

Chetwynd & Edgmond

Email Responses – 13

I object to the proposed merger of Chetwynd and Edgmond Parish Councils. Edgmond. I cannot see any need for this. Edgmond Parish Council is working very well with members who live in, work for and enjoy the village which is one of the finest villages in Shropshire. Please record my objection to this proposal

I am writing this as a member of the public living in the parish of Chetwynd, although I am a [REDACTED] this is not a formal objection written from the council's point of view. •First of all the name Chetwynd is historic and the lands of this Historic Park are worth cherishing - I see a value in keeping that history alive within the council's Governance arrangements as part of the requirement to reflect the identity and interests of this rural parish. Our hamlets and groups of houses are scattered in the parish but we need to realise their needs are as important as a large university village like Edgmond. Our council members do not charge expenses, the precept is low and for the few services we receive I think that is acceptable. The apparent wish to upload the costs of the larger town facilities onto adjoining parishes with a small population when we already pay our rates to support those facilities is not really an reasonable move. •A merger with Edgmond PC would mix two very varied areas, one which is rural, large in area but small in population with another which has a large village almost conjoined with Newport, a university, together with the hamlets of Adeney, Edgmond Marsh, Caynton, Calvington and Sidlington together with housing requirements for new builds that would not fit easily in with Chetwynd's very rural area and lack of services. With regard to the provision of services (there is no public transport from Chetwynd or Sambrook), many homes are not on main drains, more vehicles from new homes would also add to the difficulties of safe driving on the lanes - the closure of the A41 has certainly proven this to be a negative and sometimes dangerous experience for horse riders, cyclists and indeed car drivers. •The proposed diminished number of councillors for the present area of Chetwynd in the a new parish council would mean that there would be little support for our local community views to be listened to let alone upheld by councillors whom we would not know or feel able to approach, there is also the point that our councillors would not be familiar with the needs of Edgmond's parish needs. I disagree strongly with this proposal.

I have completed the online survey with these comments, but when I submitted the form it didn't say, 'thank you for your submission', so in case it didn't go through, please see my comments again below: I vehemently object to the merging of Chetwynd and Edgmond parish councils. As stated in the information pack, NO representation was made for merging these two parishes, and yet TWC has taken a centralised decision, with no thought to its negative implications for our community. Edgmond is a competent and tight-knit village, led by active parish councillors who care deeply about maintaining its rural setting and vernacular, its community safety and facilities, its historical importance and of course, its long-held traditions. Edgmond is thriving, with an agile and cohesive local community. We do not want or require, people from outside the village having a say in our future plans. There is no evidence of need to merge with Chetwynd and this decision represents zero benefit for our village. TWC are simply making a change for changes sake, which could have negative consequences. If the proposal goes ahead it risks diluting our community and will forever alter the way in which Edgmond is governed. Edgmond parish councillors are obviously against this decision and TWC should not undermine their authority or diminish their decision-making powers within Edgmond village.

am writing to make some comments regarding the boundary review and in particular the possible proposal to amalgamate Edgmond and Chetwynd Parishes. A merger between Edgmond and Chetwynd Parish seems wholly inappropriate. Edgmond Parish serves a well defined area and works well with the community. Incorporating Chetwynd will only serve to dilute the relationship between the Parish and the tight knit Edgmond Community; the Parish will lose focus and its highly proactive approach will be put at risk. Parishes ideally need to serve clearly defined localities and be local if they are to be effective. They should not move towards being more strategic bodies covering large areas. I see no value in the merger, and can only see it harming the capacity of Edgmond Parish to respond to local issues and keep up the excellent work it does. On a much more specific note, it seems entirely sensible to bring Summerhill fully into Edgmond Parish. There are four houses in Summerhill; two houses currently in Edgmond and two in Chetwynd. Our house is in Edgmond [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] All four houses relate closely to Edgmond

I am writing to make some additional comments regarding the proposal to merge Edgmond and Chetwynd Parishes. I have picked up that there is a concern that in smaller parishes too much money may go on administration. That may be an issue in some cases. In which cases it is surely primarily for local residents to address that issue and seek opportunities for joint working with other parishes where appropriate. But to think of smaller parish councils as primarily service delivery vehicles is to misunderstand their roles. Smaller parishes play a key issue in identifying local issues and following these up with appropriate bodies in a way that most individuals would struggle to do. That role is better performed in natural communities and not in larger entities. My very clear view is that amalgamating Edgmond with Chetwynd will significantly damage the capacity of the parish council to perform this role. It will also be deeply unpopular with local residents. The result of any amalgamation will be a lot of political pain for no gain, and a less effective parish council

In my opinion such a merger is not to be recommended. Edgmond is a well established and manageable area and this is very likely to be lost if the merger proceeds. However I do agree that the addition of the houses at Summerhill to the Edgmond Parish would benefit both areas.

