police, especially for “real time” reporting of incidents [Dorset Police/Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership]

10.3 Just over a quarter of respondents in the questionnaire survey felt that an improved Neighbourhood Watch Scheme would help. It seems to the Steering Group that Neighbourhood Watch, which clearly many put some faith in, has become somewhat moribund locally, but whether this is a local phenomenon or part of a wider picture is not clear. A reinvigorated scheme locally would seem to have the prospect of helping to alleviate the perceptions discussed above.

Action Point Cr3 Re-evaluate and relaunch Neighbourhood Watch [Dorset Police/Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership/Parish Council]

ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

11.1 Most residents of the Parish (92%) agree that environmental matters are important, and many use the recycling centres and garden waste disposal at Household Sites or by composting. 80% of those with access to kerbside recycling participate. The Steering Group expressed some surprise, therefore, at the low take up of Council Insulation Grants which are cost effective for both residents and one presumes the Council. Although some forms of insulation are not appropriate in many local buildings due to building age and design, there is perhaps a certain lack of awareness of the grants and the benefits of additional insulation.

Action Point En1 Raise awareness of Purbeck District Council insulation grants and the benefits of insulation [District Council]

11.2 There was also a surprising level of support for alternative energy sources, including wind power (52% expressing support for encouraging alternative energy generation in the Parish, compared with 23% disagreeing). Whilst there is a range of opinion on the subject and quite a difference between a theoretical general question and a real proposal, the results are, to say the least, interesting.

Action Point En2 Explore the potential and real support for alternative energy sources (e.g. wind, wave and solar) in the Parish [District Council]

11.3 A popular energy reduction measure raised in the questionnaire survey, that would also reduce light pollution\(^ {27}\), is the reduction in unnecessary overnight lighting.

Action Point En3 Introduce measures to reduce the impact of street lighting (including downlighting and turning off unnecessary lighting during the night) [County Council/Parish Council]

11.4 Turning to more specific services, the variable quality and timing of verge maintenance within Corfe Castle and Kingston causes ongoing problems and complaints. There appears to be a long chain of command between the County Council Area Highway Office and the subcontracting staff on the ground, and the County Council appears to be finding it difficult to keep track of specific problems on the ground on an ongoing basis. In the past reporting of problems has tended to be rather haphazard, when the Parish Council receives a complaint. The Steering Group feels that a more formalised and regular monitoring and report regime might be an advantage. If this is timed to when the cuts are due to take place, the County Council can receive an immediate and specific response.

Action Point En4 Develop local monitoring and reporting of verge maintenance on behalf of the County Council [Parish Council with volunteers]

---

\(^ {27}\) which is probably the reason why many support it
11.5 Another local problem perceived by many residents is the emptying of litter bins. Whilst this is monitored by the District Council and bins are by and large emptied regularly, there are occasions when some bins get overlooked and overfull; this does cause distress and concern as it is something that a resident may be seeing all day every day until it is emptied. The Steering Group suggests that this problem could be simply resolved by placing a sticker on each bin giving the telephone number at the District Council to enable the situation to be reported. The notice could make clear that problems should be reported only if serious (e.g. completely full or overflowing for more than 24 hours).

**Action**

Point En5 Place a “hotline” number on litter bins for the public to report bins that are full or overflowing and have not been emptied for a while [District Council]


11.6 Another complaint since the kerbside recycling scheme was changed is the increase in plastics at the mini-recycling centres. This problem has been acknowledged by the District Council in general within the District, but no additional containers have as yet been provided at Corfe Castle. Given the interest in recycling by local residents, and the problems continuing over full plastics containers, it would appear that further plastics capacity is needed at the West Street car park mini-recycling centre.

**Action**

Point En6 Additional plastics recycling capacity is required in the West Street car park mini-recycling centre [District Council]


11.7 A great concern of residents is dog fouling, expressed both through the questionnaire survey (where 53% said that more resources should be put into dealing with it, the highest number for any of the options covered in the question) and through complaints to the Parish Council. Especially with the area now designated under the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act, there is a case for a far more widespread coverage of dog bins (for example in the main streets as well as in the amenity areas). More visits by the dog warden, as directed by the Parish Council to serious problem areas, would also be an advantage.

**Action**

Point En7 Dog Fouling:

a) More dog bins are required, over a wider area [Parish Council]

b) More visits by the dog warden, as directed by the Parish Council, would be welcomed [District Council/Parish Council]


11.8 The number and location of public toilets in the Parish are probably adequate. They are, however, a vital part of the tourist infrastructure in what is one of the primary tourist destinations in the County. In this context, the need for the West Street car park toilets to be open for longer periods remains, and is supported by a significant majority of residents (71% agreeing that they should be open daily all year, compared with just 9% disagreeing). The East Street toilets, which were open all year, are currently closed and in need of urgent repair. Given their location and importance as part of the tourist infrastructure, the toilets must not be closed on a permanent basis and efforts should be made to carry out the repairs as soon as possible. In their “pre-closure” state they do not necessarily give a very good impression to visitors, and could benefit from some basic refurbishment within the repair process.

**Action**

Point En8 Public Toilets:

a) Continue to press for longer opening of West Street car park toilets [Parish Council lobbying District Council]

b) Repair and refurbish the East Street toilets as soon as possible [District Council]


---

28 there is, however, regular clearing of items which people have not placed in the containers

29 with the remaining 20% not expressing an opinion
COMMUNICATIONS

12.1 Almost everyone in the Parish receives the Corfe Valley News and the vast majority of residents (90%) say they use it as a source of what is happening in the Parish. For half the population, it is their main source of information. It is clearly a valuable and valued communication source. It is vital that it is maintained, delivered to everyone in the Parish and free at point of delivery if its effectiveness is to be maintained. Whilst there is now an editorial/production team and there are no sign of problems, as a voluntary exercise funded from individual contributions, grants and advertising, it could be vulnerable and would be sorely missed. The community does need to ensure that it keeps going.

Action Point Co1 The Corfe Valley News is a vital communication source and must be maintained, delivered to all in the Parish and free at point of delivery [Corfe Valley News/Parish Council and the community in general]

12.2 The Advertiser was mentioned by almost as many people as an important source of information, though far fewer view it as their main source. Although the Purbeck Gazette was mentioned as a source of information by only half the number that mentioned the Advertiser, this is still a source for a significant number of residents. Given that most residents read the Advertiser and many the Purbeck Gazette, the Steering Group feels that more use could be made of these publications, with more news provided by the Parish Council and other organisations in the Parish. There is also the need to make sure that they are delivered or otherwise available to everyone in the Parish; a survey might be useful.

Action Point Co2 Encourage more use of the Advertiser and Purbeck Gazette to communicate information to residents. Delivery and availability should be monitored [Parish Council/Parish organisations]

12.3 From the questionnaire survey, over 40% of residents use the internet and would find a Corfe Castle community website useful. This could both cover information on the activities of the Parish Council and other organisations and groups in the Parish, and act as a forum for the community to share ideas and generate new initiatives. It could also act as a gateway to other authorities and service providers. The Steering Group has no views as to whether it is better for such a website to be set up and run by the Parish Council or by a voluntary group, but probably in reality a combination of the two would be needed. Equally, the Steering Group has no views as to whether existing national frameworks, such as the Local Channel, or developing a specific tailored website for Corfe Castle would be more appropriate.

Action Point Co3 Consideration should be given to developing a local community website [Parish Council with the community]

12.4 The questionnaire survey responses relating to how difficult it is for people to contact the District and County Councils and whether they get enough information about what the Parish, District and County Councils are doing are probably not sufficiently worrying or significant enough to feature in this Plan. However, the attention of the various Councils is drawn to the survey results. The Parish Council has identified that the noticeboard at Kingston is in a poor state of repair (in its current position it is prone to ongoing damp) and will need replacement, possibly in a new position.

Action Point Co4 Provide a new noticeboard for Kingston [Parish Council]

YOUNG PEOPLE

13.1 The Steering Group found the general attitudes expressed by young people in the survey encouraging and feels that this bodes well for the future of the Parish. Albeit with a small sample, 75% said they felt part of the community, compared with 14% who said they did not. 16 of those answering saw themselves staying in the Parish in the long-term, with a further 7 saying they would like to but didn’t think they would be able to; only 5 said they definitely didn’t wish to stay.
13.2 Throughout the questionnaire survey, whenever the opportunity arose, many residents agreed that more should be done for young people in the Parish. Amongst the young people themselves, the highest dissatisfaction rating regarding existing facilities related to sports facilities, entertainment (including discos and dances) and after school activities. The most popular new facility (supported by 95% of the young people responding, and also mentioned unprompted in the qualitative one-to-one interviews) would be a swimming pool. As already noted, the development of a full-sized pool from scratch might be an over-optimistic aim; however, the possibility of utilising the school swimming pool out-of-hours would certainly be a “halfway house” worth pursuing. As already noted, this would need many issues, including legal, health and safety, security, management and financial, to be resolved to the satisfaction of the School and the County Council, but as previously noted, this has been achieved in the past. It may need a club established to manage the activity and provide the lifeguards (possibly as part of the sports club discussed below). It would, however, appear to be the most popular initiative that could be taken in relation to young people.

