



Borough of Telford and Wrekin

Boundary Review Committee

Thursday 4 September 2025

6.00 pm

Council Chamber, Third Floor, Southwater One, Telford, TF3 4J

Democratic Services:	Millie Wallace	01952 381542
Media Enquiries:	Corporate Communications	01952 382406

Committee Members:	Councillors G Luter (Chair), Z Hannington (Vice-Chair), M Boylan, N A Dugmore, N A M England, R A Overton and K Tonks		
---------------------------	--	--	--

Agenda		Page
1.0	Apologies for Absence	
2.0	Declarations of Interest	
3.0	Minutes of the Previous Meeting	3 - 6
	To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting held on Thursday 30 July 2025.	
4.0	Community Governance Review 2025	7 - 18
	To receive a report on the 2025 Community Governance review following the conclusion of the second phase of consultation.	
4.1	Appendix A - Phase 2 Consultation Responses	To Follow
4.2	Appendix B - Adopt Proposals	19 - 26
4.3	Appendix C - Retain Pre- existing Parish Arrangements	27 - 30

4.4 Appendix D - Consult on new Parish Proposals

31 - 40

4.5 Appendix E - Maps

**To
Follow**

If you are reading these papers on an electronic device you have saved the Council £15.22 and saved 6.1kg of CO₂, based on average agenda printing costs for the 2022/23 municipal year.

BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on Wednesday 30 July 2025 at 6.00 pm in Council Chamber, Third Floor, Southwater One, Telford, TF3 4JG

Present: Councillors G Luter (Chair), Z Hannington (Vice-Chair),
K T Blundell, M Boylan, N A Dugmore, N A M England and R A Overton

In Attendance: A Lowe (Director: Policy & Governance), M Wallace (Member
Support Officer) and R Phillips (Registrars, Public Protection, Legal &
Democracy Service Delivery Manager)

Apologies

None.

BRC35 Declarations of Interest

None.

BRC36 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2025 be
confirmed and signed by the Chair.

BRC37 Community Governance Review 2025

The Director: Policy & Governance presented the Community Governance
Review (CGR) report, which updated the Committee on the representations
received throughout the second phase of consultation on the Community
Governance Review and sought approval for an amended timetable to bring
the review to a conclusion.

The Committee was provided with an update on the current CGR and the
steps taken throughout the consultation to canvass views on the proposals
next steps would be.

Members were reminded that the CGR commenced on 17 February 2025 with
the closing date for the first round of consultation being extended to 14 April
2025. It was noted that this was a borough wide review, and everyone was
invited to submit their views on what Town and Parish arrangements should
look like in the future. The consultation pack was published online and
circulated to all Town and Parish Councils, SALC and others. It was then
agreed by the committee at the meeting on 12 May 2025 for the second
consultation process to take place starting on 19 May 2025 until 14 July 2025.
This consultation received over 1,000 responses.

In order to get the most engagement as possible, officers followed several different processes to reach as many people as they could. Officers wrote to 3,000 community groups and Town & Parish Councils. Adverts were running in leisure centres across the borough; social media posts went out reaching 10,570 people. It was also on the Council's website, in the local press and seven drop-in sessions had been organised over seven different locations to provide more information.

More than 1,000 submissions had been received with almost all Town & Parish Councils making a submission. Some submissions covered more than one proposed area.

The Director: Policy & Governance then discussed the next steps and confirmed that a meeting had been scheduled for 4 September to receive the final proposals for consideration. After a decision had been made, the 'new councils' would then start to form from April 2026. A checklist had been prepared from the Council's Legal Services to ensure any changes such as employment related matters, precept-related matters and assets were covered.

The Committee thanked officers for all their hard work and expressed their appreciation to be given more time to read all submissions before the final proposals were presented.

It was noted that while many comments were constructive and offered thoughtful suggestions, assumptions should not be made about non-responses indicating support. Concerns were raised about proposals potentially affecting community identity, particularly in areas like Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine, Waters Upton, and the Weald Moors. Emphasis was placed on ensuring proposals reflected local identities, as outlined in paragraph 52 of the guidance. Members expressed interest in meeting with officers to better understand the reasoning behind proposals and ensure decisions were resident focused.

Officers confirmed the consultation process was designed to be fair and transparent, with all information made accessible and queries addressed. While some Town and Parish Councils had actively campaigned, officers assured members that efforts had been made to maintain impartiality. Mixed responses had been received across various areas, with some communities expressing strong opposition to proposed mergers. Members commended the consultation efforts and agreed that further meetings would be beneficial to ensure all feedback was properly considered before final recommendations were made.

The meeting ended at 6.45 pm

Chairman:

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank



Telford & Wrekin
Co-operative Council

Protect, care and invest
to create a better borough

Borough of Telford and Wrekin

Boundary Review Committee

4 September 2025

Community Governance Review 2025

Lead Director:	Anthea Lowe – Director: Policy & Governance
Service Area:	Policy & Governance
Report Author:	Anthea Lowe – Director: Policy & Governance
Officer Contact Details:	Tel: 01952 383219 Email: anthea.lowe@telford.gov.uk
Wards Affected:	All wards

1.0 Recommendations for decision:

1.1 It is recommended that the Boundary Review Committee:-

- a) Approves the adoption of the proposals contained in **Appendix B** (those proposals to take forward following consultation) with the associated maps in **Appendix E**;
- b) Approves the adoption of the proposals in **Appendix C** subject to the amendments set out therein (those areas where it is recommended that the current arrangements should, largely be retained) with the associated maps in **Appendix E**;
- c) Notes the contents of **Appendix D** and associated maps in **Appendix E** in respect of those areas where further consultation might be required;
- d) Confirms what, if any, further proposals should be put out to consultation; and
- e) Delegates authority to the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chair of the Boundary Review Committee, to make all necessary arrangements to allow for further consultation and to publish the relevant consultation documents.