Please find below our response to your request for views on the above proposal :We are opposed to expanding the parish boundary other than by including the Summerhill properties exclusively. Bigger is not better with regard to community spirit and wellbeing. It is hard to see how reducing the number of Parish Councillors will result in better governance for local residents, who will feel disenfranchised and more remote from decision-making bodies. Local engagement is achieved by keeping administrative bodies rooted in the local community so that their representatives remain in close personal touch with residents. Thriving communities should be the ultimate aim of any Council and they result from creating a sense of ownership amongst citizens; residents will not be invested in their own locality if its boundary is perceived to be distant.

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary changes to Edgmond by combining with Chetwynd Parish. Edgmond is a large rural parish which is served by an active and efficient parish council. Chetwynd is, reportedly, one of the largest parishes in England but is sparsely populated. Combining Edgmond and Chetwynd parishes will create an enormous parish which will do little or nothing for the communities they serve but will create an enormous amount of extra work for the VOLUNTEER councillors. According to parish council rules meeting must last no longer than two hours unless there are extenuating reasons. Currently parish council meetings in Edgmond go perilously close to this time frame, and do, on occasions, go beyond it. It is my opinion that a parish council meeting which properly represents both parishes will not be properly completed within a two hour time frame if issues are to be properly debated. This, obviously, means that councillors will be spending a great deal more of their voluntary time debating matters for both parishes. The T&W Community Governance Review comments in several places that merging parishes will help to create the most appropriate community

identity. It also makes reference to promoting community cohesion. I fail to understand how making parish councils larger will promote community cohesion. If anything merging parishes will help to cause division. The Review further states that boundary changes will be reflective of the identities and interests of the community, be effective and convenient. I must question how combining two large parishes can possibly develop community cohesion. I fail to understand how combining two large parishes can result in a parish council that is effective and it will be far from convenient to try to do so. Community identity will be diluted under the development of even larger parishes and will be divisive and difficult to administer. We all know that establishing a large committee to solve a problem is far too unwieldy and issues are more easily resolved with smaller committees. As, it is claimed, T&W council recognises that the development of strong, sustainable communities it should recognise that creating new, larger parishes will lead to a more difficult and time consuming administration which is, after all, run by a VOLUNTEER force of parish councillors. Volunteers cannot be expected to apply more of their VOLUNTARY time to administering larger and more unwieldy organisations. Creating larger parishes will lead to division especially when assets of one parish may be greater than the assets of another. If developing larger parishes in the Edgmond area is deemed necessary then it would be more sensible to combine Chetwynd with Cherrington and Tibberton. The reasons for this is are that activities in Tibberton are attended by people from Chetwynd and Cherrington and children from these parishes attend Tibberton primary school. My final point revolves around comments that, currently, many parishes do not hold elections and are dependent upon the cooption of councillors, if they can find sufficient volunteers. It must, therefore, be clear that cooption takes place where there are insufficient numbers of candidates to force an election. I fail to understand the logic behind your statements indicating that combining parishes would somehow automatically create a new cohort of residents, who currently not want to become parish councillors, to suddenly come forwarder election to a post that is going to demand a larger time commitment. I contend that residents interested in becoming parish councillors would have done so already. Combining parish councils will hardly encourage more residents to come forward.

I wish to strongly object to the suggestion that Edgmond and Chetwynd Parish Councils should merge. The only thing in common is the B5062. All the children from Chetwynd attend Tibberton School and there is no community cohesion between the two parish councils. To make one parish out of these two would be a nonsense, less councillors and more area to cover. We currently have councillors deliver the Parish newsletter but the area covered would then include those in Chetwynd and none of the information on the newsletter would be of interest to those who live in the Chetwynd parish. The only benefit to this review is the residence that live in Summerhill (4 houses) would be for the boundary to change to include those houses in Edgmond area as they currently have to travel to Sambrook to vote, whereas they could walk to the village hall in Edgmond. I also want to make representation about the two recent meetings held on Wednesday 2nd July and Thursday 3rd July. At the Wednesday meeting the TWC representative wanted to hear individual complaints but took NO NOTES whatsoever, seems to be 'lip service' to the consultation process. On Thursdays meeting; one of the 'newly elected' (which makes a mockery of the whole process) member suggested that if only a few people complained that the rest are happy. This member was reminded of the conditions for the review and therefore shows that ■ had no idea what is expected from ■ appointment. ■ suggestion of 2% objecting and 98% not saying anything means they agree with the recommendations, is not the case, just because they all don't turn up at meetings does not mean that the few that have turned up are only speaking for themselves, most are representing the views of their parishes. TWC would not be able to cope if everyone sent in emails about the nonsense of this review; that looks more like a table top paper review has been completed as the parishes all have different needs and communities.

I would like to object to the merger of Edgmond Parish with Chetwynd Parish as I believe it will impact Edgmond's unique identity.