**Action**

**Point Yo1** Develop use of school swimming pool out of school time, for children [School Governors/County Council/Youth Club]

13.3 Several of the other suggested facilities and activities, well supported in the survey, could be covered by the setting up of a sports club. To be inclusive, and encourage more exercise by all young people, this should not only cover traditional sports such as football and cricket, but should also include such activities as gymnastics and dance/ballet. The Steering Group feels that the Sports Trust could look to championing this, especially once the sports field development has been implemented. The new pavilion could accommodate some activities, although dance, etc might be better suited to the Village Hall. A range of sports and movement activities would require a range of coaches and teachers; what is not available locally through volunteers (identified via the Volunteer Forum, SM5) would need to be bought in, and a paid co-ordinator might also be needed. The cost of this and any equipment needed could be covered by subscriptions and grants, but conceivably a contribution from the Parish Council raised via the precept would also be appropriate.

**Action**

**Point Yo2** Develop a sports club for youngsters to offer a wide range of sports and “movement-related” activities (e.g. dance) [Sports Trust/County Council Youth Service/County Council Culture and Community Planning Officer]

13.4 15 of the respondents to the youth survey (40%) said they would use skateboard facilities if provided. There have been concerns raised within the community over skateboarding in inappropriate places, especially relating to public liability issues. Following a petition in 2001 the Parish Council did investigate the practicalities of providing some equipment, and some fundraising was carried out by the young people at the time. There remained a number of issues with which the Parish Council had some concern (such as actual demand on an ongoing basis, value-for-money and maintenance) and a final decision was deferred. There clearly remains a demand from a section of the young population and the Parish Council needs to reassess the possibility of providing some small-scale skateboarding facilities of some description.

**Action**

**Point Yo3** The decision whether to proceed with skateboarding facilities in Corfe Castle should be reviewed [Parish Council]

---

30 and popular right across the age and gender range
31 the opportunity to link with Activate, the new agency focussing on dance development in Dorset, is noted
32 taken also to include facilities for other “wheeled sports” such as roller blades, roller skates and BMX
13.5 Whilst the youth shelter on the Middle Halves is useful in its own right, the one-to-one interviews revealed that somewhere indoors for use in the evenings was really wanted. This could also support facilities requested in the questionnaire survey (computer club and coffee bar). Existing buildings (for example, the station) would need to be evaluated for possible venues, or a new development might be needed (for example, extension to the Village Hall). An alternative would be to encourage and support appropriate businesses to open for evening sessions for young people. Even utilising an existing building would probably necessitate some refurbishment/fitting out works, and with the possible staffing implications, a meeting place would not be a minimal cost project. An element of grant funding would be needed. The possibility of locating the “meeting point” within the community resource centre discussed below (CR1) is also a possibility.

Action Point Yo4 Develop an indoor “Meeting Point” for young people, to include facilities such as café and IT facilities [Parish Council/County Council Youth Service/Youth Club]

13.6 A half of the young people responding to the questionnaire said they would use facilities in surrounding towns more if there was a special bus. It is evident from the one-to-one interviews that that such a service has to be cheap, responsive to the youngsters’ needs in terms of times and destinations, and that the youngsters would prefer to travel in company with people that they know. The Youth Club uses Minnie the Bus for occasional outings and the Steering Group feels that this is a local resource that could be much better utilised in this respect, with demand responsive regular trips to surrounding facilities. The legal obstacles that might prevent Minnie’s use in this manner need to be investigated, and cleared if they present a problem. Finance would also be an issue - the Steering Group feel that the service would ideally be free, or at the very least very heavily subsidised. Given the doubts over a general dial-a-ride service mentioned earlier, this could be a possible project for the Parish Transport Grant.

Action Point Yo5 Make more positive use of Minnie to provide a demand responsive regular service for young people to surrounding facilities. This requires legal and other potential obstacles to be investigated and funding sought to enable free use [Corfe Castle Community Bus]

13.7 Throughout the research with young people there is a general feeling evident that they would like to be included more in decision making in the Parish. Despite current comments regarding the youth shelter, the Parish Council did spend some time with the youth club at the time and this did appear to be useful. An ongoing liaison between the Parish Council and the youth club, with regular visits in both directions, might be useful. A Youth Council will only succeed if there is the demand and support from the young people themselves. This is something the youth club might like to look at.

Action Point Yo6 Improve liaison between the youth club and Parish Council through regular meetings [Parish Council/Youth Club]. Explore the demand and support for a Youth Council amongst the young people of Corfe Castle [Youth Club]
COMMUNITY SUPPORT

14.1 In addition to the specific connections between various Action Points noted throughout the Plan (and summarised in the Action Plan on pages 9-14) there are several action points which arise out of the Plan and which cut across and do not naturally fall under any of the topics.

14.2 At several points the Plan has identified the advantage in providing a range of facilities that could be brought together in a meeting room or building, in the role of a “community resource centre”. This could include a youth drop-in centre, facilities for training courses and adult education, a tourist information point and fast food facility. It could also be envisaged as an information point for council services. Finding the right building would not be easy, and the scope for developing a new one would be limited, though not impossible, in relation to availability of sites. Finance would also be an issue. This is likely to be a long-term ambition. In the meantime, it is easier to envisage a “virtual” community resource centre utilising the various venues already existing and planned. It just needs pulling together and co-ordinating; including resolving any physical or management barriers to wider usage at particular venues. These venues include the Village Hall, the Town Hall, the School, and the Pavilion (when built), but other rooms and buildings might also be suitable if available. Without prejudice to their existing use and ownership, examples of where lateral thinking could identify potential resources include the Fudge Shop and the telephone exchange. There is also the opportunity, should the Nursery School not need the site to the rear of West Street, to take advantage of the planning use already established for the site of community use.

Action Point CR1 Investigate the possibilities and practicalities of developing a Community Resource Centre to offer a range of facilities, either as a standalone venue or as a “virtual” centre using existing venues [Parish Council/Village Hall Committee/Town Trust]

14.3 Similarly, several action points in the Plan refer to the need for a co-ordinator or other staff resource. Putting these together, there is probably sufficient work involved to warrant a paid position, certainly on a part time basis. In terms of time, pay and experience, the Parish Council or Clerk to the Charity is a useful benchmark. There would certainly be no greater time, pay or experience needed than these sorts of positions, and there is every possibility it could appeal to an existing resident. Once again, this would provide (in a very small way) an additional employment opportunity for a local.

Action Point CR2 Investigate the practicalities of employing a Community Worker (preferably from the local population) to help with the “staffing” implications of the Parish Plan Action Plan [Parish Council/DCA]

14.4 The Parish Plan has identified in several topic areas the need for more volunteers so that existing community services can be maintained and enhanced, and new services considered. It seems to the Steering Group that a “clearing house system” might help volunteers come forward and be matched with needs. This could take the form of a Parish Volunteer Forum and would probably require a Co-ordinator, who might need paying on a part-time basis. This could be one of the roles of the Community Worker identified in CR2.

Action Point CR3 There is a need for a Parish Volunteer Forum and Co-ordinator to encourage volunteer activity (of all sorts) and match volunteers to needs [Parish Council with assistance of VOLNET]

14.5 Although the final action point does not sit precisely within this section, neither does it sit well anywhere else. The Town Hall is suffering from damp and structural problems and is in need of restoration, estimated to cost £100,000. Restored and refurbished, it could provide a more useable venue for several of the activities mentioned in the Plan, such as for courses and tourist information, as part of the “virtual” Community Resource Centre. The Town Trust is actively engaged in fundraising and this project should be supported.

Action Point CR4 Restore and refurbish the Town Hall [Town Trust]

33 and perhaps on a grander scale, a Parish Council office
APPENDIX 1: A PARISH AUDIT - FACTS AND FIGURES

A note about Ward data: Most statistics, other than those from the Census, are only available at ward level. However, due to a boundary change the ward covers a different area depending on the date of the data. In the case of recent data [referred to as Castle Ward (NEW)], Castle Ward comprises just Corfe Castle Parish and Studland Parish but for earlier data [referred to as Castle Ward (OLD)] Arne Parish was included in the ward. For a rough approximation for Corfe Castle Parish, Castle Ward (NEW) figures should be reduced by a quarter and Castle Ward (OLD) figures by a half.

