The Weald Moors

Email Responses – 3

I am a resident of Eyton Parish and wish to respond to the proposals in the CGR Review 2025.I strongly object to the proposal to merge Eyton Parish into a larger Weald Moors Parish Council on the following grounds:•We are an effective and efficient Parish Council. We meet regularly and respond to local issues as they arise. We are a strong and cohesive community. We may be small in population but we have a strong community identity. We have no connection with, or community identity with, the Parishes of Preston, Kynnersley or Horton. Geographically they are 4 – 5 miles away and there is little social connection between Eyton and these parishes. We just happen to be rural areas in roughly the same geographical area, but we are very different in character. My understanding is that Preston and Kynnersley Parishes do not feel any community Identity with Eyton Parish either!•Eyton Parish Meeting does not raise any precept and we do all our work voluntarily. We should not be penalised for this. We hold regular Parish Meetings which are well attended, we hold regular social events and arrange work parties to do work that needs doing in the Parish. We do not want or need to raise money from our residents. This would change if we are part of a larger Parish Council where all the other parishes already raise a precept. We would be paying for the needs of residents far from us, in the Parishes of Kynnersley, Preston and Horton.•As part of a larger Parish Council we would lose our voice and be effectively disenfranchised. As one Councillor of 6 or 8 Councillors (as proposed) we could have very little influence and our needs will not be represented at Parish or Borough level. Disenfranchisement is not a good result for the residents of Eyton Parish.•As the new development proposed in the Local Plan proceeds, Eyton Parish want to be involved in a positive way to influence the development that is likely to proceed over the next 10 years. We will be unable to do that as part of a larger Parish Council, where the other Parishes are not directly affected by the development, as Eyton Parish clearly is. I feel that this again disenfranchises the residents who will be most directly affected by the new development.•There was no evidence following the consultation responses at Stage 1 of the CGR that anyone resident in the Parish proposed this merger. As you clearly state in your consultation publicity that the proposals that have been made are based on feedback from the community, I would seriously contest this statement in relation to the proposals for Eyton Parish.As a result of the above points I strongly object to the proposal to include Eyton Parish in a new Weald Moors Parish Council.

For the attention of the Boundary Review CommitteeKynnersley, Preston Upon the Weald Moors & Eyton on the Weald MoorsThe proposal to abolish the Parish Meetings of Eyton on the Weald Moors and Preston on the Weald Moors to create a new Weald Moors Parish, with Kynnersley Parish Council could have been considered more favourably had it been thoroughly investigated and within a very brief submission contained in the Community Governance Review information pack (updated May 2025), the approval of the revised TW Local Plan would mean a further more succinct CGR to include Eyton on the Weald Moors to incorporate the considerable development expected in this area of the Borough.As it stands, however, the community of Eyton has no direct road or walking links to either Preston on the Weald Moors or Kynnersley, they share no similarities or interests nor is there any community cohesion.Eyton on the Weald Moors has a very small, but dedicated electorate and a Parish Meeting which has operated extremely successfully and democratically and they have a strong desire to continue their current administration arrangements – not only because they work, but because there is no suitable alternative at this moment in time.I, therefore, strongly support their request for the community of Eyton on the Weald Moors to be excluded from any recommendations in this current review.Having listened to residents of both Kynnersley and Preston Upon the Weald Moors, they do accept there are similarities in their character and landscape. They already work collaboratively on local issues, especially regarding planning, highways, safety and both communities use Preston School and Kynnersley Village Hall.It was a positive outcome to have

a Preston resident join Kynnersley Parish Council – this brought about an opportunity for each community to share interests and understand needs and a relationship has already started to be formed. They engage in activities and events – I am told that this has happened for a good number of years.Both communities are now accustomed to working in partnership and if the Committee is minded to agree a merge, it should be between Kynnersley and Preston, only. The only condition I would add to this, on behalf of the communities is that the six or eight councillors should be elected from two equal wards, with the same number for Kynnersley as Preston. Any other option would be met with disagreement and would not be in the best interests of a good working relationship moving forward. For similar reasons, it would be important to retain the historical names of Kynnersley & Preston on the Weald Moors Parish Council.