In relation to the proposed merger of Edgmond and Chetwynd parishes, I object to this moving forward. In short I believe it does not meet the needs of the locality especially when you are focusing on community identity, governance effectiveness, and local participation in planning. I make the following points in support of why the merger should not take place; Edgmond's historical and community identity: Edgmond has a long-established identity since the 1600s, supported by its architectural diversity and the Edgmond Conservation Area created in 1981, and its parish records date back to 1898, emphasizing its distinct community history. Strong community engagement: The Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan referendum in 2018 had a high turnout of 45.2% with 94.2% voting in favour, exceeding average neighbourhood plan participation rates which is indicating strong local cohesion and engagement. Concerns about the merger: Merging Edgmond with Chetwynd would create inconsistencies, as Edgmond has a made neighbourhood plan while Chetwynd does not, leading to governance anomalies until 2028. Housing needs survey distinction: A 2025 housing needs survey finalised this month focused solely on Edgmond, showing 23.4% community participation, further differentiating it from Chetwynd and complicating unified planning responses post-merger. Limited shared community features: Besides transportation routes and some local landmarks, Edgmond shares few common elements with Chetwynd. The parish of Edgmond has no shared history or commonalities that link the two parishes. The parishes of Tibberton & Cherrington have more in common with Chetwynd as the children use Tibberton CofE primary school. Governance effectiveness criteria: The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and related guidance stress that community governance must reflect local identities and be effective and convenient, criteria that Edgmond currently meets. This is borne out by the participation and abilities of the local councillors to achieve this with its electorate. The merger would enlarge the parish and at the same time reduce the number of councillors, which ultimately would reduce the effectiveness of the ability to engage with residents. No clear benefit from merger: The document argues there is no evident need or material gain from merging Edgmond and Chetwynd, noting that Chetwynd has closer ties with Tibberton & Cherrington, and that current fiscal arrangements and administrative processes would be burdened by the changes. Communications: The current arrangements for communicating with our residents apart from electronic means using our own website and local social media platforms is supplemented with a newsletter delivered quarterly to all residents. This is to ensure inclusivity of our elderly population which applies to 16% of Edgmond's 1,079 electors as of January 2025 that are not engaged with online communications. In addition our councillors deliver these newsletters by hand to every household. Should the merger take place the continuance of the newsletter across the larger parish with fewer councillors would potentially cause the collapse of this method of engagement in the distribution of information to our elderly residents. In relation to the CGR proposal for the properties at Summerhill being absorbed into Edgmond Parish, I agree with this proposal as outlined below. Support: I have as [REDACTED] to the parish council spoken with the residents in Summerhill, who have expressed the wish for this minor change to take place. As they have requested and receive our newsletter due to the fact they are closer to Edgmond than Chetwynd. Also, they expressed annoyance in relation to having to cast their vote, at Sambrook Village Hall, 5 miles away, where they could vote at Edgmond Village Hall which is only 0.9 miles away. In addition, I have spoken with Chetwynd parish council's, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who has voiced [REDACTED] support for this minor change at Summerhill and I am led to believe that Chetwynd Parish Council submitted to the CGR a letter of support for this minor change to their parish at phase 1 of this consultation. Information: I believe currently Chetwynd Parish Council have not responded to the second consultation of CGR proposals and I would ask that if this were the case that the panel do not consider this lack of response as an indication that they are in agreement with the merger. Chetwynd Parish Council meets only quarterly and their next full council is scheduled for the 14th July 2025 right on the consultation deadline and may not give them the opportunity to respond. <https://chetwyndparishcouncil.gov.uk/> Yet again from conversation I know that the [REDACTED]

does not agree with the proposed merger of Chetwynd with Edgmond under the proposals outlined in the CGR second consultation. I hope the panel will consider these views.