History
The Parish has a history of occupation since prehistoric times and several significant Roman sites have been found in the area. Corfe Castle has been a site of fortification for over 1,000 years, and it was here that King Edward the Martyr was killed. The castle built by the Normans was developed over the centuries as a royal castle, finally being blown up by Act of Parliament after the Civil War. Corfe Castle was granted borough status by Elizabeth I and as a classic “rotten” or “pocket” borough returned two MPs to Parliament from 1572 to 1832. The Parish has seen much mineral extraction over the centuries, Purbeck stone and marble, ball clay and in modern times oil and gas. Farming has always been a significant influence on the area (though not so much today in employment terms), but perhaps the biggest change in recent years has been the growth in tourism.

Local Government reorganisation in the 1880s saw the loss of mayor and corporation. The Town Trust was set up to care for the corporation’s assets. It was at this time that the civil parish of Corfe Castle and the parish council were created.

Corfe Castle has been a significant settlement for centuries. Even in 1790, William Morton Pitt’s private census recorded a population of 1,239, but far fewer dwellings than the present. Despite a fair amount of development (principally in Corfe Castle village itself) the population of the Parish remained relatively constant during the twentieth century. From 1,400 in 1921 the population declined a little to 1,290 in 1971 but has since returned to the earlier level.

Geography
Lying in the centre of the Isle of Purbeck, the Parish of Corfe Castle is “somewhat long and thin”, stretching from Poole Harbour (including all the islands except Brownsea) in the north east to the south coast in the south west [see map on page 2]. The parish, at 3,745 hectares, is the largest in the district.

Approximately two-thirds of the population live in Corfe Castle, which lies in the centre of the Parish and is a local service centre for the parish and surrounding areas. The remaining population is centred on Kingston, Norden, Bushey, Rempstone and Underhill (Woolgarston etc).

The A351 passes through Corfe Castle, leading to the towns of Wareham to the north west and Swanage to the south east (both 5 miles). Poole, at 14 miles distant, is the nearest large town. The County town of Dorchester lies some 20 miles to the west.

People
Total population: 1,429 Total Households: 637 (source: 2001 Census)

Population distribution within parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corfe Castle</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Street etc</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square, West St etc</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norden</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushey/Rempstone</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 and export, for example via the quay at Ower.
35 source: DCC website, Facts and Figures
36 proportions estimated from the electoral register, adjusted to the total census figure for parish
### Age Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-17</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved into parish during year</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved within parish during year</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved out of parish during year</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No usual address one year ago</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Containing Pensioners only</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Lone Pensioner</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Lone Parent with two or more dependent children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Births and Deaths (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Births to Castle residents</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Deaths of Castle residents</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crude Birth Rate (per 1000 people at 2001)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crude Death Rate (per 1000 people at 2001)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source
- Births and Deaths: Vital Statistics Outputs Branch, Office for National Statistics (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)

---

37 People whose address was different 1 year before the Census
## The Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity of residents</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employees</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employees</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other economically inactive</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of Employment of residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Employment</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/hunting/forestry; fishing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining/quarrying</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities; Construction; Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/retail trade/motor repair</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and catering</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial; Real estate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration; Education</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social work</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Grade of residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Grade of residents</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB Higher and intermediate managerial/administrative/professional</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Supervisory; clerical; junior managerial/administrative/professional</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Skilled manual workers</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E On state benefit; unemployed; lowest grade workers</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distance to work for residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to work for residents</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works mainly at or from home</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2km</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2km to less than 5km</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5km to less than 10km</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10km to less than 30km</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30km to less than 60km</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60km and over</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fixed place/outside UK/offshore</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents working (wherever they work)</th>
<th>511</th>
<th>excluding people who work mainly at or from home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People working in Parish (wherever they live)</td>
<td>540*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*380 of these are recorded working outside Corfe Castle village - many of these will have been employed at Wytch Farm

**source:** 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)

### Pay:
The Steering Group has been advised that the figures on wages quoted in the draft Plan are based only on a few samples and statistically invalid at district or ward level and must not be published. Nevertheless, it is clear that wage levels for local residents are as low as and probably lower than Purbeck as a whole, which in itself has low wage levels. The Office for National Statistics has produced experimental estimates of average income for wards, based on modelling the relationships between income and data from the census and other administrative sources. This modelling suggests that Castle Ward (OLD) lies well within the bottom half of wards in Purbeck, both in terms of average gross household income and in terms of average net household income after housing costs have been taken out and adjustments have been made to neutralise the effects of different household sizes and composition in each ward.

---

38 looking after home/family, permanently sick/disabled and other

39 Other includes; other community; social and personal service activities; private households with employed persons and extra-territorial organisations and bodies

40 available from the New Earnings Survey via the NOMIS website

41 i.e. Corfe Castle, Arne and Studland
Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Castle Ward (OLD)</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unemployment (September 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Castle Ward (NEW)</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People unemployed</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Male</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*all were aged 25-49 and had been unemployed for less than 6 months

source: Jobseeker’s Allowance claimant count, Office for National Statistics (via NOMIS website)

Employment Locations within the Parish

Apart from BP at Wytch Farm, there are no major employers in the Parish; even there, there are few opportunities for local employment with redundancies in recent years (and since the Census figure quoted above); BP has however consolidated its former Holton Heath activities onto the Wytch Farm site. There are a number of shops and small businesses in Corfe Castle village providing some jobs, many of which are tourism related. A redevelopment of redundant farm buildings at Rempstone into 10 small units in 2000, according to the District Council, “currently provides employment for about 25 local people, with several businesses employing several people; one company employs 8 people and is looking to acquire significantly larger premises.” The District Council goes on to note that “the site has been 100% occupied since soon after completion and there remains a waiting list of potential occupiers”.

Businesses registered for VAT (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Castle Ward (NEW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>20 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>10 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>5 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>10 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels &amp; Catering</td>
<td>15 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>20 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>5 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin &amp; Other Services</td>
<td>10 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Castle Ward (NEW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with 0-4 employees</td>
<td>85 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 5-9 employees</td>
<td>10 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 10-19 employees</td>
<td>5 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 20 or more employees</td>
<td>5 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: Inter-Departmental Business Register, ONS (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)

42 VAT registered enterprises. Below the VAT registration threshold (£58,000 as at 1 April 2004) enterprises are included only if they have chosen to register voluntarily or not to de-register.

43 though the Steering Group notes that it is unclear how many of these are residents of Corfe Castle parish.
Education

**Schools:** Corfe Castle Voluntary Community Nursery (currently in temporary accommodation)
Corfe Castle C of E VC First School (4-9 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Spare places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DCC Education website*

**University applicants:** from Castle Ward (OLD) who were successful (1998): 15
*Source: Oxford University; UCAS (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications 44 (people aged 16-74)</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (eg 1 O level)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (eg 5+ O levels)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (eg 2+ A levels)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 4/5 (degree/professional)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)*

Housing

**Total Dwellings:** 701 (source: 2001 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned with mortgage</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of those owned that are owned</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Rented 45</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rented</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which rented from employer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living rent free</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)*

44 No Qualifications : No academic, vocational or professional qualifications.
Level 1: 1+ ‘O’ level passes, 1+CSE/GCSE any grades. NVQ level 1, Foundation GNVQ
Level 2: 5+ ‘O’ level passes, 5+CSEs (grade 1). 5+GCSEs (grades A-C), School Certificate, 1+’A’ levels/AS levels, NVQ level 2, Intermediate GNVQ
Level 3: 2+’A’ levels, 4+ AS levels, Higher School certificate, NVQ level 3, Advanced GNVQ
Level 4/5: First degree, Higher degree, NVQ levels 4 and 5, HNC, HND, Qualified Teacher status, Qualified Medical Doctor, Qualified Dentist, Qualified Nurse, Midwife, Health Visitor
Other qualifications/level unknown: Other qualifications (e.g. City and Guilds, RSA/OCR, BTEC/Edexcel), Other Professional Qualifications.
45 Local Authority, Housing Association, etc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Homes (December 2003)</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Properties at 50% Council Tax</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*source: Purbeck District Council*

(Figures available from the Census are not directly comparable as the judgement whether to classify a dwelling as a second home was left to the census enumerator, which resulted in a general underestimation. It would appear from these census figures, however, that the incidence of second homes in the Parish is at least twice that for the County as a whole and three times that for the Region.)*

**Rented Housing Providers**

- Purbeck District Council (transferred to Purbeck Housing Trust) - Halves Cottages, Webbers Close, Springwell Close (elderly sheltered)
- Corfe Castle Charity - Abbots Cottages (general housing), Uvedale Court and Jubilee House/St Edwards Close (elderly sheltered/almshouses)
- Knightstone Housing Association - Hollands Close
- Raglan Housing Association - rear of 52/56 West Street UNDER CONSTRUCTION
- National Trust - various in Corfe Castle
- Bond Estate - various in Corfe Castle
- Encombe Estate - various in Kingston
- Rempstone Estate - various in Rempstone/Bushey

**House sales (2002)**

- Total number of sales in year: 29
- Sales as % of all privately owned dwellings: 4.5% 6.9% 8.5%
- Average Price: £327,741  £173,221  £144,935
- Price: Lower Quartile: £164,050  £112,850  £88,000
- Price: Upper Quartile: £402,750  £205,000  £173,000
- Cash sales as % of all sales: 72% 40% 28%

*source: Land Registry (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)*

**Property Values: Council Tax Bands (2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Castle Ward (NEW)</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>62 3.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>55 3.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>232 14.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>379 24.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>319 20.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>306 19.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>203 12.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>20 1.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*source: Valuation Office Agency (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)*

---

46 only main locations for each provider mentioned

47 A transaction occurs when a change of freeholder or leaseholder takes place regardless of the amount of money involved, even if the property is given away. The Land Registry records the actual price for which the property changed hands but “non-market” transactions, for example transfers within a family at non-market valuation or with right-to-buy discounts, are excluded from these figures, which are therefore considered to be a good reflection of market values.