2.0 Purpose of Report

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to provide members of the Committee with further information following the last meeting of the Committee on 30 July 2025, including recommended proposals for adoption, areas where it is recommended that the current arrangements should be maintained (subject to some minor amendments) and those areas where, following the direction of Committee members, further consultation may be desirable before the Committee reaches a view.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 At its meeting of 13 February 2025, the Boundary Review Committee agreed to commence a Community Governance Review in respect of the Town and Parish Council arrangements within Telford & Wrekin. A Community Governance Review is undertaken in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Statutory guidance under the Act provides further information that the Committee is required to take into account when undertaking a review. Earlier reports to the Committee summarise this guidance.
- 3.2 The statutory guidance provides significant detail on the important role that Town and Parish Councils play within their communities, enabling them to build cohesion, address social exclusion and deprivation and cultivating respect amongst communities. It is clear, from the guidance that, whatever the arrangements, there should be strong and accountable local government and leadership with Town and Parish Councils being able to take the lead on local matters in some cases whilst, at other times, they may act as an important stakeholder or partner to key organisations such as the principal council, police, fire and the private sector.
- 3.3 There is no 'one size fits all' approach to community governance with the guidance setting out that in some communities there will be specific characteristics which help to define a parish, for example representing particular groups whilst, in others, the community may coalesce around particular interests such as lifestyle groups or leisure pursuits.
- 3.4 When considering the size and population of local communities and / or parishes, the guidance clearly sets out that it is often these matters that influence whether or not it is going to be viable. It also identifies the range of council sizes at a local level, from small hamlets in which the council represents 50 residents to large towns in which the council may represent more than 40,000 electors. Additional guidance is also available in respect of recommended councillor numbers. This guidance is limited in its usefulness in so much as there are differing views as to optimum councillor numbers and the indicative ranges do not align within the two guidance documents. As a result, when it comes to councillor numbers, wherever possible, the aim is to have equality of representation. However, it is not possible to deliver this in areas which comprise both large, highly-populated urban areas and large sparsely-populated rural areas. That being the case, there is also a need to consider quoracy within Councils and ensuring that smaller Town / Parish Councils are able to transact business.

First phase of consultation

- 3.5 The consultation process is set out in the statutory guidance and has been followed throughout this review.
- 3.6 The first phase of consultation which ran from 17 February 2025 until 14 April 2025 was aimed at inviting as many submissions as possible on what the Town and Parish arrangements should be in the future. At this stage, Telford & Wrekin Council did not provide any potential options for people to consider; rather, it was a case of there being a 'blank canvas' with an opportunity for people to share their views without any restrictions.
- 3.7 To support those wishing to make a submission in this first phase of consultation, a consultation pack was created setting out information on what a community governance review was, what it could take into account and details around the electorate for each local area within Telford & Wrekin. A survey was also created to help people shape their submission although there was no requirement to submit a survey response for a submission to be valid.
- 3.8 The consultation pack was shared with:-
- Local MPs;
 - Town and Parish Councils within Telford & Wrekin;
 - Community Groups within the Borough;
 - Chief Officer Group;
 - Community Centre Managers;
 - Telford Crisis Network Group;
 - Lloyds Bank Foundation;
 - Shropshire Association of Local Councils;
 - Shropshire Council;
 - Interfaith Council;
 - Strategic Partners; and
 - Ward Members
- 3.9 As well as sharing documents with those listed above, officers held a session that Clerks and Town / Parish Councillors were able to attend during which the community governance review process was explained and attendees had an opportunity to ask questions. Additionally, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Boundary Review Committee, together with officers, met with the Chair, and colleagues, of Shropshire Association of Local Councils ("SALC").
- 3.10 Officers also attended two sessions attended by Town and Parish Clerks during this first period of consultation.
- 3.11 A total of 292 responses were received comprising 219 completed surveys and 73 emails were received during this round of consultation. In addition, 8 emails were received requesting additional information.

Second phase of consultation

- 3.12 At its meeting on 12 May 2025, the Committee agreed the draft proposals to put out to consultation. These proposals were put forward having taken account of the statutory guidance in relation to Community Governance Reviews, the legislation and the responses received in the first round of consultation. The second phase of consultation ran from 19 May 2025 until 14 July 2025.
- 3.13 Again, a consultation pack was prepared which included a set of maps setting out the draft proposed town and parish boundaries and information regarding each area. This consultation pack was shared with the same individuals and organisations as set out in paragraph 3.7 above. Comments were sought on the proposals and submissions could be made by completing an online survey, by email or by letter.
- 3.14 Officers also attended 7 drop-in events where people could find out more information about the proposals. These took place at:-
- Southwater 1 library;
 - Madeley library;
 - Wellington library;
 - Newport library;
 - Brookside Community Centre;
 - Waters Upton Village Hall; and
 - Hub on the Hill, Sutton Hill
- 3.15 In addition, the radio station playing in all Council-owned leisure venues also publicised the review on an hourly basis to raise awareness of the review and to encourage residents to have their say.
- 3.16 During the second period of consultation more than 1,300 responses were received. These were provided to the Committee at its last meeting on 30 July 2025. For completeness, they are included again at **Appendix A**. In response to feedback about the presentation of these responses, they have been presented in a slightly different format. This Appendix is sorted into area based upon the **proposed Town / Parish Councils** put forward in the second round of consultation. Some have been included in more than one area based upon the comments they contain. Where a submission also included an attachment, this has been added as an Annex. Some submissions have been included in an “others” category – this is those submissions that are not capable of being identified as relating to a specific area.

4.0 Themes arising from consultation responses

- 4.1 Whilst there is no intention to repeat the consultation responses within this report, there are a few themes that should be noted by the Committee. These are outlined below:-

Amount of Precept

The precept is the sum that a Town / Parish Council levies for each household in its area to provide the services that it delivers. The precept amount is decided by the Town / Parish Council on an annual basis and is collected with Council Tax by Telford & Wrekin Council before being passed on to the relevant Town & Parish Council. The amount of precept charged by a Town / Parish Council can go up or down each year depending upon the budgetary needs of the relevant Council and the number of properties in the Council area at any time.