Proposed merger of Edgmond Parish Council with Chetwynd Parish Council. In consideration of the creation of new parish councils Section 94 of the 2007 Act applies in relation to those recommendations. Where upon it places principal councils under a duty to recommend that a parish should have a council in parishes which have 1000 electors or more. Edgmond is well over this initial threshold for the second part of section 94 and as demonstrated below as a parish council it fulfils the aims of achieving the more direct participatory form of governance through the 1,079 electors (Jan 2025). The parish of Edgmond has organically developed since its creation as an ecclesiastical parish in the diocese of Lichfield (1600's) and is considered of sufficient size to justify adequately by the number of councillors in post to represent local people's views and aspiration for a safe and reasonable quality of life. Edgmond has its own sense of identity which are both historical adaptive to changes as the properties in the village cover a significant range of architectural styles as it has developed over time. This development has been marshalled through the sense of protection of its identity enhanced through the creation of the Edgmond Conservation Area in March 1981. The most recent significant development of a neighbourhood plan undertaken by the Parish in February 2018, Telford & Wrekin Council's Cabinet agreed to proceed to a referendum on the draft Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan. The significance of the referendum for the making of this neighbourhood plan, which was made on 31st May 2018, was the number of electors that participated in this ballot. 2. Community Governance Review – Edgmond Parish Council Response – July 2025. A significant percentage of Edgmond's population voted in the referendum with a turnout of 45.2% with 94.2% of the votes cast in favour of the Neighbourhood plan. (Electorate: 1151 Ballot Papers Issued: 520). The significance around Neighbourhood Plan turnout, follows an analysis of the first 206 Neighbourhood Plan referendum poll results (2013 - 2016) which was conducted by 'Planning' where they found that there were more than 336,000 votes cast in neighbourhood plan referendums. Of these, 87.1 per cent have been in favour. The average turnout was 32.4 per cent - just slightly lower than the 34 percent achieved in the very first poll made in Upper Eden valley area in Cumbria on 8th March 2013. As this shows our turnout of 45.2% is a high participation rate and it is also worthy of note that the referendum for the Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan was not conducted in conjunction with any local election ballot and yet again demonstrates our residents' engagement in local matters with a clear indication of what should be catered for in matters pertaining to the parish and clearly demonstrates the level of community cohesion that exists. The three complimentary factors above, demonstrate a cohesive community with a strong sense of identity which the proposed merger with Chetwynd would effectively deplete rather than enhance. Amongst the three recommendations in the second phase of the TWC CGR documentation in relation to Chetwynd and Edgmond, is the consolidation of the two parishes being merged into one. This process would create a series of anomalous outcomes. These would be brought about as follows, where by one section of proposed new parish would have a made neighbourhood plan, whereas the other would not. This anomalous arrangement would continue to exist at least until 2028. In support of the Edgmond neighbourhood plan review, we commissioned a housing needs survey in February 2025 which was undertaken by "Community Resource" utilising an independent housing officer supplied by the charity; Action With Communities In Rural England (ACRE). The survey and subsequent reports provisions was designed to address the housing needs for Edgmond and not those of Chetwynd and this would also serve to add to the differentiation in any potential merger and decision-making processes in response to applications. The imbalance in these approaches to planning decisions would create an inconsistent response to the local planning authority from the newly created parish and the lack of consistency consultation responses due to the anomalies could potentially disadvantage the parish through the proposed changes by the merger. The participation in the housing needs survey highlighted again the readiness of our community to participate in the survey, demonstrating the community cohesiveness,

resulting in a 23.4% response, whereas this type of survey would provide a normative return of 10-11% participation in such surveys. Apart from the historical and geo-political factors that have forged Edgmond as a parish council since its creation in 1894, the parish has access to all Parish Council minutes dating back to 1898. As a community there are very few common elements that we share with Chetwynd, other than the current boundaries that exist along long established arterial routes for transportation, these are the A41 and the B5062 and the Deer Park Show ground and the unclassified road that serves Chetwynd church from off the B5062 at the northern boundary of the village of Edgmond.

3. Community Governance Review – Edgmond Parish Council Response – July 2025

Section 93 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 Act requires principal councils to ensure that community governance within the area under review will be:

- reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area and
- effective and convenient in the form of community cohesion

In the guidelines provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government Local Government Boundary Commission for England in their Guidance on community governance reviews published March 2010, continues in sections 53 and 54; when considering the criteria identified in the 2007 Act, principal councils should take into account a number of influential factors, including:

- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion and
- the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish

54. In considering this guidance, the impact on community cohesion is linked specifically to the identities and interests of local communities. Size, population and boundaries are linked to both but perhaps more specifically to community governance being effective and convenient. If the community governance review concludes that the existence of the parish council reflects community identities and provides effective and convenient local governance, the need to merge these two parishes does not appear to apply, nor is there any apparent material gain for the community or efficiency savings in the proposed merger. The current fiscal arrangements for precept would not impact population nor the local authority as these processes are well established and a change would result in additional administrative burdens on the local authority. The proposals do not appear to consider the common features, or lack of them, in the suggested changes to merge the parish boundaries. The current Chetwynd parish has more in common with Tibberton & Cherrington, due to the fact the children in Chetwynd Parish share the same primary education facility in Tibberton. Edgmond St Peter's CofE school is oversubscribed and there would be limited social cohesion brought into effect with the proposed merger of Chetwynd and Edgmond around this aspect of normal social interaction in a community. Our original submission to the CGR was to adopt 4 houses at Summerhill and this was reflected in one of the proposed suggestions. We continue to welcome that particular part of the proposal for change under the recommendations under phase 2 of the CGR. This has been discussed with the affected residents who are in full support of this proposal.

4. Community Governance Review – Edgmond Parish Council Response – July 2025

Communication is already stretched when delivering newsletters to all the houses in Edgmond Parish. In order to work with the community in Chetwynd Parish, communication would be a further important point to consider. The main B5062 road cuts through the proposed merged parish and would make the distribution of newsletters very difficult due to the size of the proposed new Parish. We were pleased to hear that the members of the Boundary Review Committee confirmed that their decision would be based on the views of the people in the parishes. It is clear when speaking to Edgmond residents that they are not in support of the merger with Chetwynd Parish, although there is no opposition to the inclusion of Summerhill properties within the Edgmond boundary for community cohesion and interest.