48 i.e. a quarter of the prices were lower than this amount

49 i.e. a quarter of the prices were higher than this amount
**Housing Need**

The Parish Housing Needs Register is maintained by the Parish Council and the Corfe Castle Charity. People can ask for their details to be added at any time, and every two years or so a full up dating exercise is carried out, which usually results in some entries being removed due to non-response or notification that the individual no longer wishes to be on the register. The last detailed analysis of the register was undertaken at the start of 2003 (to support the Raglan planning application), from which the information below has been taken.

There were a total of 46 entries on the register (couples and families count as one entry), of which 33 were also on the PDC Housing Register. 15 were in severe need (e.g. homeless/no permanent accommodation/notice to quit/couples living apart), a further 14 had a very strong need. 13 had both a severe need and had links with the parish of at least 50 years. 18 had been looking for accommodation for 5 years or over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms needed</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 beds</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more beds</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Household types**

| Family (couple plus children) | 17 |
| Single parent family          | 7  |
| Couple (of child bearing age) | 3  |
| Couple (older)                | 5  |
| Single                        | 14 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Link with Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several Generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family link with Parish*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* but link with surrounding parishes

**Social Need/Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Types</th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Containing Pensioners only</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Lone Parent</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Lone Parent with two or more dependent children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All one-person households</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Long-term illness/disability*60     |                    |
| Persons with a long-term limiting illness | 287                  | 20.1%            | 18.6%         | 19.2%            | 18.1%            |
| of which over retirement age        | 203                 | 52.5%            | 53.4%         | 51.9%            | 56.5%            |

*60 A self assessment of whether or not a person has a limiting long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits their daily activities or the work they can do, including problems that are due to old age.

Source: 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)
Corfe Castle Parish Plan

Provision of unpaid care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents who provide unpaid care</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19 hours a week</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49 hours a week</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ hours a week</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons providing unpaid care as % of total household population</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons providing unpaid care for every person with long-term illness</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Castle Ward (OLD)</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With good health</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With fairly good health</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not good health</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits Claimants (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Castle Ward (OLD)</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Allowance Claimants</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Higher Rate Claimants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Lower Rate Claimants</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Living Allowance Claimants</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Care Component Claimants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which Mobility Component Claimants</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacity Benefit Claimants</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Disablement Allowance Claimants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Support Claimants</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% figures are claimants a % of total population

Numbers are rounded to the nearest 5 by the data provider - therefore figures are indicative only.

source: Department for Work and Pensions (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)

Deprivation: The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister commissioned the Social Disadvantage Research Centre at the University of Oxford to produce a new “Index of Multiple Deprivation” for 2004, based on a variety of different indicators. Castle Ward (NEW) lies almost exactly in the middle of the 247 areas in Dorset (generally wards in rural areas but smaller areas in towns). Although, statistically, the Parish may not score especially highly on the deprivation index, as with all areas there are pockets of individual “hidden” deprivation, as the casework from the Corfe Castle Charity or Purbeck Citizens Advice Bureau would indicate.

51 Looking after; giving help or support to family members; friends; neighbours or others because of long-term physical or mental ill-health or disability or problems relating to old age.
52 A self-assessment of a person’s general health over the 12 months before the Census.
53 Attendance Allowance is a benefit for people aged 65 or over only who need help with personal care because of illness or disability. For example, a person may qualify if they have difficulty with washing, dressing or similar tasks. The benefit is not income related and has two payment levels. Those requiring help both during the day and night, or who are terminally ill, are eligible for a higher rate, otherwise recipients are provided with the lower level of benefit.
54 Disability Living Allowance is payable to people who are disabled and need help with personal care, getting around, or both. The two components, care and mobility, can be paid separately or together depending on the needs of the individual.
55 Incapacity Benefit is paid to people who are assessed as being incapable of work and who meet the appropriate contribution conditions.
56 Severe Disablement Allowance (now abolished for new claimants) is paid to those who cannot work because of a severe illness or disability but do not satisfy the contribution conditions for Incapacity Benefit.
57 Income Support can be paid to a person aged 16 or over who is not working 16 hours or more a week and has less money coming in than the law says they need to live on. In general it is only available to people who are not required to be available for work (for unemployed people Jobseeker’s Allowance is applicable).
58 income, employment, health and disability, education, skills and training, barriers to housing and services, crime and the living environment.
Facilities

(all in Corfe Castle unless specified)

Farm shop/nursery (Norden)

Pubs: Four (Corfe Castle), one (Kingston)

Cafes/Tearooms: Three

Churches: St Edwards (Corfe Castle), Evangelical Congregational (Corfe Castle), St James (Kingston)

Other: Surgery, Library, First School, Nursery School, sports field, playground

Venues and meeting rooms available to residents: Village Hall, Town Hall, Station, Robing Room,
School Hall, Royal British Legion

Community/Parish Magazines: Corfe Valley News (mainly covers all Parish except Kingston, although it is
delivered there), The Dubber (Kingston)

Local Organisations and Activities

Trusts

Corfe Castle Charity: Financial assistance to individuals and organisations within Parish. Social housing provider.

Town Trust: Town Hall (including museum) and other old Borough property

Sports Trust: Development and operation of sports facilities on sports field

God's Acre: Cemetery

Other Organisations

Corfe Castle Chamber of Trade and Commerce

Corfe Castle Festivities Committee: Christmas lights, entertainments, senior citizens and children's parties

Common Management Committee: use (including grazing) of Corfe Common

Twinning Association: Corfe Castle village is twinned with Pont Hébert in France

Probus Club: retired professional and business men

Women's Institute

Royal British Legion Club

Meals on Wheels

Activities (generally weekly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Club</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Guides</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownies</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Act: drama</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent &amp; Child Group</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool Workshop</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Mat Bowls</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>Village Hall &amp; RBL Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Club</td>
<td>Sports Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td>Sports Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boules</td>
<td>RBL Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Club</td>
<td>RBL Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dance</td>
<td>Village Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee mornings various</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Ringers: bellringing</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various activities, including</td>
<td>Congregational Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameo children’s club, Bright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour, coffee morning, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various activities, including</td>
<td>Springwell Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; crafts, coffee morning, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Land Holdings**

**National Trust:** land and property in and around Corfe Castle village, including the Castle, Corfe Common, parts of Middle and West Halves, West Hill, Hartland

**Bond Estate:** land and property in Corfe Castle

**Rempstone Estate:** land and property in east, generally from Poole Harbour to Purbeck Ridge

**Encombe Estate:** land and property in and around Kingston

**Corfe Castle Charity:** land and property in and around Corfe Castle

Much of the land outside the villages is managed as small, family-run and most usually tenanted farms

---

**Traffic**

**Annual Average Daily Flows (AADF) for count points in the vicinity of Corfe Castle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Road No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1983</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A351</td>
<td>Stoborough</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>A351</td>
<td>East of Corfe Castle</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>B3351</td>
<td>Rempstone</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*source: DCC Local Transport Plan Statistics 2000 & 2001*

Using the above data, the Parish Council (for its evidence to the Purbeck Local Plan Inquiry) estimated that the AADF on East Street, Corfe Castle would be in the region of 10,000 vehicles, of which approximately 80% would be through traffic. A survey carried out by the Corfe Castle Society in June 1998 gave a figure of 10,457 vehicles in East Street for a 15 hour period.

August figures at the A351 count points are almost 50% higher than the annual averages quoted in the table.