A number of submissions made comments regarding the precept a household currently pays or, alternatively, is anticipated to pay under new Town / Parish arrangements. This is understandable given the financial implications arising out of this.

However, the amount of precept that any Town / Parish Council may charge is not something that the legislation or the guidance sets out can be included in the Committee's considerations.

Reason for review

In some submissions, there was a misconception that a review could only look at those Town / Parish Councils that are considered to be 'failing'. This is not the case. It is considered best practice for a principal authority (in this case, Telford & Wrekin Council) to undertake a review of their areas every 10 or so years. Whilst a review was carried out in 2023/24, this concluded with no changes due to the Committee's concerns around the low level of engagement throughout the consultation periods. This was the first review undertaken within Telford & Wrekin since its inception.

Whilst it is the case that the review needs to consider whether or not the arrangements in place deliver "effective and efficient governance", it is not the case that only those Town or Parish Councils that are failing that should be subject to amendment. The review needs to consider all elements of the guidance with none of the criteria taking priority over the other. In addition, "effective and efficient governance" is not solely concerned with the effectiveness of a Town and Parish Council; equal consideration needs to be given to the efficiency of arrangements.

Parish meetings / Removal of Parish Councils

The Borough currently has 27 Town / Parish Councils and 2 Parish Meetings within its area. Submissions were received in respect of one area in particular (Horton ward of Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council) seeking the removal of Horton ward from the Parish Council and the creation of a Parish Meeting for Horton.

Whilst there is some sympathy for the well-articulated submissions that were received on this point, there is clear government guidance that an area that is currently within a Parish Council should not become unparished. That being the case, the suggestion to create a Parish Meeting cannot be supported.

Similarly, some submissions suggested that all Town and Parish Councils should be abolished. Again, for the same reasons, this is not capable of being supported.

Councillor numbers

As set out in paragraph 3.4 above, the guidance in relation to councillor numbers is of limited help in reaching a settled conclusion on appropriate councillor numbers. It was clear from a number of submissions that the recommendations, even in areas where the proposals were broadly supported, that a review of the recommended councillor numbers would be welcomed. Therefore, Members of the Committee will see that there are some proposals where changes to councillor numbers have been suggested.

- 4.2 It is clear from the submissions that some of the proposals contained in the second phase of consultation were particularly unwelcome whilst others attracted more support. It is worth reminding Committee members that, in cases such as these, obtaining unanimity in submissions is highly unlikely to occur and that the responses received during consultation are just one element that needs to be taken into account when deciding the outcome of the review.
- 4.3 Furthermore, it also worth mentioning that every change made will necessitate further changes elsewhere in order to ensure that the 'jigsaw' of the Borough's geography fits together as it should. Clearly, therefore, there might be instances where some changes are supported and clearly have benefit which result in consequential changes that are less well supported. This is the balancing exercise that the Committee needs to undertake when reaching a decision.

5.0 Current position

- 5.1 Members are now asked to consider the position in relation to those proposals contained in the attached **Appendices B to D with maps shown at Appendix E** which are each explained in more detail below:-

Appendix B

- 5.2 This Appendix contains the proposals that were put forward during the second phase of consultation which it is recommended the Committee should adopt for the reasons set out in the Appendix.
- 5.3 It should be noted that, in some cases, in response to consultation submissions, some changes have been proposed to councillor numbers. The table below summarises the position:-

Proposed Parish / Town Council	Original Proposed Councillor Numbers	Current Proposed Councillor Numbers
Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote & Church Aston	Ten	No change

Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council	Seventeen	No change
Ketley Parish Council	Eleven	No change to councillor numbers but the distribution between parish wards has been updated to better reflect the electorate in each.
Lilleshall Parish Council	Seven	No change
Muxton Parish Council	Five	Nine
Newport Town Council	Twelve	No change
Priorslee Parish Council	Five	Nine
St Georges & Donnington Parish Council	Seventeen	No change
Tibberton & Cherrington Parish Council	Six	No change
Wellington Town Council	Twenty-five	No change although the Town ward groupings have changed to deliver better electoral equality.
Wrockwardine Wood, Trench & Oakengates Town Council	Fifteen	No change

Appendix C

- 5.4 This Appendix details those Town / Parish Councils where it is recommended that the no changes are made and the current pre-existing arrangements should remain in place. The reasons for this are set out in the Appendix. The table below summarises the position in relation to this Appendix:-

Town / Parish Council	Councillor Numbers
Chetwynd Parish Council	Seven
Edgmond Parish Council	Thirteen
Preston upon the Weald Moors Parish Meeting	Not applicable
Eyton upon the Weald Moors Parish Meeting	Not applicable
Kynnersley Parish Council	Five
Waters Upton Parish Council	Six
Ercall Magna Parish Council	Thirteen

Appendix D

- 5.5 This Appendix sets out proposals for the Boundary Review Committee's consideration and, potentially, to undertake a further period of consultation on these proposals. This follows the meeting of the Committee where Members asked for further work to be done in relation to two specific areas; namely the proposed The Nedge Parish Council and the proposals in relation to the Dawley / Horsehay / Lightmoor area which would have seen the current Dawley Hamlets Parish Council subsumed into other Town / Parish Councils.
- 5.6 In addition, having considered consultation responses, some alternative proposals in relation to Wrockwardine, Little Wenlock and Rodington are contained in this Appendix.
- 5.7 In relation to the proposals contained within this Appendix, the table below summarises the position:-

Original proposals	Changes proposed	Committee asked to:-
Proposed creation of The Nedge Parish Council made up of the current:- • Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council; and • Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council	To review the proposals in light of Committee comments. Number of options:- • Leave as per current arrangements; • Create 2 new Parish Councils made up of Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley and standalone Brookside Parish; • Leave Hollinswood & Randlay as per current arrangements and create standalone Stirchley and standalone Brookside; • Leave Stirchley & Brookside as per current arrangements and create standalone Hollinswood and standalone Randlay	• Unless decision is to keep the current arrangements in place, Committee is asked to confirm which option, if any, to consult upon and the reasons for that decision; • If one of the alternative proposals is considered appropriate for consultation, Committee to agree to seek specific proposals on potential names for any new Council(s); • It is proposed that any consultation will be for a period of three weeks only.

