Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote & Church Aston

Email Responses – 1

Telford and Wrekin Community Governance Review 20251. Church Aston Parish Council (CAPC) response to the proposed merger between CAPC and Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Council (CA&WPC).2. CAPC has spent a great deal of time in assessing the proposed merger and its likely impact. In so doing we have identified a number of key factors that must be satisfied to ensure that any new form of administration is beneficial to all constituent communities. Those key factors are:The new administration can continue to provide a first-class service for all residents throughout the new merged areas.That there is a synergy between the constituent Parish Wards that in combination strengthens and supports the effect of each pre-existing council.That there is a history and proven track record of a close working relationship between the merged pre-existing councils.That the structure of the resultant merged Parish Council is equitable and fairly represents the electorate of each of the Parish Wards.We have considered and addressed our submission in terms of the key parts of the proposed merger:The proposed merger between CAPC & CA&WPC.CAPC supports the proposed merger between CAPC and CA&WPC. We believe that a merger between our PCs is a positive development that would bring our collective resources and skills together and best serve the collective and similar needs of our combined communities going forward. It would continue to build on the close and trusting relationship that we have developed with our neighbours over a number of years.b. The proposed warding arrangements.CAPC agrees with the proposed wards arrangement. Namely:- Church Aston Ward and Chetwynd Aston Ward.We believe that this warding arrangement will maintain the rural and individual identities of each of the current parishes whilst enabling each ward to be separately represented.It is important that each of the Parish Ward boundaries mirrors their current parish boundaries. The internal ward boundary must follow the current connecting parish boundary between Church Aston and Chetwynd Aston. This importantly maintains and enforces the individual identity that is very important to residents from each of the constituent parishes. Attached is a copy of the proposed layout boundary map for Church & Chetwynd Aston Parish Council. We have annotated it with the required ward boundary (red line). c. The number of councillors proposed in respect of the Parish Wards.We support the general principle that the number of councillors for each of the parish wards should be a fair representation determined by the number of electors that they represent. Especially as each of the parish wards as proposed are of a similar geographical and rural layout. Though it is noted that the proposed ratio of electors per seat is significantly different for each of the parish wards (i.e. 153 for Church Aston & 122 for Chetwynd Aston).(i) Church Aston Ward:We request a review of the councillor numbers as proposed for Church Aston Ward. The proposal is for 7 councillors serving this ward that is based on current (April 2025) elector numbers of 1072. We believe this assessment is flawed as is non-compliant with the Governance Review ToR. Paragraph 7 of the ToR requires that the Council must consider the electoral forecasts over the next 5 years when determining electoral arrangements for the parishes.Our initial submission to the review was a proposed reduction from our current 10 councillors to 8. This assessment was based on the forecast numbers that were provided by TWC within the CGR Information Pack.The projected electorate for Church Aston as provided in the Information Pack is 1282 electors and our proposed councillor numbers were based on that projection.Additionally, the Published Local Plan includes a proposal for significant development within Church Aston Parish. The proposal is for the build of 211 homes. This would increase the total housing stock within Church Aston by 40%, with a corresponding increase in elector numbers. The developer has committed to starting delivery of the development well within the next 5 years. This would increase the forecast electorate numbers for Church Aston to 1500+ within the next 5 years. We believe that this projection should form a significant part in the assessment of the required councillor numbers.We therefore strongly request that the proposed councillor numbers for the Church