**Daily Goods Vehicles in Corfe Castle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>over 3.5 tonnes</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which over 7.5 tonnes</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which over 17 tonnes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*source: DCC Local Transport Plan Statistics 2001*

Information collected from one day manual counts between 1999 and 2002. All flows are 16 hour Weekday Values

---

**Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corfe Castle Parish</th>
<th>Purbeck District</th>
<th>Dorset County</th>
<th>South West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with no car</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one car</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with two or more cars</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*source: 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics (via Neighbourhood Statistics website)*

---

**Public Transport**

**Bus:** 142/143/144 Poole-Swanage. Approx 1 hourly via Corfe Castle, approx 2 hourly via Kingston, 7 days a week.

Weekdays first bus arrives Swanage 0825, Poole 0740, last bus leaves Swanage 1815 (2235 Fridays/Saturdays) Poole 1820 (2245 Fridays/Saturdays)

X52 Swanage-Weymouth via Corfe Castle. Twice daily, morning and evening, weekdays during Weymouth College termtime.

275 Linkrider via Corfe Castle to Wareham. Once on Thursday mornings

29A Leisure Bus via Corfe Castle to Wareham. Once on Thursday evenings (being withdrawn)

**Train:** Swanage Railway, Swanage-Norden via Corfe Castle. Reduced price tickets available with residents’ card and on evening diesel services.

**Community mini-bus:** “Minnie” the bus, donated by BP, available for hire by parish organisations, groups and individuals.
**Car Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>nominal capacity</th>
<th>ownership</th>
<th>parking fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norden Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>PDC (managed by Swanage Railway)</td>
<td>Free - donation suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle View</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Street, Corfe Castle</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>PDC</td>
<td>Pay and Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walkers car parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>approx 5 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill Lane, Encombe, Brenscombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents Car Parking at Station Road and West Street, Corfe Castle

**Tourism**

The Corfe Castle area is a significant tourist destination, with an estimated 500,000 visitors a year (source: “Keeping Purbeck Special” A Strategy for the Purbeck Heritage Area June 1995).

**Attractions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>02/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>153,484</td>
<td>163,618</td>
<td>144,543</td>
<td>153,511</td>
<td>166,094</td>
<td>178,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per annum: 50,000-60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanage Railway</td>
<td>147,243</td>
<td>152,306</td>
<td>168,082</td>
<td>180,911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenscombe Outdoor Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon Rides, Bushey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pay and Display tickets issued at West Street Car Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apr-Jun</th>
<th>Jul-Sept</th>
<th>Oct-Jan</th>
<th>Jan-Mar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>36,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* assumes 4,000 Jan-Mar

**Overnight Accommodation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>approx capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Pubs</td>
<td>77 bedspaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed &amp; Breakfast</td>
<td>68 bedspaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>450 pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Catering</td>
<td>210 bedspaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* sites included: Glebe, Norden Farm, Cats Eye, Woodyhyde, Burnbake - although some of these are technically outside the Parish they are literally on the parish boundary and have therefore been included

**Crime**

Although there are no reliable crime figures available for the Parish, local crime rates are low and of the less serious or violent kind. There is very little house burglary, though theft from outbuildings has been a little more frequent (though still no doubt low compared with other parts of the country). Petty vandalism and general anti-social behaviour is in evidence on occasions and tends to be connected with the presence of particular individuals in the area. Farms occasionally have barns broken into and generally on rural holdings some trespass and poaching takes place. Damage and theft from cars is occasionally reported. Speeding and dangerous driving through Corfe Castle and at Norden is a concern. There have been isolated incidents of drug dealing reported.
Development

The District Local Plan designates Corfe Castle village a “large settlement” and Kingston a “small settlement”, in which development will be permitted (limited infilling in the case of Kingston). The settlement boundaries are, however, drawn tightly and there is very little scope for further development. Existing development in Corfe Castle is either the historic core (tightly developed, mostly listed buildings, historic plot characteristics) or more modern largely twentieth century development (in some cases a perhaps uninspiring layout but physically sound buildings with high market value - little redevelopment or infill potential). What infill and redevelopment opportunities exist have largely already been taken up. All other parts of the Parish are designated “countryside areas”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Completions and Outstanding Permissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfe Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: DCC website, Facts and Figures

Nature/Landscape

The whole of the Parish lies within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Parts of the Parish, including Poole Harbour, Corfe Common, the southern coastline and much of the heathland are designated SSSI and in some cases Internationally Important Sites (Ramsar, SAC, SPA). The southern coastline forms part of the World Heritage Coast.

There are no nature reserves as such in the Parish, but there are a range of important habitats throughout the Parish, as identified in the Purbeck Biodiversity Action Plan.

The landscape of the Parish varies considerably. Very broadly moving north east to south west:

**Poole Harbour and the heathland:** The heathland landscapes are carpeted by dense tracts of heather on undulating, lowland terrain, interspersed with occasional stunted pines and gorse bushes. This habitat provides a rich blend of colours and textures, and the open, windswept appearance gives a feeling of remoteness. The open, expansive nature of the landscape allows long views across the terrain. The occasional Scots pine provides a dramatic silhouette and makes a valuable contribution to the visual character of the landscape. The open views have been curtailed where the heathland is fragmented or enclosed by scrub and/or woodland. The margins of the heathland generally give way to pastures fields and patches of birch and pine woodlands. Stronger contrasts exist where the heathland is bordered by conifer plantations, and the contrasting nature of this dense, dark backdrop to otherwise open views can have a dramatic visual impact. The extensive stands of conifers form a bold and prominent landscape feature. They provide a dense, solid backdrop to views throughout the Poole Basin, and help camouflage many areas of potentially unsightly development, such as the Wytch Farm oil wells.

**Purbeck Chalk Ridge:** The landscape of the ridge is exposed, comprising open chalk grassland, interspersed with patches of scrub on the slopes where the grazing regime has broken down. The smooth, convex curves are typical of chalk upland relief. The skyline is uninterrupted by development or trees and there are no settlements on the chalk ridge or its steeper slopes. Lower down the southern slopes the landscape form changes abruptly to a patchwork of fields. On the steep, northern slopes the chalk grassland gives way to extensive broad-leaved woodlands, which provide a visually prominent backdrop for views from the lowlands of Poole Basin, and then a narrow strip of farmland at the foot of the ridge before the landscape gives way to the extensive areas of heathland.

**Corfe Valley:** The domestic scale and intimacy of the landscape gives a peaceful, unspoilt, and deeply rural impression. The landscape is dominated by a patchwork of predominantly pastoral fields, framed by hedgerows which are often interspersed by dense belts of hedgerow trees and small, irregular mixed woodlands. In the valley bottom the fields are small in scale, becoming larger on the lower slopes of the limestone plateau where the hedgerows tend to cut across the contours, giving way to stone walls on the
upper slopes of the plateau. The eastern half of the valley is broken up by minor ridges and valleys, the latter containing numerous hedgerows, trees and small copses. The undulating valley floor contains many tiny farmsteads, hidden in shallow hollows, and villages largely concentrated in a narrow band along the foot of the chalk ridge.

**Corfe Common:** a large, isolated area of undeveloped acidic grassland stands apart in the local landscape. Here the terrain is hummocky and uneven, and the vegetation consists primarily of bramble, gorse and rough grazing, and also supports exceptional wild flowers. The Common is historically linked to, and helps form the setting of, the village of Corfe Castle.

**Purbeck Limestone Plateau:** There is a broad transition between the clay vale of the Corfe Valley to the south, and the limestone plateau. The plateau itself has a very flat landform, before plummeting to the sea on its southernmost edge. There are a number of deep, narrow valleys that run towards the coast around Worth Matravers. The limestone plateau has a distinctive, rather bleak, landscape marked with small, limestone quarries and stark stone villages. It is very exposed and windswept, with virtually no trees or woodlands except in the deep clefts of the coastal valleys. The Encombe “bowl” gives way to the coast at Houns Tout, Chapmans Pool and Swyre Head.

source: *Dorset County Landscape Assessment, commissioned by the Countryside Commission, DCC and PDC, and produced by Landscape Design Associates in 1996, as reproduced in PDC District Local Plan*

### Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled Ancient Monuments</th>
<th>grid reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rempstone stone circle</td>
<td>SY 994 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of round barrows on Nine Barrow Down</td>
<td>SY 997 816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down Romano-British farm</td>
<td>SY 957 780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow 360m south of Afflington Barn</td>
<td>SY 969 788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow 910m south east of Kingston Barn</td>
<td>SY 967 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round barrow 450m north of Afflington Farm</td>
<td>SY 972 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman site north of Brenscombe Farm</td>
<td>SY 978 827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round barrow on Brenscombe Heath</td>
<td>SY 986 836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfe Castle: a large enclosure castle and 18th century Vineyard Bridge</td>
<td>SY 9594 8226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl barrow 470m WNW of Peaked Close House</td>
<td>SY 9631 8089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of four bowl barrows 250m WNW of Peaked Close House</td>
<td>SY 9654 8084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl barrow 650m WNW of Peaked Close House</td>
<td>SY 9612 8090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl barrow 850m WNW of Peaked Close House</td>
<td>SY 9594 8092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl barrow 900m WNW of Peaked Close Copse</td>
<td>SY 9590 8089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl barrow 930m WNW of Peaked Close House</td>
<td>SY 9587 8098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl barrow 1,120m WNW of Peaked Close House</td>
<td>SY 9566 8097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rings: a ringwork and bailey and a Civil War battery 400m south west of Corfe Castle</td>
<td>SY 9562 8197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of three bowl barrows on West Hill</td>
<td>SY 9543 8236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharford Bridge (on boundary with Arne)</td>
<td>SY 967 848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: *PDC District Local Plan Appendix*

There are additionally 98 unscheduled ancient monuments listed on the County Sites and Monuments Record, including pre-historic, Roman and mediaeval sites. Of particular note are the roman villa at Bucknowle and the mediaeval new town at Newton.