For the attention of the Boundary Review Committee

EDGMOND / CHETWYND

This proposal is again an attempt to streamline whilst not understanding how by creating a larger parish area (when bringing together two existing parish councils) is not reflective of their community identities or their respective interests. It is my belief that this could lead to less community engagement and a total lack of community cohesion, which is precisely what all rural parish

councils thrive upon and value. As a [REDACTED] at Edgmond Parish, I have heard the councillors and members of the community when discussing the recommendation and they clearly agreed with Chetwynd Parish Council, in that logistically this merger would be unworkable. The local councillors and residents do agree, however, that bringing the properties at Summerhill into Edgmond Parish will benefit those residents and the reduction in the number of Parish Councillors is understandable and worthy of consideration. CHETWYND My colleague, [REDACTED], as the [REDACTED], recently reported to Edgmond Parish Council that it is the opinion of Chetwynd Parish Council that any such consideration of this merger is unacceptable, as there are no shared community interests, cohesion or identity and the recommendation would be a disadvantage to their community. Therefore, it is my view that if the Committee believes that the Chetwynd community would benefit from a merger, then consideration should be with Tibberton & Cherrington – these have shared boundaries and the community of Chetwynd has some cohesion and interests in common with Tibberton & Cherrington, not least in that the children attend Tibberton Primary School. I would have thought that this should have been an option for consideration as it would bring benefits to the community.

Survey Responses - 57

As per the parish councils views I feel that Edgmond should not merge with Chetwynd. However consideration should be given to the few houses in Summerhill merging with Edgmond to save residents having to vote at Sambrook.

I DO NOT SUPPORT the proposed changes to the parish boundaries of Edgmond and Chetwynd. Edgmond is a large rural parish and is ably administered by its parish council. Combining Edgmond with Chetwynd will create one enormous parish which, it seems to me, will be extremely large and unwieldy. Much has been stated in advisory notes about maintaining identity and enabling parishes to be supported. Creating an even larger parish will hardly lead to maintaining and/or creating community identity. Administratively where would such a parish council meet? it is proposed that Edgmond consists of 8 councillors and Chetwynd of 4. This does not lend itself to developing equitable and fair distribution of attention and policies. Enlarging parishes will create problems rather than resolving them. Of course the underlying message that has not been mentioned is one of easier administration for T&W council. One change that would probably help parishioners would be to incorporate the two houses in Summerhill into Edgmond parish. This would then give a parish boundary coinciding with the B5062 at the end of Newport Road.

I strongly disagree in combining Edgmond Parish Council with Chetwynd. This will make a large Parish council, that due to the nature of the many villages involved, will dilute the focus on local issues and will result in a reduction in the problems being addressed. In fact I believe that the idea of combining the parish's is precisely to dilute the challenges that the local communities require of Telford and Wrekin council. "If it's not broken don't fix it!"

I am commenting on Dawley Hamlets As a pensioner I strongly disagree with this proposal. A lot of people are retired in this area. Just because someone lives in a nice house doesn't mean they are well off . We have already been hit with the loss of heating allowance by this government I have voter [REDACTED] all my life There are other alternatives

I would not support the merging of parish councils between Edgmond and Chetwynd. Both parishes have distinct characters and needs, the settlements within them are distinctly different. Edgmond is already an extensive parish council area and adding to this would create further challenges to addressing local matters.

Dawley hamlets not on the list. Why not ? Dawley hamlets is a well run cost effective parish Council Local democracy is very important. Must be protected.

Appalled at the proposed change and hence abolishing the very well set up Dawley Hamlets Parish.

I'm not happy with the proposal of been moved from Dawley hamlets to greater Dawley council. This is typical Telford and Wrekin council money grabbing scheme.

I do not support the proposed merger of Chetwynd and Edgmond parish councils. There is no connection between these very different and distinct areas. The current arrangement works well and is understood by local people reflecting the communities that people live in. No benefits or reason for the proposal have been put forward. The proposal seems to have been plucked from thin air at a late stage in your review process and is not well publicised locally.

The merger of Chetwynd and Edgmond parishes is not logical as the two parishes have nothing in common. Unlike Chetwynd and Tibberton where the children in Chetwynd go to school in Tibberton. What worries me is that assets which Edgmond Parish Council have worked hard to raise money for from Edgmond residents eg the children's play area may not be supported by new councillors living a long way from these assets and not using them. Also it makes no sense to have the residents of Summerhill in Chetwynd parish. Knowing these residents as friends, I know that they use the facilities in Edgmond village and feel part of Edgmond. It would make more sense to have Summerhill in Edgmond Parish not Chetwynd.

No change I have lived in Sambrook for over fifty years and can see no reason to change what has worked for that time. The government should leave alone.

I disagree with the proposed to merge the 2 parish councils The 2 parishes have very little in common and are split by the A41 Edgmond is a location of specific historical interest and needs to retain its identity

I would like the parishes to remain separate.