Aston Ward be reconsidered and that our initial case for 8 councillors should be accepted and adopted. This would equate to 187 electors per seat based on the projected number 0f 1500 electors.(ii) Chetwynd Aston Ward:There are no forecast electorate numbers within the CGR Information Pack for Chetwynd Aston as a stand- alone ward. The current elector numbers (April 2025) of 366 is the only number available for consideration. Whilst there is a significant difference in the ratio of electors/councillor between Church Aston Ward and Chetwynd Aston Ward, even more so when factoring in the projected numbers as identified for Church Aston Ward as at 3c(i) above, it seems reasonable that Chetwynd Ward should operate with the proposed 3 councillors. This is in recognition of theChetwynd Aston Ward being predominantly rural.d. The number of councillors proposed in respect of the new Parish Council.Based on the assessments we have made on the Parish Ward Councillor numbers as at sub-para. 3c it follows that we propose a total of 11 Councillors for the new merged council – Church Aston Ward 8 seats and Chetwynd Aston Ward 3 seats.e. The proposed name of the merged Parish Council.It is important that the name of the merged PC is recognisable as representing clearly defined community groups. Residents within the defined administrative area must be able to readily identify with the name of their PC. It is also important that the ordering of the name represents the relative size (by elector numbers) of the constituent wards.We therefore propose that the name of the new PC should be:CHURCH & CHETWYND ASTON PARISH COUNCIL. This is a name that clearly and as concisely as possible is identifiable with the Parish Wards that it represents. It is a title that is recognisable by all residents from Church Aston & Chetwynd Aston as it mirrors the shared community and social hub that is Church & Chetwynd Aston Village Hall.We are aware of and concur with the decision taken by CA&WPC in proposing the same name for the merged PC.

Survey Responses - 10

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 chages to the boundry that have been put forward by Newport parish Council. We need reas like station road to be included in the newport parish now as it 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 facilitys like the library.

I fully support the proposals. Edgmond needs to do more and a merger would help us residents, although it should be warded to keep community identity and local councillors speaking for their area.
I do not agree that you are going to abolish the Dawley Hamlets Parish. It's not broken so leave it as it is. When I ticked the box to get to this page there was no box to tick for Dawley Hamlets Parish have you already deleted it?
The Clerk gave a presentation on the proposals by Telford & Wrekin Council to merge Church Aston Parish Council and Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Council into a new Parish Council called Church & Chetwynd Aston Parish Council. Members discussed the Community Governance Review at length and focused the deliberations on: • Education • Crime • Elections • Health and social care • Access to services, including community facilities and shopping • Shared values on environment, development planning and community cohesion. Members felt that though we would have liked to remain as the current form of Parish Councils, there were benefits to both communities by becoming as one. It was therefore RESOLVED to support the proposals for the new Church & Chetwynd Aston Parish Council, subject to the conditions that the warding for this new parish should be: Church Aston (5), Chetwynd Aston (4) and Woodcote (1) to better represent the new parish as a whole and ensure that their is fairer representation.
The proposed merge of station road into Newport is the only sensible option. Those ling in wright avenue, Hutchison Gate development and the current site being developed behind screwfix will benefit from being in Newport South ward. Residents use the services provided by Newport Town Council, including the library. If the merge doesnt take place, i would like to see a fee charged for services used in Newport for the residents who don't pay towards Newport Town Council via their council tax. I support the boundary change.
See uploaded document.
I fully support the proposals for muxton, donnington & St. George's, the Weald moors and church Aston and Chetwyn Aston although I do think Horton should stay with Hadley

Generally supportive. The extension of the Newport boundary to include the recent housing & industrial developments to the south and up to the A518 seems very reasonable. However it seems strange that the NI Park industrial estate is not included in the Newport area as most people regard it as a part of the town. The argument that the boundary can not go beyond the bypass does not hold up to scrutiny as the Mere Park development is in Newport but beyond the A41 bypass boundary.
As a resident living on the boundary between Newport and Chetwynd Aston parishes [redacted]), I thoroughly support the extension of Newport parish's southern boundary. The area affected "feels" like Newport, is now increasingly urban, and if you talk to people who live there, they say they live in Newport, not Chetwynd Aston. It also makes sense for borough and parish wards to align. I also support the move of Admaston and Bratton to Wellington parish. I visit reasonably frequently, and they feel as much part of Wellington as neighbouring Shawbirch does. Indeed it shares services with Shawbirch and it is difficult to know where Admaston ends and Shawbirch begins. Very much in the orbit of Wellington, and will be beneficial for residents to have a say in the running of the town.