### Listed Buildings

**Grade I:** Castle, St James

**Grade II**: Mortons House Hotel, Encombe House, Scoles Farm House, St Edwards, the Town House, the Town Hall, Furzemans House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of Grade II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Street, Corfe Castle: 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Street, Corfe Castle: 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Square, Corfe Castle: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere: 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Grade II: 193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: THE SURVEY OF RESIDENTS

Bournemouth University have published the full analysis of the survey in a separate report. The following is a summary of the findings from the questionnaires.

The main survey had 505 responses, representing a 43% response rate. There is some bias in the responses in relation to age (over 45s are overrepresented and under 45s underrepresented) and in relation to tenure (owner occupiers are overrepresented and other tenures underrepresented). The geographical spread of responses, however, was very representative of the actual situation. Bournemouth University conclude that: “Whilst there are differences in over and under representation of certain sub groups, it is reasonable to claim that in general the 505 people responding to the survey are in many respects quite representative of the general population of Corfe Castle Parish. This enables any action undertaken as a result of the consultation exercise to be carried out with even more confidence that it represents the views of local residents.”

The number of people who answered each question varied and not all questions were answered by all 505 respondents. Where percentages are quoted these refer to the percentage of those answering that particular question.

Living in Corfe Castle Parish

The respondents were asked how long they, or their families, had lived in the Parish, the most common answer being 1-10 years (31.4%), followed closely by 11-25 years (30.0%). 12.3% had family who had lived here for generations.

With regard to the quality of life in the parish compared with 10 years ago:
- 139 (28.8%) felt “it’s better in some ways but worse in others”
- 116 (24%) felt “it’s the same”
- 105 (21.7%) felt “it’s worse”
- 15 (3.1%) felt “it’s better”
- 108 (22.4%) were not sure

There was a tendency for those aged over 60 to feel “it’s worse” but not a large majority. There was certainly a significant association with those who have lived in Corfe Castle Parish longer feeling that the quality of life is worse than it was 10 years ago.

The three best things about living in the parish:
- The countryside/environment - 134 responses
- The ambience/atmosphere/people - 76 responses
- The community spirit - 59 responses

The three worst things about living in the parish:
- Tourism/Visitors - 176 responses
- Traffic - 122 responses
- Poor public transport - 25 responses

When asked how strongly they feel that their area is part of Corfe Castle Parish:
- 218 (46.1%) felt “very strongly”
- 145 (30.7%) felt “strongly”
- 52 (11%) felt “not very strongly”
- 23 (4.9%) responded “not at all”

Those least likely to feel part of Corfe Castle Parish were those living in Kingston and the Underhill area, whilst those most likely to feel part of Corfe Castle Parish were those living in Corfe Castle village.

Knowing what is going on in Corfe Castle Parish

The Corfe Valley News is a very informative means of communication with 485 (96.8%) confirming that they receive it every month and 454 (89.9%) stating that they use it to find out what is going on in the parish. For 233 (50.4%) respondents it is the main source of such information. Other leading sources of information are:
- Word of mouth - 105 (22.7%) respondents
- The Advertiser - 43 (9.3%) respondents

A large majority (71.5%) of respondents stated that they receive enough information about what the Parish Council is doing. The main suggestions for improvement were:
- Publish a newsletter - 18 suggestions
- More information in Corfe Castle Valley News - 15 suggestions
- More information in other ways - 13 suggestions
Feelings were mixed regarding the District and County Councils with 218 (49.7%) believing that there is enough information available about what each council does compared with 221 (50.3%) who do not. Those who have contacted these two councils, in the main, have had a positive experience with 258 (74.1%) and 158 (56.6%) finding it either “very easy” or “easy” to contact the councils respectively.

As well as 215 (43.7%) using the Internet, 224 respondents also agreed that they would find a Corfe Castle community website useful.

**Housing**

Opinion was divided regarding where new housing should be built with “redevelopment of old property” (59.2%) and “limited development confined to built up areas of Corfe Castle and Kingston” (55.8%) most popular. 25.1% support “new development although it may mean building outside the village boundaries”. A minority of residents (18.6%) prefer no new housing development with a slight tendency for more recent residents to be against further housing development. For those supporting housing development, the most supported proposal by 365 (72.3%) respondents was for “affordable houses for local people to own”. This support was consistent irrespective of where people live in Corfe Castle Parish. The next most supported option was housing association development (36.7%), closely followed by private owner occupied housing (34.6%).

The need for alternative accommodation was relatively low proportionately, though still significant numerically, with 21 (4.3%) stating “yes now” and 76 (15.7%) stating “possibly within the next 5 years.” For those unable to move to the type of accommodation needed, the main reason given were “price” (16.4%) and “lack of suitable homes to buy” (9.5%). Interestingly a small minority (5.7%) identify the problem as “lack of suitable homes to rent” and 22 (4.4%) identify the reason “unable to afford the cost of moving.”

**Employment**

The most popular suggestions for additional employment opportunities were in the fields of:
- Agriculture / horticulture/conservation - 305 responses (60.4%)
- Light industry - 178 responses (35.2%)
- Tourism - 173 responses (34.3%)

It was also considered that there is a shortage locally of full time employment for school leavers and adults (44.8% and 41.6% agreeing respectively).

The main barriers to taking up training or employment (for those seeking work) were “transport”, “lack of information on job opportunities” and “the cost/lack of child care.” It should be noted that with many residents (235) among the survey having retired there was a relatively small number of unemployed (4). However, besides these, there were others (e.g. unwaged housewife/husband), as well as those who were currently employed on a part time basis, whose employment situation would be improved by better childcare facilities either in the community or in the workplace. With specific reference to childcare facilities the most popular proposals supported were for:
- pre-school children weekdays - 44 responses (8.7%)
- school pupils during school holidays - 44 responses (8.7%)
- school pupils after school - 42 responses (8.3%)

As one would imagine, the majority of respondents were female, thus confirming the need for improved childcare as a means of facilitating employment for women in the area.

**Shopping**

The vast majority of respondents (431 = 90.2%) do their main food shopping other than in Corfe Castle. The situation was somewhat reversed in terms of “top up” food shopping with 326 (72.4%) doing this in the parish. Those who do shop in Corfe Castle were more likely to be older residents aged 60 and over and those without a car of their own.

Considerable use is made of the Post Office in Corfe Castle with 401 (83.9%) making regular use of it. This was particularly true of those aged 45 and over.

Again, with regard to banking, the situation was reversed with the majority of respondents (373 = 88%) stating that they do their banking away from the parish. Age and car ownership figure less prominently with location of banking than with food shopping.
The survey also enquired about the use that would be made of other services if provided:

- **Cashpoint**: 331 (75.2%) said they would use it
- **Regular market**: 274 (63.6%) said they would use it
- **Fast food outlet (shop)**: 109 (28.5%) said they would use it
- **Fast food (visiting van)**: 65 (17.5%) said they would use it
- **Cyber Cafe**: 42 (11.7%) said they would use it

A cashpoint and a regular market would be very popular in general but especially with those aged 45-59 whilst a Cyber Cafe would be utilised by younger respondents.

## Transport, Traffic, Parking and Pavements

There was considerable support for a bypass for Corfe Castle with 239 (49.1%) respondents “strongly agreeing” and 80 (16.4%) “agreeing” with the need for one. Conversely, 91 (18.7%) people responding disagree with its need. Respondents living in the East Street area, in particular, support the need for a bypass. Among the places most often quoted for where the bypass should go were:

- To the East - 50 suggestions
- To the West - 27 suggestions
- In the area of the railway line - 36 suggestions
- Norden - 12 suggestions

Volume of traffic was seen as the main traffic problem (407 respondents) in East Street although the speed of traffic, congestion, noise and pollution all rate a high response as “problems.” Lorries receive particularly high mention as a problem although cars also receive a high rating.