Chetwynd Parish Council unanimously voted to reject a potential merger with Edgmond. There would appear to be no benefits to either Parish for a merger. Chetwynd is a large, in geographical terms, very rural Parish with little infrastructure. Edgmond is a, in population terms, much larger Parish, including a University, a shop, bus service, school and two public houses and is in a housing development area. Chetwynd has 9 councillors spread out throughout the Parish hence personal representation is very valuable in this large area. Should a merger go ahead any issues between the two Parishes would be resolved by 8 Councillors for Edgmond vs 4 Councillors for Chetwynd. Hardly a level playing field. As Chetwynd Councillors are unpaid and do not claim expenses there would be no cost savings for T and W should a merger take place. Chetwynd has already agreed to a boundary change for Edgmond to take in Summerhill as the residents were reluctant to travel to Sambrook to vote. Conversely Chetwynd Councillors would almost certainly have to travel to Edgmond for council meetings of which Edgmond have a least 6 meetings per annum compared to 4 for Chetwynd.. From general conversation, should the merger take place it is my understanding that no Chetwynd Councillors would stand for re election. This is not an official Parish Council view but one that is influenced by conversations and discussions at Parish meetings.

If in the future Edgmond and Chetwynd were to merge, the next phase would be merging with Newport.. No one wishes this to ever happen so, please leave well alone. Edgmond have competent councillors who work well for the community and take time to listen to what is being said. The parishes have worked well in the past and there is no reason to alter the situation.

I do not agree with the proposal to merge Edgmond Parish with Chetwynd. The current Edgmond Parish Council works most effectively because the Parish is the ideal size for adequate oversight and efficient consultation of its residents. Residents feel connected to the decision-making process at present and are fully engaged. This would not be the case if the boundary was extended as suggested. A feeling of belonging to the local community is essential to the health and wellbeing of citizens. Bigger is not better when dealing with communities.

Edgmond Decisions need to be made by Representatives from the Area not people that have no allegiance to it Just leave alone

I am not in favour of merging Edgmond and Chetwynd parish councils. We have a close knit community here in Edgmond and councillors who work very hard for the benefit of our community. This works very well and shouldn't be altered as it may be detrimental to Edgmond.

I am concerned about the suggested merger of chetwynd and Edgmond parishes. As a resident of Edgmond for nearly 40 years I feel important that Edgmond keeps its own parish status. It would be wrong for someone from Chetwynd to be able to join our parish council and influence decisions about Edgmond without actually living in the village. Please keep our Edgmond parish separate.

The merger of Edgmond with Chetwynd makes no sense. Edgmond could end up with councillors not elected by residents in Edgmond who could make decisions with no knowledge of Edgmond village life. Please do not go ahead with this non sensical suggestion.

Edgmond parish council consist of local people. People who care passionately about the village and its residents. The village is a very close community where we all take an interest. I believe this proposal could damage everything that has been built up within our village. Having memebbers on a parish council from out of area with no interest in the village woule ensure backward steps in everything this council has achieved.

I believe that the merger of the 2 parishes, will be to the detriment of both parishes. So believe they should stay as they are.

Edgmond has a strong village identity with a thriving community spirit with a parish council and village hall committee who work hard for the residents it should not merge with Chetwynd as this would dilute the parish identity and loyalty.

I vehemently object to the merging of Chetwynd and Edgmond parish councils. As stated in the information pack, NO representation was made for merging these two parishes, and yet TWC has taken a centralised decision, with no thought to its negative implications for our community. Edgmond is a competent and tight-knit village, led by active parish councillors who care deeply about maintaining its rural setting and vernacular, its community safety and facilities, its historical importance and of course, its long-held traditions. Edgmond is thriving, with an agile and cohesive local community. We do not want or require, people from outside the village having a say in our future plans. There is no evidence of need to merge with Chetwynd and this decision represents zero benefit for our village. TWC are simply making a change for changes sake, which could have negative consequences. If the proposal goes ahead it risks diluting our community and will forever alter the way in which Edgmond is governed. Edgmond parish councillors are obviously against this decision and TWC should not undermine their authority or diminish their decision-making powers within Edgmond village.

I do not agree with the proposed merge as I feel that we could have people making decisions for our village that don't have a vested interest

It do not agree with the merger of Edgmond and Chetwynd as this will dilute the core identity of Edgmond and those features that make Edgmond a treasured local village with it's own unique identity. If adopted; in the May 2027 elections, due to the boundary changes, a resident from Staffordshire could stand as a councillor and have a seat on the Edgmond parish council, with no vested interests in Edgmond whatsoever. Our current parish councillors do a great job and understand Edgmond and its needs. A merger will not be good for our village.

I am against the merger of additional parishes joining Edgmond Already we don't get heard or the parish council doesn't advocate enough on our behalf against unnecessary infill housing development, it would be even worse if more local autonomy was lost. To save our village we need a voice and no further developments outside the 3yr plan

Edgmond currently has a strong community spirit where the current parish council care about what happens within the village from helping with the introduction of speed signs to working alongside new housing development companies to ensue that new houses are built within keeping of the village. By merging with other parish councils the village will loose this close net community, care and spirit.