Proposed changes in the Dawley / Horsehay / Lightmoor area created by expanding the areas of Great Dawley and Lawley & Overdale resulting in the subsuming of Dawley Hamlets Parish Council into other areas.	To review the proposals in light of Committee comments; Updated proposal is that:- Lawley & Overdale Parish Council to take on the Smallhill Parish ward (polling district TLS) from Dawley Hamlets Parish Council; Great Dawley Town Council to take on part of the Town Centre parish ward (polling district TMH) from Lawley & Overdale Parish Council; The creation of a new Parish Council broadly comprising the areas of Horsehay, Lightmoor and Aqueduct (more information available in Appendix C); The Gorge Parish Council to lose Lightmoor parish ward to the new Parish Council referred to above and subsequent changes to councillor numbers as a result; Madeley Town Council to take on Nightingale Walk parish ward (polling district TWL) from Dawley Hamlets Parish Council	Confirm agreement to consult on the following:- • Creation of new Parish Council comprising broadly those areas made up of Horsehay, Lightmoor and Aqueduct; • Inviting specific submissions in terms of the name of the proposed new Parish Council area; • Proposed changes to The Gorge Parish Council as a result of the creation of new Parish Council; • Proposed amendments to Madeley Town Council to take on the Nightingale Walk parish ward (polling district TWL) from current Dawley Hamlets Parish Council The remaining proposals in relation to Lawley & Overdale Parish Council and Great Dawley Town Council do not require a further period of consultation as these have already been consulted upon.
Proposed creation of Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine and Rodington Parish Council	To maintain the existing arrangements in respect of Little Wenlock Parish Council. Updated proposal to create a Wrockwardine & Rodington Parish Council.	Confirm agreement to consult on the creation of a new Wrockwardine & Rodington Parish Council.

6.0 Next Steps

- 6.1 If the Committee agrees to undertake a further consultation for the areas outlined in this report and **Appendix D**, it will be asked to meet again to make its final decision. It is anticipated that that further meeting will take place in mid-October.
- 6.2 Following that meeting, steps will need to be undertaken to complete a review of polling districts, polling places and polling stations to ensure that they reflect the updated Town and Parish Council arrangements (if any changes are made).
- 6.3 Furthermore, any Town or Parish Councils that are facing changes will need to agree how best to prepare for the future arrangements. This will include matters such as the distribution of assets, income and expenditure both until elections in May 2027 and beyond, staffing levels and similar. Some guidance has been shared with Town and Parish Councils already and, once the new arrangements are known, officers will make contact with the Clerks of affected Town and Parish Councils to provide further guidance.
- 6.4 Elections to the new Town and Parish arrangements will take place in May 2027 at the next scheduled local elections.

7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 Depending upon the final arrangements that are agreed by the Boundary Review Committee, there may be a need to consider the impact on any Special Fund arrangements in respect of Town and Parish Councils.
- 7.2 Additionally, it should be noted that, where new Town or Parish Councils are created, the legislation sets out that they are able to delay the setting of their precept until October of the year in which the new Council takes effect. This is due to the fact that elections to the new Council will only take place in May 2027. Having said that, in the approach to May 2027, there will be a need for any new Town / Parish Councils to work in 'shadow form' to ensure that matters arising from the review are dealt with.

8.0 Legal and HR Implications

- 8.1 The legal implications are as set out in this report.

9.0 Ward Implications

- 9.1 The final arrangements decided upon by the Boundary Review Committee may have implications for particular Borough wards. These will be confirmed once the final arrangements have been confirmed.

10.0 Health, Social and Economic Implications

- 10.1 Whilst the communities served by the current Town and Parish Councils have diverse needs, there are no direct health, social or economic implications arising

directly from the proposals contained in this report other than already set out in the body of this report.

11.0 Equality and Diversity Implications

- 11.1 There are no groups that are disproportionately affected by the proposals contained in this report.

12.0 Climate Change and Environmental Implications

- 12.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report.

13.0 Background Papers

- 1 Consultation Pack (phase 1)
- 2 [Report to Boundary Review Committee 13 February 2025](#)
- 3 [Report to Boundary Review Committee 12 May 2025](#)
- 4 Consultation Pack (phase 2)
- 5 Presentation to Boundary Review Committee 3 July 2025
- 6 [Report to Boundary Committee 30 July 2025](#)

14.0 Appendices

- A Phase 2 Consultation Responses
- B Adopt Proposals
- C Retain pre-existing parish arrangements
- D Consult on new draft proposed parish arrangements
- E Maps associated with Appendices B to D

15.0 Report Sign Off

Signed off by	Date sent	Date signed off	Initials
Legal	26/08/2025	27/08/2025	RP
Finance	26/08/2025	27/08/2025	MB

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX B: ADOPTION OF “PROPOSED” PARISH ARRANGEMENTS

Further to consultation, it is proposed that the following parish arrangements are adopted.

CHURCH AND CHETWYND ASTON PARISH COUNCIL

It is proposed that a new parish council for Chetwynd Aston and Church Aston is created. With the proposed removal of the Station Road area from Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish to Newport Town Council, this would leave Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote as a small parish with limited opportunities and resources to meet the needs of its residents. The statutory guidance that covers community governance reviews sets out expectations that Town and Parish Councils should be sufficiently viable to provide services to their residents and making these changes will provide some assurance that this can be done.

Additionally, it should be noted that, in the last few years whenever a vacancy has occurred at either Chetwynd Aston or Church Aston, there has been insufficient interest from potential candidates meaning no election is held and, instead, the vacancies have been filled by co-opting a new councillor. Whilst this is within the rules for filling vacancies, it does not lend itself to efficient democracy when there is no ability to put the vacancies to an election.