When considering effective means of reducing traffic speed, a camera received the highest response (149 = 45.2%) followed by traffic calming (68 = 20%), pelican crossings (38 = 11.5%) and a lower speed limit (33 = 10%). The most popular site for another pelican crossing in East Street was by the library/village hall (223 respondents) with one by the school also being well supported. Those aged over 75 years favour such a crossing, but, perhaps surprisingly, those in the 45-59 year and 60-74 years age groups were more likely to feel that a crossing isn’t needed.

Opinion was divided on the proposal for an all-year ban on parking in West Street between the Square and the marked bays with 195 (42.8%) respondents in favour and 261 (57.2%) opposing such a ban. Those living in the West Street area were particularly keen to see a parking ban introduced.

Those living outside Corfe Castle village were asked to identify one thing that would improve traffic conditions in their area. The most common replies were:

- stopping speeding traffic - 24 responses
- problems on Sandy Hill Lane (verges, cyclists, junctions, passing places, etc) - 10

The main parking problems identified by respondents were:

- Daytime/short term parking for shopping - 30 responses
- Inability to find parking in the square - 27 responses
- No parking available near own property - 20 responses
- Nowhere to park - 18 responses
- Shortage of residents parking - 15 responses

With regard to another car park the most popular suggestions were for:

- Near the railway - 24 responses
- Middle Halves - 14 responses
- National Trust land - 11 responses

The majority view (65.8%) was that a new car park should be available for both residents and visitors, although 26.8% felt it should be for residents only.

Respondents suggested that better use of the Norden Park and Ride would result from there being a shuttle service to the village. Other popular ways of increasing its usage would come from better signs to encourage people to park there and it being open on days when trains aren’t running. If they were using the Park and Ride, most respondents (64.6%) said they would be prepared to wait up to 10 minutes for a shuttle whilst 72 (20.2%) would wait 20 minutes. The most popular suggestions for a minibus drop-off point were:

- The Square - 116 responses
- Railway station - 72 responses
- West Street car park - 32 responses
Opinions were divided on which organisation should manage the Park and Ride; the most supported options were Swanage Railway (28% of those expressing an opinion), a partnership of several organisations (24.5%) and the Parish Council (20.7%).

With regard to uneven pavements in the parish, 116 (29.4%) respondents felt personally inconvenienced by them compared with 279 (70.6%) who do not. As might be predicted, older residents (especially those aged 75 and over) were more likely to be inconvenienced. When asked whether they were concerned about uneven pavements, 224 (54.8%) answered “yes”, suggesting a concern by many for other residents rather than for themselves. The vast majority of respondents (394 = 84.5%) would not wish to see the natural stone pavements replaced by tarmac, as in parts of East Street and West Street.

Swanage Railway was seen mainly as a tourist attraction by many (55.8%) but most respondents (69.1%) believe that it should fulfil both functions. The use of the railway by respondents if services were maintained all year round would be somewhat limited with:
- 9 (1.9%) saying they would use it daily
- 68 (14.1%) saying they would use it weekly
- 18 (3.7%) saying they would use it monthly
- 247 (51.4%) saying they would use it occasionally
- 137 (28.5%) saying they would never use it

The use would increase somewhat if it connected to the mainline at Wareham with 14 using it daily, 84 weekly, 49 monthly, 261 occasionally and 76 never using it.

When considering public transport, the majority of respondents (411 = 82.9%) said they live within easy walking distance (for them) of a bus stop and 290 (58.7%) of the railway station. Again those less likely to be within walking distance of both forms of public transport were aged 60 and over.

In terms of current usage of public transport, 325 (64.4%) do not use any on a monthly basis. The numbers who said they used public transport at least once a month were: Bus 98, Train 94, Taxi 32. Only 14 (3.0%) respondents used the Leisure Bus.

If there was a Dial-a-Ride scheme for shared taxis:
- no one said they would use it daily
- 14 (3.0%) would use it weekly
- 14 (3.0%) would use it monthly
- 191 (40.7%) would use it occasionally
- 250 (53.3%) would never use it

Sport, Recreation, Leisure and Learning

Relatively few respondents currently participate in sport, probably reflecting the age profile of the respondents in the parish with:
- 29 (5.7%) involved in tennis
- 12 (2.4%) involved in cricket
- 10 (2.0%) involved in football
- 66 (15.7%) belonging to a club or team
- 13 (3.2%) being a qualified coach

With regard to participation in sport there was, as one would imagine, an age factor associated with football and cricket. However 18 (62.1%) of those involved in tennis were aged 45-59 years and 5 (17.2%) aged 60-74 years. In addition 45 (46.4%) of those undertaking other sporting activities were aged 60 and over. Whilst, in this survey, football and cricket were very much gender-related, tennis and other sporting activities were evenly undertaken by males and females. 45 people aged 60 and over were still actively involved in sporting activities such as golf (13), boating/sailing (6) and bowls (5).

There would be interest, given the availability of appropriate facilities, in participation in local sports clubs whilst 45 respondents also expressed a willingness to become involved with the organisation of local sports clubs.

Improvements needed to sports facilities in the parish were supported as follows::
- pavilion and existing sports field (West Street) - 250 (49.5%) responses
- swimming pool - 164 (32.5%) responses
- skatepark - 91 (18.0%) responses
- BMX track - 50 (9.9%) responses
Walking was by far the most common way of using the surrounding countryside (425 responses) followed by cycling (100) and horse riding (21). Generally speaking respondents felt that footpaths and bridleways are adequate in number (358), well maintained (252) and adequately signposted (285). Many respondents (268 = 72.6%) felt that there should be more printed maps and guides whilst respondents were fairly equally divided about the need for more historical or environmental guided walks.

When asked to consider the need for more organised leisure activities for specific groups, most support was for youth (231 responses), followed by elderly (118). Good levels of support were also evident for cinema (162), concerts (152) and theatre (87). A finding for follow-up in future is that 91 respondents state that they would be prepared to become involved in the organisation of these activities.

Altogether 178 (38.7%) respondents had undertaken some form of learning programme in the previous 5 years. Of these, 108 (61.7%) were female with respondents spread evenly across the age spectrum. The major sources of such learning were adult education, university/college and community learning centres with the main subjects being:

- IT - 57 responses
- Arts/Crafts - 28 responses
- Languages - 12 responses

Barriers to learning identified by respondents included:

- Time - 47 responses
- Age - 28 responses
- Not interested - 19 responses

Sessions based in the Parish (as opposed to further afield) were of most interest with evenings in Autumn and Winter being the most popular timing. There was also interest in taster and one-off sessions. Popular subjects for learning programmes include:

- The Arts/Craft - 54 responses
- IT - 48 responses
- Languages - 27 responses

There was some variation in the use of the village hall with the majority of respondents (225 = 46.1%) only using it once or twice a year but a good number (152 = 31.1%) using it once or twice a month or more frequently. Use increases with age, especially for those aged 60 and over whilst women use it much more frequently than men.

The most common reason for usage was “social”, (198 = 39.2%) with “fundraising” coming a close second (176 = 34.9%). A large majority of respondents (374 = 88.6%) believed that the village hall and its facilities are adequate for the needs of the parish. In terms of improvements to the village hall the main suggestions were as follows:

- an extension in size - 12 responses
- storage facilities - 12 responses
- larger car park - 9 responses

Generally, respondents felt that the current community meeting facilities in the parish are adequate with only 37 (12.1%) wishing to see additional facilities. The main suggestions for additional facilities include small meeting rooms, sports pavilion, a meeting place at Kingston and something similar for young people.

### Pre-School and After School Activities

Bearing in mind the age profile of the parish and those responding to the survey, this will clearly affect the uptake of child-related services. The children of 63 (19.1%) respondents used, or had used, the nursery school at least one day per week. These tend to be families who have lived in the parish a long time, reflecting the recent migration to the area of older people. 22 (7.1 %) would expect to use the nursery within the next 5 years. 16 (5.2%) would use it if it was open all day and 18 (5.9%) would use it if it was open during the holidays.

The children of 57 (21.5%) respondents used, or had used, the toddler group in the past, whilst 16 (5.4%) expected to use it within the next 5 years. If after-school supervised activities were available, 32 (11.0%) respondents stated that their children would use them.
Social and Medical Services

31 (6.6%) respondents said they were registered disabled and 54 (12.2%) experienced difficulty in accessing local facilities whether registered disabled or not. The main difficulties encountered were:
- Walking - 11 responses
- Transport - 8 responses
- Pavements (damaged) - 6 responses

Of those 31 registered disabled, 23 (74.2%) would use a disabled parking bay if made available in or near the Square whilst another 31 respondents who were not registered disabled stated that they would also make use of such a facility (presumably with a friend using their car legitimately for that purpose).