Eyton parish is very smallbut we do have a strong community spirit. Kynnersley and Preston have much larger popultions and are seperated from yton by the unpopulated area of the weald moors. Eytons future problems are likely to come from the urgab areas to the south/west, west side of eyton, these potential problems are unlikely to me of concern to kynnersley or preston yetthey will have the power over these concerns. Eyton village is so small it is possible to know its views of the vast majority of the residents. at the age of 82 it is not important to me but i know they wish to remain independent.

Survey Responses - 32

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 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

I recognise the importance of effective local governance. Any changes to the current Town and Parish Council boundaries should, first and foremost, be designed to strengthen local representation, improve accountability, and maintain the unique identities and historical ties of the communities within the borough of Telford & Wrekin. For any proposed changes to the current arrangements, the Council should explain clearly how those changes would address each of those points. Telford & Wrekin Council should engage further with residents, community groups, and other local stakeholders before any final decisions are made. My comments on the Council's draft proposals have been informed by conversations and correspondence with Town and Parish Councillors, Borough Councillors, and other interested parties. The Community Governance Review is more extensive than it needs to be at this time. With the latest version of the draft Local Plan still to be published, a more targeted review to accommodate significant new developments in Muxton and Priorslee would be sufficient, while a more comprehensive review could be conducted following the publication of the final version of the Local Plan. Waters Upton and Ercall Magna – I support maintaining the current boundary and governance arrangements. Both communities have a distinct identity and are geographically separated by a significant distance. Muxton – I support the proposal for a separate Parish Council. The boundary of the new Parish Council should be the same as the Borough Council ward boundary. The new developments on Donnington Wood Way and at the top the Redhill should be included in the Muxton Parish boundary to include the new residents in the existing community. The extra care facility on Donnington Wood Way was approved with community facilities for Muxton included in the planning application. Donnington Wood Way, Redhill and the A5 are the obvious and logical boundaries of the new Muxton Parish as opposed to the arbitrary proposed boundary which divides the existing community. Priorslee – I support the proposal for a separate Parish Council. Donnington, Wrockwardine Wood, Trench – I do not support the current proposals. Donnington and St. Georges are older, well-established communities. Residents of Donnington will associate more with Wrockwardine Wood and Trench, whereas residents of St. Georges will identify more with Oakengates. The proposals as currently drafted would split Wrockwardine Wood in two, with Summer Crescent, Cockshut Piece and The Nabb being moved into St Georges. A more logical proposal would be to merge Donnington (excluding Redhill) with Wrockwardine Wood & Trench; alongside the creation of a single Oakengates and St Georges Town Council which would better reflect community identities. Eyton, Preston, Kynnersley and Hadley & Leegomery - Wealdmoor Parish Council should include Kynnersley and Preston. Horton should have its own Parish Meeting as it is a predominantly rural community which is clearly distinct from Hadley and Leegomery. Eyton should retain a Parish Meeting due to its distinct and isolated rural location. Apley Castle should not be included within the Hadley and Leegomery Parish, as it is a distinct community with little connection to Hadley & Leegomery. Wellington Town Council - Admaston, Bratton & Shawbirch should have their own Parish Council, separate from Wellington, as they constitute a distinct urban area with shared local services. Wrockwardine and Little Wenlock – these villages are geographically separated by The Wrekin and are long established distinct communities. They should each have their own Parish Council. I know that Little Wenlock Parish Councillors have serious concerns about the proposals to merge the Parish Council with other areas, as they feel that would create a loss of identity and influence for their community. I am told that, in response to a recent survey carried out by the Parish Council, a majority of Little Wenlock residents supported keeping a separate Parish Council for Little Wenlock. Rodington – this village should retain its own Parish Council. I would welcome further opportunities to contribute as the Community Governance Review progresses.