In making these proposed changes and warding the new Parish in the way that has been identified, it maintains the rural identity of the area whilst enabling each area to be separately represented. On the whole, there was support for these proposals although there was a request for the warding arrangements to be different to those proposed. Similarly, representations were received regarding the proposed name with the one included in this proposal having some support.

Representations were received referring to the difference in councillor numbers between the two proposed Parish wards with a request that Church Aston be increased by one, giving a total councillor number of 11, particularly given the projected increase in electorate within 5 years. The projected growth within this proposed parish area is around 305 additional electors within a 5 year period which provides a projected electorate of 1,758 (when accounting for the movement of a polling district into Newport Town Council area). The guidance around councillor numbers indicates that an electorate of between 1,401 and 2,000 should be 9. It should also be noted, where possible, there should be an equality of representation amongst electorate but this is not always possible. Taking into account the guidance, it is recommended that 10 councillors is an appropriate number.

The proposed Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote and Church Aston Parish Council will have an electorate of 1,453, represented by 10 parish councillors across 2 wards:

Parish ward Name	Polling District	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Church Aston	WCA, WCB	7	1081	154	6%
Chetwynd Aston	WCC	3	372	124	-15%
Total		10	1453	145	

HADLEY & LEEGOMERY PARISH COUNCIL

It is proposed that the existing arrangements for Hadley & Leegomery are retained, with the exception of increasing the number of parish councillors from 16 to 17. This additional councillor will be allocated to the Trench parish ward to improve the variability in the electorate to councillor representation.

That the current arrangements for Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council are retained and will consist of 11,906 electors and is represented by 17 parish councillors across 5 wards.

Parish ward Name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Apley Castle	WAC	4	2,765	691	-1%
Hadley Castle	WHL, WHC	7	5,628	804	15%
Hadley Manor	WHM	3	2,138	713	2%
Horton	WEX	1	145	145	-79%
Trench Lock	WOL	2	1,230	615	-12%
Total		17	11,906	700	

KETLEY

It is proposed that for the purposes of community identity, the existing boundary of the Parish Council is amended such that the area of Beveley Road and Lea Brook (to the east of Ketley Park Road) form part of the proposed Oakengates, Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council.

The arrangements for Ketley Parish Council will consist of a current electorate of 3,171 represented by 11 parish councillors in two wards.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Beveley	TOK, TOB (part 12%)	2	479	240	-17%
Ketley	TKY	9	2692	299	4%
Total		11	3171	288	

LILLESHALL

It is proposed that the existing arrangements for Lilleshall Parish Council are retained. The area will see significant population growth if the Borough Council's draft Local Plan is adopted. This may require further warding of the Parish as this proposed development is delivered and, as the development progresses, may require a review of this area to ensure arrangements remain effective.

The proposed arrangements for Lilleshall Parish Council will consist of an electorate of 1,108 and 7 councillors in a single unwarded parish.

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Lilleshall	WCJ	7	1,108	158

MUXTON

As Muxton has a distinct community identity and different needs from Donnington, it is proposed that the two areas' needs are best met through alternative community governance arrangements. As such it is proposed that the community of Muxton has its own parish council which will be reflective of the identity and interests of the community. Some comments were received that the proposals were "change for change's sake" whilst others felt that there was merit in having a standalone Parish Council for the Muxton area.

The original proposals were for councillor numbers to sit at 5. Representations were received that this proposal was too low given the electorate number particularly given the projected growth in the area. Having reviewed the guidance on councillor numbers, it is recommended that this is increased to 9.

The proposed Muxton Parish Council will have a current electorate of 3,848 and 5 councillors in a single unwarded parish.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Muxton	WMO	9	3848	428

NEWPORT TOWN COUNCIL

For the purposes of community identity and cohesion, it is proposed that the boundary of Newport Town Council is moved to incorporate the area known as Station Road that is currently within the parish of Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote.

The proposal to extend the Newport Town Council boundary south to include the area bordering on the A518 road would make the Parish boundary coterminous with the current Newport South borough ward boundary which would provide effective and convenient community governance in this area and reduce elector confusion. Consultation responses were broadly supportive of the proposals in relation to Newport.

The Station Road development is currently mainly contained within Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish, with a small number of properties in the Newport South ward of Newport Town Council. In terms of the identity and interests of the community and on community cohesion, this area fits better with the more urban Newport Town Council than with Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote. Residents are more likely to look to Newport for local services, schools and its High Street, than to the more rural Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish.

The proposed Newport Town Council will have an electorate of 10,083, represented by 12 parish councillors across 4 wards.

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Newport East	WNE	3	2394	798	-5%
Newport North	WNN	3	2589	863	3%
Newport South	WNS, WNX	3	2367	789	-6%
Newport West	WNW	3	2733	911	8%
Total		12	10083	840	

PRIORSLEE

As Priorslee has a distinct community identity and different needs from St Georges, it is proposed that the two areas' needs are best met through alternative community governance arrangements. As such it is proposed that the community of Priorslee has its own parish council which will be reflective of the identity and interests of the community.

The original proposal was for the Council to comprise 5 councillors but, given that this would provide for 900+ electors per Council in an area which is facing increased development, this seems slightly on the low side to enable effective representation.

In terms of the number of responses, there were far fewer received in relation to this proposal. There was some comment on the area of Redhill and its proposed inclusion in the new St Georges & Donnington Parish Council area on the basis that it is more aligned with Priorslee than anywhere else. This was not something which was notably present in many submissions and, it is considered this area is actually a distinct community of its own but, regrettably, it is not considered of sufficient size to be a sustainable Parish Council on its own. The facilities that those living within the Redhill area are likely to look to supermarkets and other facilities within the Donnington area (Asda, Donnington and service stations, shops in the Donnington parade), its inclusion within the St Georges and Donnington parish area seems appropriate.

The proposed Priorslee Parish Council will have a current electorate of 5,185 and be served by 9 parish councillors across two parish wards Priorslee East and Priorslee West. this delivers better electoral equality than the original proposal.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Priorslee East	TPP	6	3374	562	-2%
Priorslee West	TPR	3	1811	604	5%
Total		9	5185	576	

ST GEORGES AND DONNINGTON

The communities of St Georges and Donnington share a common identity of being older established communities in the borough with similar needs, demographics and identity. As such it is proposed that a parish council is established to serve these two communities which will be reflective of the identity and interests of the community.