I am not in favour of the proposed merger of Edgmond and Chetwynd. My belief is that the two are different in their requirements and nature and the communities of each would not be best served by merging.

I am resident of Dawley Hamlets parish council. *unable to choose this option from the tick box menu Dawley Hamlets foster a close-knit community atmosphere, where residents know their neighbors and participate in local events and initiatives. Community centers and local projects thrive, providing spaces for social connection, support, and civic engagement, which enhances overall well-being and reduces social isolation. This such event is the Aqueduct memorial walk. We are also content with out council tax rates and as a community this work well for us. The majority of our residents are having stable jobs and actively contributing the the parish budget.

Chetwynd is a small Parish that plays a big part in decision making for planning etc. We are much smaller than Edgmond and we shouldn't have to be over shadowed by a larger parish. As a resident of Edgmond for 18 years but now a resident of Chetwynd (Sambrook) for 33 years I don't want decisions being made by people that do not live in the parish I don't want to pay for a larger parish and loss identity

Chetwynd is a smaller Parish than Edgmond and we would be the losers in all decisions, including financial affairs, it would be an unfair move. Chetwynd should remain on their own and look after our local people and facilities. I strongly object to the merger and my Wife does too.

I am against the proposed merger due to concerns about funds for our parish being used to fund services elsewhere

I object to the proposed merger of Chetwynd and Edgmond parishes. I do not wish for people currently outside our Parish to make important decisions for us such as housing, where and how our precept is spent and a range of other important decisions. Chetwynd has very few services, Edgmond on the other hand have many. Chetwynd may therefore subsidise Edgmond. We live in Sambrook and believe it will affect every household in Chetwynd, if we have to merge with Edgmond.

This would not be beneficial to our rural residents and would take away huge benefits from our rural parish. This is a narrow sighted proposal that will cause huge problems long term.

I have lived in Sambrook for 18 yrs. I love to live here and don't want to be combined with Edgmond.

It is my opinion that merging the two councils would be DETRIMENTAL to both. Chetwynd Parish Council (of which I am a long standing member) is working on behalf of a very rural community - it is the eyes and ears for that community, but as such has a small precept as it has only a few services (like lighting) that it is fiscally responsible for. The Council has a firm grip on the rural nature of the community it supports and will involve the parish on any issues it feels are extraordinary, such as the planning application for a very large house behind the garage at Stanford Bridge - a public meeting was called. Edgmond, on the other hand, has a different set of concerns being a large population in a small area and including Harper Adams University. In my opinion a merger would detriment the Chetwynd populous because the focus would remain on Edgmond with its population density. A final thought, Chetwynd is one of the largest Parish Councils in the country by area so our Councilors have a lot to look after - I would hate to see that diluted.

Reject - the larger parish will give residents of the individual area's less representation.

I disagree with the proposed merger of the two parishes. This is on the grounds of the fact that it will adversely affect Chetwynd residents in respect of reduced funding and therefore services.

Edgmond has more amenities than Chetwynd, so it is therefore extremely likely that Chetwynd residents will be subsidising and paying for amenities they have no means of using. This also means their precept is liable to rise substantially for no benefit whatsoever. Chetwynd has differing needs to Edgmond, being almost totally rural, whereas Edgmond is almost suburban, despite being classed as a village. People who have no connection with an area are going to make decisions on things such as housing, building projects etc with no knowledge or regard to the effects it will have on the residents of that area. Bigger is not necessarily better.

As a resident of Edgmond I am not in agreement to the creation of a single parish council for Edgmond and Chetwynd. The existing arrangements within Edgmond has served the parish well, which is the sole purpose of a parish council. Hence, I see no reason to change. As far as local communities are concerned the existing warding arrangements are as such to represent and serve the people in that small community. If there is a combination of parishes this defeats the purpose of local parish councils and dilutes the representation of each community. The reduction in the number of councillors surely mean that the local community is not represented very well in terms of their local concerns or issues. Each ward currently has sufficient council representation for their needs. As I disagree with the combination of the two parishes I disagree with the change of name. Edgmond should remain as at present.

Do not agree for any merger. No need. Larger parishes will swamp any needs for the smaller parishes.

Edgmond should stay a parish by itself. I'm against the merger. The village has its own identity and issues that are very different to Chetwynd.

I oppose the merger as I feel the needs of Sambrook & Chetwynd residents won't met when combined with Edgmond which is a much bigger & totally different village to Sambrook.

Chetwynd is a very different community to Edgmond. We are much smaller population, and a more rural parish. If we get merged with Edgmond, we will have decisions made that are dominated by Edgmond's interests and ignore the specific needs of the Chetwynd community. There is a risk that decisions will be made largely by people living outside our parish.