Interest was expressed in participation in voluntary work associated with young children (22 respondents), youth (16), senior citizens (39), Hospital Car Services (26) and a combination of other causes (17).

The majority of respondents (295 = 60%) were registered with the GP in Corfe Castle but a sizeable minority (132 = 26.8%) were with the practice in Swanage and 36 (7.3%) in Wareham. The most common pattern of visiting the surgery was “twice a year or so” (208 = 42.6%) but many (155 = 31.8%) said they visit once a month or more whilst for 125 (25.6%) it was less often than twice a year. Personal car was the most popular means of travelling to the surgery (234 = 52.8%) with walking also very common (183 = 41.3%). As very few go by bus or get lifts, the choice of GP outside Corfe Castle is presumably influenced in part by car ownership (only 10 of the 168 registered at Swanage or Wareham not possessing a car).

When respondents were asked to consider the use of other health-related services, if provided at their surgery, the most popular choices were:
- Dentist - 242 (47.9%)
- Chiropody - 181 (35.8%)
- Physiotherapy - 130 (25.7%)
- Medication delivery - 115 (22.8%)

Respondents agreed with the need for additional facilities for the frail and elderly as follows:
- Increased community/nursing care in the home - 260 (51.5%)
- Car service for hospital appointments and other trips - 222 (44.0%)
- Residential home - 139 (27.5%)
- Nursing home - 113 (22.4%)

The majority of respondents (268 = 62.6%) felt that the public toilets in the parish are adequate in general although even more (358 = 88.4%) would like to see the public toilets in West Street open daily all year.

Crime

Many respondents (116 = 24.1%) stated that they have been victims of crime within the parish. Of these incidents, the most common were:
- Burglary of an outbuilding - 32 (6.3%) respondents
- Burglary in the home - 26 (5.1%) respondents
- Vandalism/damage to property - 26 (5.1%) respondents
- Theft of a vehicle - 21 (4.2%) respondents
- Theft from a vehicle - 21 (4.2%) respondents

Higher rates of crime had been experienced, in this survey, by those aged 45-59 years and those living in Corfe Castle village (Square, West Street or off West Street).

Many respondents (276 = 59%) expressed some level of concern about crime with particular concerns relating to a lack of police presence, loutish behaviour (particularly of youth) and of generally becoming a victim. In a number of cases several concerns were expressed by respondents. The main type of crime over which people expressed concern was burglary in the home with 75 (38.5%) of responses referring to this perceived threat. The main reasons for people to be concerned were “the personal experience of others” (90 = 41.6%) and “media reports” (65 = 30.1%) with “personal experience” only coming third (48 = 22.2%). People were mainly concerned about the threat of crime either at night or both during the day and at night.

The most common precautions reported as being taken were the following:
- Avoid going out after dark - 82 (16.2%) responses
- Go out with someone else rather than alone - 62 (12.3%) responses
- Stay away from certain areas - 49 (9.7%) responses
Considerable support was shown for a range of measures aimed at addressing crime or fear of crime:

- Greater police presence on foot - 299 (59.2%) responses
- Greater police presence in vehicles - 146 (28.9%) responses
- More activities for young people - 200 (39.6%) responses
- Improved neighbourhood watch - 133 (26.3%) responses
- Community wardens - 126 (25.0%) responses
- More drug/alcohol education - 107 (21.2%) responses

Environment

The vast majority of respondents (437 = 91.8%) believed that environmental issues are important to the parish. In general the respondents were satisfied with the quality of the environment although a sizeable minority were dissatisfied with cleanliness such as litter (36.4%) and the upkeep of roads and verges (38.7%). Animals, birds and plants were all considered to be very important to the local environment by the respondents with only a small minority (2.7%) disagreeing.

Most respondents said they make use of environmental facilities such as the Green Box kerbside recycling collection (63.2%), the mini recycling centre (62.8%) and garden waste disposal (67.5%). For those living in Corfe Castle village, where the Green Box service is available, the uptake of 77.8% was good, though with scope for further improvement.

Again there was some support for various measures regarding the efficient use, and conservation, of energy by:

- improved insulation grants - 172 (34.1 %) agreed
- use of energy efficient equipment - 231 (45.7%) agreed
- encouragement of solar power - 213 (42.2%) agreed
- reduction of unnecessary overnight lighting - 220 (43.6%) agreed
- more recycling - 286 (56.6%) agreed
- more use of public transport - 186 (36.8%) agreed
- more walking and cycling - 209 (41.4%) agreed

A majority of respondents (315 = 68.3%) were concerned about the overall cleanliness and tidiness of the parish with older people tending to be more concerned. When considering other measures to maintain and enhance the quality of the local environment, most support was shown for:

- dealing with dog fouling - 267 (52.9%) responses
- better emptying of litter bins - 226 (44.8%) responses
- clearing weeds from pavements - 224 (44.4%) responses

There was a range of opinion over the use of alternative energy such as power, wave power and solar energy. Whilst 133 (28.2%) said they “definitely” agreed and 110 yes, they “thought so”, 55 (11.7%) said “not at all” and a further 55 (11.7%) were “not really” in favour.

Tourism

Tourism was considered to be important to the economy of the parish by most (93.7%) respondents. Even so, the majority of respondents felt inconvenienced by it either “a lot” (69 = 14.0%) or “to some extent” (246 = 49.8%). Others, who did not feel inconvenienced, either replied “not really” (118 = 23.9%) or “not at all” (49 = 9.9%). There was a tendency for those having lived longer in the parish to express a degree of inconvenience than more recently-arrived residents.

With regard to the provision of facilities for visitors to the parish, the most supported proposals were for:

- better parking facilities - 293 (58.0%) responses
- safer pedestrian access around the village - 192 (38.0%) responses
- picnic area with play and toilet facilities - 189 (37.4%) responses
- more litter bins - 182 (36.0%) responses
- better transport facilities - 178 (35.2%) responses

Youth Survey

The question regarding general satisfaction with the facilities provided for young people in the parish, suggest more dissatisfaction than satisfaction with facilities with 16 (43.2%) respondents expressing some
level of dissatisfaction compared with 7 (18.9%) being satisfied. Females in general were slightly more
dissatisfied than males though not significantly so. Those facilities receiving the highest satisfaction rating were:

- General Clubs (youth club etc)
- Transport
- Brownies and Rainbows

Those facilities receiving the highest dissatisfaction rating were:

- Sport facilities
- Entertainment (discos, dances etc)
- After-school activities

When asked about the extent to which facilities would be used, if available, a swimming pool came out
as a clear “winner” with 36 (94.7%) stating that they would make use of one. Whereas the answers to
many of the other facilities were gender and age related, a swimming pool would be appreciated, and
used, across the age and gender spectrum.

The remaining facilities that were well supported were:

- A sports club - 21 responses
- Disco - 17 responses
- Skatepark - 15 responses
- Coffee bar/café - 15 responses

There was quite a positive response regarding the use of facilities in surrounding towns if a special bus
service were provided, with only 6 respondents stating a definite “No”. Whereas 19 (52.8%) of those
responding said “Yes”, 11 others were uncertain and thus, perhaps, potential users of such a bus
service. The uptake of this proposal was equally attractive to both genders whilst, in terms of age, its
more popular with older respondents to the youth survey.

As in the case of satisfaction with existing facilities several respondents had difficulty in answering the
question relating to issues which may be problematic in the parish. Between a third and a half replied
“Don’t know” to all options in the question.

- 37.1% agreed there was a problem with Attitude of adults towards the youth
- 20.6% agreed there was a problem with Underage drinking
- 20.6% agreed there was a problem with Unsocial behaviour
- 17.1% agreed there was a problem with Juvenile crime
- no one agreed there was a problem with Drugs

Suggestions made by respondents for dealing with the above issues included:

- More enforcement generally and police presence regarding underage drinking
- More education at school and parental control
- Meetings between adults and young people

There was a fairly equal division of opinion regarding the extent to which young people felt enough is being
done to preserve the parish for future generations with 14 (38.9%) agreeing that enough is being done and
11 (30.6%) disagreeing. Females were slightly more inclined to agree than males as were older children
also.

A positive response was forthcoming to whether the young people felt part of the community, with 28
(75.7%) either stating “yes definitely” or “yes to some extent” as opposed to only 5 (13.5%) not feeling part of
the community. The degree of positivity increased with age.

For those not feeling part of the community, the suggestions made for improvement were:

- Better facilities for young people
- More social activities for young people
- Young people being on the Parish Council

A majority of those with a clear view (57.1%) saw themselves remaining in the parish with only 5 (17.9%)
stating categorically that they did not wish to remain. The main reasons given for either not being able, or
wishing, to stay in the parish in the long term were:

- Aspiring to university or college
- Local housing too expensive
- Problems of commuting

---

59 i.e. numbers expressing satisfaction compared with numbers expressing dissatisfaction