I agree with the proposed Weald Moors Parish on the basis that when any revised Local Plan that allows significant development within Eyton upon the weald Moors area as part of this plan is excluded from the Weald Moors Parish. I further agree with a Weald Moors Parish if each Church retains control over it's ongoing independance over local government controls and also that common community areas and villiage halls retain their own governance. In order for this to work local warding arrangements should be adopted within the framework of the new Parish.
I do NOT agree with the merging of the parishes Kynnersley & Preston with Eyton. The villages of Kynnersley and Preston face very different local challenges to Eyton. Eyton has a huge new build development programme so issues of infrastructure, local amenities, local connection will dwarf those of Kynnersley & Preston
I believe an overhaul of the parish councils is needed. Eyton is represented by only a few village members [redacted]. An opportunity for others to be welcomed and able to be part of a larger [redacted] group can only be for the greater good of the community.
I don't believe that Weald Moors Parish should include Eyton. In the 6 years I have lived in the village of Preston I have never visited Eyton but have visited Kynnersley on a regular basis. Many of the Kynnersley residents travel through the village of Preston in travelling to Telford and surrounding areas and therefore they have an understanding of the village of Preston and events which take place in the village. I appreciate that the boundary of Eyton parish are adjacent to Kynnersley but I believe that is the only connection the two villages have.

Having read the recommendations from the first consultation, it appears that the bulk of our views have been disregarded. Given Kynnersley sent in 32 responses, (pro rata one of the highest) these were not expressed in the subsequent conclusions and recommendations you provided. However, you did include a view from someone not connected to the village who was able to have their identical copy and pasted views included for each area in your report! We specifically said we do NOT wish to join with other areas, and do NOT wish to be called anything similar to Weald Moors Parish - which you have already adopted for the area drop down selection of this very survey! You appear to have cherry picked answers, ignored others and not given a true representation of what has been said by residents. We know from recently holding and attending several residents meetings the strength of feeling against your proposals and would like our views to be taken into consideration this time - not ignored as T&W has a history of doing for residents in rural areas. I would repeat that I do NOT agree with joining up/lumping together areas of Telford which have NO similar characteristics or issues. For example Kynnersley if it had to join another parish, would be a good size and geographical fit for a link with Preston, but NOT in addition to Eyton, Wappenshall, Horton, or Wheat Leasowes. Taken together this would create a huge urban development given the level of housing you intend to go ahead with according to the Local Plan. All of these areas already have different issues to Kynnersley, which has a conservation area within it. The very rural character of the village would thus be eroded and we would have very little 'voice' to raise matters which would be relevant to our small village, but maybe not for other areas. It simply does not make sense, other than potentially for T&W to lump together areas to make it easier for them to manage. It did not inspire confidence, when at a recent drop in session at Waters Upton, [redacted] gave the stated objective of the review was to provide 'more economy and efficiency' which is distinctly NOT what a CGR is meant for: Having reviewed the March 2010 Local Government Boundary Commission guidance for CGRs, it would appear there are many sections which T&W are not compliant with, not least community cohesion and consultation: S23 - recommendations ought to improve community engagement, better local democracy resulting in more effective and convenient delivery of local services - NOT just about economies or efficiencies for T&W! S33 - they should take account of any representations received and ensure CGR reflects the identities and interests of the community - NOT ignore them S45 - build on existing parish structure to improve its capacity to deliver better services and represent the community's interests - NOT replace them S50 - views of communities and inhabitants are of central importance - NO - we are being ignored S59 - Parishes should have their own sense of identity - NO - the village will be swallowed up to form a huge urban area with totally different planning considerations and regulations S95 - CGR must take account of any representations received and evidence that recommendations made would meet the criteria of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 - as it stands the first recommendations do NOT meet this criteria S99 - CGR should be conducted transparently - NOT the case as recent reasonable FOI Act requests have been denied saying information is readily available on T&W website - NO the information requested CANNOT be found on the website, hence the requests were made S110 - Naming of long established parishes - Some history for housing and the village church can be traced back to the 16th century - LA will wish to take account of these preferences in deciding the name of the parish, but may NOT make any recommendations about alternative style, it is for the Parish Council to revolve if it should have an alternative style - NO - you have already decided what we shall become! S114 - Grouping needs to be compatible with the retention of community interests - it would be inappropriate for it to be used to build artificially large units under single parish councils - NOT the case, the proposed area is absolutely massive and completely out of character with the small village that Kynnersley is. S125 - many rural parishes have been in existence for hundreds of years and changes should not upset historic traditions but do reflect changes over time - NO significant population shifts or development within the village to necessitate change or resulted in a different community identity