It is proposed to join Chetwynd and Edgmond Parishes councils together to make one new one. Chetwynd parish do not accept this proposal when it was discussed at our Parish council meeting (110% against the proposal) We could see know advantage to Chetwynd. We could not see any cost saving by reducing the number of Councillors as they are not paid any salary, also do not think there are any saving t be made by amalgamating the two. As the council the majority of counselors will be Edgmond it is quite likely that Chetwynd will just be left on sde when a vote is taken in the new format [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Chetwynd Parish Council

I do not believe that bigger is always better. In a parish with a scattered population a local person is far more likely to understand the needs and problems within that area. indeed sometimes the larger council as needed to be educated about the existence of this area being within their remit. First of all the name Chetwynd is historic and the lands of the Historic Park are worth cherishing - I see a value in keeping that history alive within Telford council's Governance arrangements as the requirement to reflect the identity and interests of this parish are rural. A merger with Edgmond PC would mix two very varied areas, one which is rural, large in area but small in population with another which has a large village almost conjoined with Newport, a university, several hamlets - Adeney, Edgmond Marsh, Caynton, Calvington and Sidlington together with housing requirements for new builds that would not fit easily in with Chetwynd's very rural area and lack of services. With regard to the provision of services (there is no public transport from Chetwynd or Sambrook) more vehicles from new homes would also add to the difficulties of safe driving on the lanes, the recent closures of the A41 has certainly proven this to be a negative and sometimes dangerous experience. The proposed diminished number of councillors for the present area of Chetwynd in the a new parish council would mean that there would be little support for our local community views to be upheld by councillors whom we would not know or feel able to approach.

I am NOT in favour of merging Edgmond council with Chetwynd. The proposed boundary changes would mean that someone from Chetwynd (Staffordshire) could be a member of Edgmond parish council but with no vested interest in the community of Edgmond. We need Edgmond council to be represented to persons from Edgmond only.

As a Resident of Edgmond Parish I write to raise my objection to the merger of Chetwynd and Edgmond under the new TWC proposals. Our current Edgmond Parish Council as bee in existence for a number of years and works well to serve the needs of Edgmond residents. I can see no advantage to either parish with a merger.

Object to any planned change. I see no advantage only confusion to any planned change.

I feel the proposed merger would not be beneficial to either parish. The councillors at present are more connected to their parishes than they would be to a new combined parish. There could also possibly be conflicts of interest in certain situations , resulting in councillors opposing other councillors depending on where they live and which parishes they represented previously.

Chetwynd Parish Council has considered the proposals set out in the Community Governance Review. The council would prefer to make no changes to the current arrangements for Chetwynd and made the following specific observations: 1. We see no overall benefit in merging Chetwynd Parish with Egmond Parish and therefore support the proposals in Option 1 to retain the existing arrangements for Chetwynd Parish, with the exception that the boundary at Summerhill is amended so that all properties at Summerhill are moved into Egmond parish. 2. At the last local elections in 2023, all our current 9 seats were filled without the need for co-option. The proposal to reduce the number of councillors to 5 achieves nothing but to reduce the active participation of parishioners in the running of the parish council. We propose that for Chetwynd Parish, although the current councillor to elector ratio is low by reference to national guidelines, the number of councillors remains at 9.

I don't support the merger of Chetwynd and Egmond parishes. They are different places with different identities and geographies so they are best represented by separate councils.

I feel the total parishes offer no services to residents just a job for their friends and should be merged as shown in hand draft recommendations. Bigger parishes with wider representation will offer better services for its residents, my parish hasn't even signed the armed forces covenant what a waste of time they are

I 100% agree with the proposed changes to the boundary that have been put forward by Newport parish Council. We need areas like station road to be included in the Newport parish now as it's long overdue. The changes will better reflect/represent the area. Especially as all those houses in that area will be using Newport council run/owned facilities like the library.

I fully support the proposals. Egmond needs to do more and a merger would help us residents, although it should be guarded to keep community identity and local councillors speaking for their area.

CHETWYND AND EDGMOND Supportive of this proposal. Chetwynd Parish is mostly set in a very rural area with small hamlets and pockets of development such as Blue House Barns, Woodland Heights and Cheney Hill which are more contiguous with Newport or as proposed Edgmond, which will ensure their “semi-rural status”. However, the settlements of Howle, Standford Bridge, Sambrook and Pickstock are more reflective of a rural identity and share similar demographics and identities with Tibberton & Cherrington Parish. Chetwynd Parish, like Tibberton & Cherrington have had limited/uncontested elections. Chetwynd Parish is currently protected within the current local Plan (HO10/11) from development in the rural area, whereas Edgmond and Tibberton are not. During the changes with the revised local plan some of the Chetwynd/Sambrook protection may be lost. The proposal to merge the two parishes should not adversely affect the rural character or identity of the parishes. There is a necessity to maintain the name of “Chetwynd” within any merger.

NEWPORT Supportive of the proposal to extend the Newport Town Council boundary south to include the area bordering on the A518 road, it has long been the aspiration of Newport Town Council to include this area, and as stated in the proposal will provide effective and convenient community governance in this area and reduce elector confusion, and give residents not only of the new development on Station Road, but those of Wright Avenue a clear definition of where and who provide their local service provision (Allotments, Cemetery, Library).