The arrangements for the proposed St Georges and Donnington Parish Council, are a current electorate of 12,759 served by 17 councillors across 3 parish wards. The

three parish wards will be Donnington, St Georges and Red Hill. Red Hill has a distinct identity to the other two areas both by geography and by way of it being a community in development. The variance in the electorate per councillor ratio in Red Hill is forecast to rapidly alter as the planned development is built out. Whilst there were mixed views on the merits of merging these two communities, on the whole, there was support for the proposal.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Donnington	WDG, WMH WDO, WDE	8	6075	759	1%
St Georges	TSE, TGK, TSW TPS, TSG, TSP	8	6094	762	1%
Red Hill	WMM	1	590	590	-21%
Total		17	12759	751	

TIBBERTON & CHERRINGTON

It was proposed that the current boundary arrangements for Tibberton & Cherrington be retained. Whilst there were some comments about this proposal as part of a wider submission on other proposed areas, no consultation responses were specifically focussed on this proposal. On this basis, and in view of the criteria for community governance, it is proposed that the current boundary arrangements will be retained with the Parish Council area comprising 804 electors represented by 6 councillors in a single unwarded parish – this is a reduction of two councillors against the current arrangements.

Parish ward name	Polling District	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Tibberton & Cherrington	WEE	6	804	134

This proposal is based upon the guidance around councillor numbers. In addition, past election experience indicates that Tibberton & Cherrington is an area with limited elections to appoint their councillors with most vacancies being filled through co-option.

WELLINGTON

It is proposed that Admaston and Bratton are incorporated into Wellington Town Council from Wrockwardine Parish Council. The rationale for this proposal is community identity and cohesion. Admaston and Bratton are an extension of the urban community of Wellington, whilst the other part of the existing Wrockwardine Parish is rural. The residents of Admaston and Bratton look to Wellington for the provision of services including schools, medical and dental services and shopping. There is a clear change in identity between Admaston and Wrockwardine which can be seen when travelling from the estate-type development of Admaston towards the village type settlement of Wrockwardine.

In addition, the Lewis Crescent area of Wrockwardine is also proposed to be incorporated into Wellington Town Council to bring co-terminosity with the Borough boundaries. In addition, residents in the Haygate Fields development look to Wellington for the provision of services rather than to the village of Wrockwardine. Transport links between the Haygate Fields area are more connected to Wellington than to Wrockwardine and see residents from Haygate Fields traveling through Wellington to reach Wrockwardine.

Although there were some mixed opinions on some of the proposed changes, these proposals received some support through the consultation. It is considered that these proposals will also provide effective and efficient governance arrangements, support strong community identity and cohesion reflecting the more urban character of these areas.

The proposed Wellington Town Council would have an electorate of 20,294 served by 25 Councillors in 5 town wards. These wards are aligned with the Borough Council wards for the area.

Ward Name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Arleston & College	WAR, WAO	6	5181	864	6%
Shawbirch & Dothill	WSD, WSB	6	4557	760	-6%
Ercall	WGE	3	2452	817	1%
Haygate & Park	WHZ, WHW, WHP	7	5620	803	-1%
Admaston & Bratton	WAA, WAB	3	2484	828	2%
Total		25	20294	812	

WROCKWARDINE WOOD, TRENCH & OAKENGATES

As these two communities share a common identity of being older established communities in the borough with similar needs and identity. As such it is proposed that a parish council is established to serve these two communities which will be reflective of the identity and interests of the community.

Whilst not unanimous, there was support for these proposals within the submissions received through the second phase of consultation.

The proposed Wrockwardine Wood, Trench & Oakengates Town Council will have a current electorate of 10,992 and be served by 15 parish councillors across three parish wards Oakengates & Ketley Bank, Wrockwardine Wood North and Wrockwardine Wood South.

Ward Name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors April 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Oakengates & Ketley Bank	TOE, TOO, TOB (part 88%),TOT	7	5518	702	2%
Wrockwardine Wood North	TWR, TWT	7	4732	670	-3%
Wrockwardine Wood South	TOW, TOH	1	742	730	6%
Total		15	10992	689	

APPENDIX C: ADOPT PRE-EXISTING PARISH ARRANGEMENTS

CHETWYND & EDMOND

Following consultation and the strength of feeling regarding community identity, it is proposed that the pre-existing parish arrangements for Chetwynd and Edgmond are retained.

Chetwynd

The current parish arrangements in Chetwynd consist of a total electorate of 481 and is represented by 7 parish councillors. This is based upon a review of the guidance for councillor numbers which states in one set that an electorate of up to 500 should have 7 councillors and the other guidance which gives a range of 5 – 8 councillors for up to 500 electors. It still provides for good electoral representation.

Some comments suggested bringing properties at Summerhill into one Parish Council area rather than split between Chetwynd and Edgmond as is currently the case. Whilst there is sympathy with this position and it would make for reduced elector confusion, the number of electors that would move would be so small as to make it unviable as a polling district.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Chetwynd	WEG	7	481	69

Edgmond

The current parish council arrangements for Edgmond consist of a total electorate of 1100 and is presented by 13 parish councillors in a single parish ward:

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Edgmond	WED	13	1100	85

THE WEALD MOORS

Further to consultation and the strength of feeling regarding community identity, it is proposed that the pre-existing parish arrangements for Eyton, Preston and Kynnersley are retained. These are:

Preston upon the Weald Moors Village

Preston currently has a parish meeting, it serves an electorate of 228 (polling district WEP)

Eyton on the Weald Moors

Eyton currently has a Parish Meeting. The electorate for this area is 72 (polling district WEM)

Kynnersley

The current arrangements for Kynnersley Parish Council consist of a total electorate of 149 and is presented by 5 parish councillors. Whilst this makes for generous representation, there is merit in having 5 councillors to ensure that, during any absence periods, the Parish Council is able to maintain quoracy so that it can transact business.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Kynnersley	WEZ	5	149	30

WATERS UPTON AND ERCALL MAGNA

Following consultation and the strength of feeling regarding community identity, it is proposed that the pre-existing arrangements for Waters Upton and Ercall Magna are retained.