I would like to have a parish council than a meeting, the same people do the same things and we don't really see any benefit. i know we like low council tax but id sooner pay more to get more local delivered services. i think the weald moors PC would be good although i think the Horton area wouldn't really like to be part of us and should stay wit Hadley.
We were pleased to see that the second iteration of the plan for this area, did not include Horton and the Horton Wood industrial area. We have always viewed ourselves as an essentially rural village in a face to face community. In this manner, over the 47 years that we have lived here in Preston upon the Weald Moors, the Village Meeting has met most of our needs. However, life is much more complicated nowadays and the new residents who have moved into the village have an expectation of service and accountability that needs a more professional approach, and more people taking up responsibilities within a Parish Council. For this reason we think that an amalgamation with Kynnersley parish would serve both communities better into the future. This would be an easy transition for us if Kynnersley was willing, they already have all the procedures of a Parish Council in place, so new Councillors would be at a huge advantage in this respect. The one problem we can see in the second draft plan which incorporates Eyton with Preston and Kynnersley, is out lack of contact with Eyton as place that is physically distant, and a community that we do no know, nor have had any contact with during our time here in Preston. We think that the new Parish should be warded with an equal number of Councillors for Preston and Kynnersley, then hopefully all residents will feel they have an equalty of support and influence.
I wish to register my OPPOSITION to boundary changes propopsed to include Kynnersley. My family and I moved into Kynnersley 27 years ago and have been extremely happy here. The village has it's own character and charm which will be lost forever if the changes were to go ahead. It was a personal choice to live in a small, rural settlement, I have no desire to live as part of a larger community. Councils should not be changed unless they have recognised failures. I can't help but think that by making non Labour areas smaller, it doubles the size of Labour areas - very undemocratic. The information online is extremely lengthy and complicated, simplification would be beneficial to most residents in order for them to give a considered response. Each small village has it's own special characterisics which is why they should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

I strongly object to the merging of Eyton parish with Kynnersley & Preston parishes Although we are the smallest parish by population we are proactive at responding to things that need attending to in the parish. There is a very strong community identity, we regulary hold social events and volunteering activities. We have held working parties to tidy up around the village hall and hold events to raise funds when required. Our officers are unpaid and do not claim any expenses instead carry out work voluntarily because there is a strong sense of community. There is no sense of community identity between Eyton and Kynnersley & Preston which are both 4-5 miles away & we do not mix with them at community events etc. It is proposed that Eyton will have 1 councillor within the new proposed arrangements which is no different except that a precept will be charged and the councillor will claim expenses when it is done voluntarily at the moment, why change that!! Also it is unlikely that they would be able to exert much influence in promoting issues in Eyton within the new parish with 6 to 8 councillors. I would like Eyton to remain as a stand alone parish as it works very well and there is no need to amend that.
This relates to the proposed merger of Eyton on the Weald Moors with Kynnersley and Preston. I see no reason for this merger as none of these parishes are next to each other, the residents of each have no connection with each other and do not attend the same events, churches and share no sense of community. Much of the work that takes place within Eyton is done on a voluntary basis (I myself am working on a new access ramp within the St Katherines church cementary for disabled access), this is the sort of things that local residents carry out as part of the community which I feel would be lost if Eyton loses its own sense of identity.
As a resident of Eyton on the Weald Moors I strongly believe that the Parish should remain unchanged for the following reasons: We are a very proactive parish and respond to issues quickly and involve the whole community in all decisions relating to the parish. We are small, but vocal and active, with a strong sense of community identity which I feel would be lost in such a merger. On that note it is unlikely that someone in Kynnersley for example would have any sense of community with Eyton and the reverse is also true.