Waters Upton

The current arrangements for Waters Upton consist of 1063 electors represented by 6 councillors in a single parish ward. This is the same as is currently in place.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Waters Upton	WEY	6	1063	177

Ercall Magna

The current parish arrangements for Ercall Magna consist of 1456 electors represented by 13 parish councillors across two parish wards. Whilst the level of councillor numbers sits slightly outside the range set out in guidance, it provides for good electoral equality across some vastly different sized parish wards.

Parish Ward Name	Polling Districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
High Ercall	WEW, WER	11	1244	113	1%
Roden	WWW	2	212	106	-5%
Total		13	1456	112	

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX D CONSULT ON NEW DRAFT PROPOSED PARISH ARRANGEMENTS

GREAT DAWLEY, LAWLEY & OVERDALE, MADELEY TOWN COUNCIL, THE GORGE

Further to the phase two Community Governance Review consultation and the strength of feeling regarding community identity in Aqueduct, Little Dawley, Horsehay and Lightmoor, the Committee requested at its last meeting for consideration to be given to any alternative proposals regarding this area.

Having looked at the criteria for community governance reviews, revised proposals have been developed which the Committee may wish to consider and, as appropriate, seek further views through additional consultation. These revised proposals have consequential impacts on the proposed parish arrangements for The Gorge, Madeley Town Council and Lawley & Overdale.

Horsehay & Lightmoor, Aqueduct and Little Dawley

This proposed parish would include Aqueduct, Little Dawley, Lightmoor and Horsehay and would include the Lightmoor parish ward that is currently in The Gorge Parish. It would exclude the Small Hill Parish Ward which it is proposed would be within the proposed revised Lawley & Overdale Parish.

If the Committee were to seek further consultation on this proposed parish, it is suggested that views are also sought specifically on the name of this parish if it were to be adopted.

Given the significant variance between electorate in each polling district, it is difficult to reach a councillor number which provides good equality of representation and it is considered that, having looked at the available guidance, the 'least worst' option in respect of representation is the best outcome.

The proposed Horsehay, Lightmoor and Aqueduct Parish Council would have an electorate of, 6,789 represented by 9 parish councillors across 4 wards.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Aqueduct	TDY	3	2168	723	-4%
Little Dawley	THA	1	794	794	5%
Lightmoor	THC	2	1003	502	-34%
Horsehay	THZ	3	2824	941	25%
Total		9	6789	754	

Great Dawley

This revised proposed Great Dawley Town Council would primarily be based on the existing Great Dawley Town Council with the addition of the following streets (part or all of) from Lawley & Overdale parish. This is not an exhaustive list, with the map at Appendix E showing the detail of the proposed boundary)

- Cambridge Close
- Dawley Bank
- Grange Farm Rise
- Hill Fold
- Concorde
- Croft Fold
- Milners Court
- Wakeley Drive
- Cemetery Road
- Milners Lane

The revised proposed Great Dawley Town Council would have an electorate of 9,073 represented by 14 councillors across 4 parish wards.

Ward Name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Dawley	TDX, TDP, TDA, TDZ	5	3287	657	1%
Doseley Road	THB	1	331	331	-49%
Malinslee	TME, TML, TMG, TMH (part 33%)	7	5065	724	12%
Trinity	THD	1	390	390	-40%
Total		14	9073	648	

Lawley & Overdale

The revised proposed Lawley & Overdale Parish Council would be primarily formed from the existing parish arrangements with the following proposed changes:

- The inclusion of Small Gate area and Lawley Gate (TLS polling district).
- That the following, part or all of, are moved to Great Dawley Town Council (this is not an exhaustive list, with the map at the end of this appendix showing the proposed boundary):
 - Cambridge Close
 - Dawley Bank
 - Grange Farm Rise
 - Hill Fold
 - Concorde
 - Croft Fold
 - Milners Court
 - Wakeley Drive
 - Cemetery Road
 - Milners Lane

The revised proposed Lawley & Overdale Parish council would have an electorate of 9539 presented by 18 councillors across 5 parish wards.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Lawley Common	TLB, TLS	5	3086	617	16%
Lawley East	TLL	5	2513	503	-5%
Lawley West	WLL	1	542	542	2%
Overdale & The Rock	TOY, TOX	5	2743	549	4%
Town Centre	TMH (part 66%)	2	655	328	-38%
Total		18	9539	530	

Madeley Town Council

The revised proposed Madeley Town Council would primarily be based on the existing arrangements with the addition of the Nightingale Walk parish ward from the current Dawley Hamlets Parish Council. This proposal for Nightingale Walk is predicated on community identity with the A4169 Queens Way acting as a hard boundary. This proposal would enhance coterminosity between borough ward boundary and parish boundary.

The revised proposed Madeley Town Council would have an electorate of 12,938 with 17 councillors across 4 parishes. It is clear, from the table below that the Academy Ward (Polling District TIH) results in a very unbalanced electoral ratio. Having looked at all options, without increasing councillor numbers significantly to the extent that they would be far outside the range contained in guidance, it is difficult to remedy this situation (see next page).

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Academy	TIH	1	219	219	-71%
Cuckoo Oak	TMB, TMC	5	3977	795	5%
Madeley Village	TMA, TMD	5	3723	745	-2%
Woodside & Nightingale	TWP, TWO, TWL	6	5019	837	10%
Total		17	12,938	761	

The Gorge

The revised proposed Gorge Parish Council would be primarily formed from the existing parish arrangements with the key change being that the Lightmoor parish ward would become part of the proposed Horsehay & Lightmoor Parish Council. This proposed change is predicated on community identity as it is consider that there is not a shared common identity between The Gorge and Lightmoor. This proposal would enhance coterminosity between borough and parish boundaries.