After moving here over 10 years ago we have enjoyed the strong community spirit and identity fostered within the parish. Regular parish meetings and emails ensure that all residents are kept up to date and are involved in the decision making process. Although a small population we have a large geographic area that has a strong community identity, fortified by social occasions run by a hard core of volunteers. Our parishioners, who are all volunteers themselves, are highly pro-active and instill a very real sense of pride and caring within the village. My concern is that the Eyton Parish will lose its very essence if merged with any of the other Parishes. We have no community connection with either Kynnersley, Preston or Horton, whose needs differ from our own parish, and who are geographically distant. I also feel our representation of only 1 councilor, on a Parish council of 6 or more, would not allow our councilor much of a voice with which to exert much influence, promote/defend our community issues, and would leave Eyton residents feeling "out in the cold". The Wappenshall SUE development is of major concern to many of the Eyton residents and our council has had a positive consultative relationship with T & W Council and the developers. As the development progresses over the next 10 years or so, I am concerned that any direct influence Eyton Parish may have on this process will be lost if the new arrangement of parishes goes ahead, as Kynnersley and Preston are not affected by the proposals. This again would lead to our community being disenfranchised.

Having attended the Eyton Parish Meeting to discuss Those Two Consultation on the draft proposals I am strongly opposed to the merger of Eyton Parish into a newly created Weald Moors Parish Council for the following reasons: 1) Community Identity: Eyton Parish is a rural community with important industrial heritage and a large number of listed buildings. We have a strong sense of community and cohesion throughout the Parish and we have no geographical links nor community cohesion with Preston, Horton or Kynnersley. As a Parish, we are very proactive in responding to issues & making decisions as a group, and we meet the needs of the Parish through volunteering rather than charging a precept (there is no precept for the Parish). As per the Local Government Boundary Commission Guidance, which states "parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity" the existing arrangements best achieves the intent of the latter provision. 2) Consideration of Feedback: The Council has stated that changes contained in the draft proposals are based on feed back received, as per the Boundary Commission Guidance requires. In the case of the Weald Moors proposal, this is not apparent. Our study of responses received to Phase One consultation finds no support for the merger from Eyton, Preston nor Kynnersley. 3)Representation and Disenfranchisement: Residents are concerned that the Eyton Parish's identity & needs will be subsumed by other parishes in any new arrangement, as it is the smallest of the three. The effectiveness of governance arrangements for Eyton would be martially adversely affected by being subsumed. 4) Interest and Influence over Proposed developments: The Wappenshall SUE development in the new Local Draft Plan will directly affect the residents of Eyton Parish. We want and need to be able to continue and develop its strong, positive and consultation relationship with TWC planners. This direct influence will be lost in the merger as the Kynnersley and Preston are not as affected by the proposals. 5) Boundaries: The current draft Local Plan envisages substantial new housing and commercial development within the southern boundary of Eyton Parish. The intensive developments have an entirely different identity and interest which will be more aligned with the existing built-up area of Telford and not the rural character of Eyton Parish. The Proposal and Rationale section of Appendix A and The Boundary Commission Guidance both confirm that the Council is required to ensure that parishes "reflect community identity and interest" and that they are "viable and democratic units". Furthermore, any grouping needs to be "compatible with the retention of community interests". Clearly the proposed merger does not recognise these attributes with the merger into an artificial and logically incoherent Weald Moors Parish.
I strongly disagree re the amalgamation of wards. I feel we are unique in our issues both existing and looking ahead to the proposed development next to our village. I feel our voice would be lost. Our parish has made great efforts to stay abreast of the developing plans with frequent formal and informal feedback to residents.I would therefore like to register my nonsupport for this proposal.
I am very happy with the representation we have through our parish meeting, the team are well informed and fully represent our unique needs. There is a large proposed development on our doorstep which makes many of our issues re traffic and footfall unique. I do not feel that an amalgamation would benefit our needs. We do not have large community spaces, street lighting maintained by the council an amalgamation would see us paying for services we do not have or would benefit our small cimmunity.