The revised proposed The Gorge Parish Council would have an electorate of 2,199 with 8 councillors across 2 parish wards. This is in line with guidance on councillor numbers and provides for reasonable electoral equality.

Parish ward name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Coalport & Jackfield	TIR, TIO	2	512	256	-7%
Ironbridge Gorge	TIB, TIG	6	1687	281	2%
Total		8	2199	275	

BROOKSIDE, STIRCHLEY AND HOLLINSWOOD & RANDLAY

The Community Governance Review phase two community consultation found considerable opposition to the creation of a proposed The Nedge Parish Council which would have been created from the merger of the existing Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council and the existing Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council. In response to this phase two consultation finding, the Committee asked for further proposals in relation to this area. This was with a view to the need for parish and town council arrangements to deliver effective and efficient governance. The recent spate of councillor resignations from Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council may be considered to indicate that the arrangements need to be reviewed.

Furthermore, in past Borough reviews, there has been a variety of views around the best arrangements to adopt in relation to this area and lower electoral registration makes it difficult to identify the optimum arrangements.

Nonetheless, the Committee has a number of options to consider:-

- Proposal one: retain the existing Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council and the Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council;
- Proposal two: create two new parish councils; one for Brookside and the second for Stirchley and Hollinswood & Randlay;
- Proposal three: create two new parish councils; one for Brookside and the second for Stirchley with the existing Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council remaining in its current form;
- Proposal four: create two new parish councils; one for Hollinswood and the second for Randlay with the existing Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council remaining in its current form.

Proposal one: retain the existing Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council and the Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council;

Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council

This proposed Parish Council would retain the existing arrangements and have an electorate of 4,361 served by 12 parish councillors in a single unwarded parish.

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Hollinswood & Randlay	TTR, TTO	12	4361	363

Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council

This proposed Parish Council would retain the existing arrangements and have an electorate of 7,136 served by 13 parish councillors across 3 parish wards.

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Brookside	TBR	5	3043	609	11%
Holmer Lake	TTH	1	343	343	-38%
Stirchley	TTT, TTS	7	3750	536	-2%
Total		13	7136	549	

Proposal two: create two new parish councils; one for Brookside and the second for Stirchley and Hollinswood & Randlay;

The proposals set out below would deliver good electoral equality and would also aim to reflect shared character of the respective areas with the South Telford estate area of Brookside being given its own Parish Council to reflect that area.

Brookside

This proposal is based on the creation of a parish council that is formed from the Brookside community as defined by Brookside Avenue and then extends northwards including properties to the south of Stirchley Road such that it is bounded by the Town Park.

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Brookside	TBR	5	3043	609	-1%
Stirchley Road	TTT (part 75%)	2	1273	636	3%
Total		7	4316	617	

Stirchley and Hollinswood & Randlay

This proposed parish council would see an area of Stirchley combine with the existing Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council. This area would, in general, be bounded by Stirchley Road (although it would include a small number of properties to the south of Stirchley Road at the north end of the recreation area) and include Tadorma Drive, Holmer Lane, Wroxeter Way and Boscobel Close in the Holmer Lake area.

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Hollinswood & Randlay	TTR, TTO	7	4361	623	4%
Stirchley & Holmer Lake	TTT (part 25%), TTS, TTH	5	2820	564	-6%
Total		12	7181	598	

Proposal three: create two new parish councils; one for Brookside and the second for Stirchley with the existing Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council remaining in its current form;

Brookside

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Brookside	TBR	9	3043	338	2%
Stirchley	TTT (part 75%)	4	1273	318	-4%
Total		13	4316	332	

Stirchley

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Stirchley & Holmer Lake	TTT (part 25%), TTS, TTH	9	2820	313

Hollinswood & Randlay

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Hollinswood & Randlay	TTR, TTO	12	4361	363

Proposal four: create two new parish councils; one for Hollinswood and the second for Randlay with the existing Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council remaining in its current form.

Stirchley & Brookside

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Brookside	TBR	5	3043	609	11%
Holmer Lake	TTH	1	343	343	-38%
Stirchley	TTT, TTS	7	3750	536	-2%
Total		13	7136	549	

Hollinswood

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Hollinswood	TTR	7	2246	321

Randlay

Parish ward name	Polling district	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Randlay	TTO	7	2115	302

LITTLE WENLOCK, WROCKWARDINE AND RODINGTON

The proposed parish arrangements which formed part of the phase two consultation for the Community Governance Review included a proposal to create a Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine and Rodington Parish Council. This proposal brought the pre-existing Little Wenlock and Rodington Parish Councils together with the Wrockwardine Parish Council excluding Bratton and Admaston as it is proposed these will become part of the revised Wellington Town Council.

The phase two Community Governance Review consultation found significant opposition to the proposal to create a parish council that included Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine and Rodington. A core objection was the size of the proposed parish and a lack of a cohesive identity. It is acknowledged that The Wrekin creates a significant natural barrier between Little Wenlock and Wrockwardine. In response and reflecting the changes that would be brought about as a result of the proposed changes to Wellington Town Council, the Committee may want to consider an alternative proposal which would see the existing arrangements for Little Wenlock retained and a new proposed Wrockwardine and Rodington Parish.

Little Wenlock

The proposed Little Wenlock Parish would retain the existing arrangements with an electorate of 436 and 5 parish councillors in a single unwarded parish. This would be in line with the guidance on councillor numbers and would provide good electoral representation.

Ward Name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat
Little Wenlock	WWD	5	436	87

Wrockwardine & Rodington

The proposed Wrockwardine & Rodington Parish Council would have an electorate of 1918 with 8 councillors across two parish wards which would deliver good electoral equality and reflect the rural village identity of this area.

Ward Name	Polling districts	Seats	Electors August 2025	Electors per seat	Variance
Wrockwardine	WWC	5	1163	233	-3%
Rodington	WWR, WWN	3	755	252	5%
Total		8	1918	240	

This page is intentionally left blank