I do NOT support the draft proposal for a new Weald Moor Parish Council merging Eyton, Kynnersley and Preston parishes. A combined parish would not reflect the community identity or interests of Eyton. There is no community cohesion or day to day connection or interaction between Eyton and the larger parishes of Kynnersley and Preston, and Eyton's interests and priorities - especially with regard to proposed residential and commercial development in the southern area of the parish - are different to those of Kynnersley and Preston. There is no material benefit for Eyton in a merged Weald Moors parish and obvious disadvantages in terms of direct representation and practical disenfranchisement. Eyton Parish Meeting is an effective, convenient and viable administrative unit and the current arrangements should be retained.
I agree that the suggested merger of Preston upon the Weald Moors with Kinnersley and Eyton would be satisfactory. Both are historic villages which must retain their unique status , which would be lost if merged with other neighbouring villages. I have lived in [redacted] for almost 50 years now .Many thanks for your kind attention.
As a tiny village we need to retain our identity and voice. By forcing us to join other much larger areas we lose this. None of the other areas you wish to impose on us have conservation areas within their parishes as we do. None have the 16th century history of our village and by amalgamating us with numerous other larger areas which have vastly different issues and problems, our own will just be swallowed up and disappear. The corridor and level of development from Eyton through Wappenshall to Horton will mean an immense area of housing with no similar issues to Kynnersley. This is NOT what we want
Kynnersley voice will be lost. However if this means there won't be a polling station at the village hall and the school that is great news - complete waste. Just keep the hall let the children have their education!
I have lived in the village of Kynnersley for all my life i am now 78 and i want us to stay just as we are not a minority what is wrong that the powers that be have to ruin it leave it alone i wstchef in horror how things have changed and ok i may be old but i am not some silly old fool that has to sit back and say nothing
Firstly, your survey is misleading. There is no Weald Moors Parish - to state such indicates a level of pre-determination. I wish Kynnersley to remain as it is. However, I expect that there is already a predetermined plan to merge Parish Councils and, if this is the case then a merger with Preston could be achievable. There is no community adhesion between Kynnersley and Eyton. There are no links with Eyton, either with transport links or any form of community links - we are totally seperate communities. You state that any decisions made are as a result of feedback from residents. This feedback is listen to residents and act on their wishes.

I want Kynnersley to stay as it is. It has operated as a Parish Council for many years. It has a significant area of land within the boundary and, being a conservation area, has its own special needs.
(Kynnersley* is its own parish council and has already been merged with The Weald Moors - incorrectly and inappropriately!) Kynnersley is a separate village from any of the others around it, dating back hundreds of years from. The surrounding villages, whilst lovely, are inherently different. Whilst this may be an attempt to be more efficient, the core values and identity of this village and others around it are being erased. If the village's views and opinions would be valued going forward perhaps people would be more trusting of the proposed process and be more amenable, however due to past distrust and decisions that have been made that have completely disregarded and ignored our perspectives and opinions, many people are not trustworthy.
The merging of the parish councils would be detrimental to each individual parish. I have grave concerns that any items we would be vocal to any issues we would no longer be heard.
I am against creating a larger Weald Moors Parish Council which includes Eyton. We have lived in Preston upon the Weald Moors since 2005 and I have never visited Eyton village. Had we any connections with them, I might not have had any objections to their inclusion. I have no objections to staying as we are as a Parish Meeting . Likewise I have no objections to joining forces with Kynnersley as we have strong links with their community and church congrgation. Should the two villages become Weald Moors Parish I favour 3 representatives from each village in the make up of the council. What I cannot foresee is a willingness from the residents to take up these council positions easily.
Preston is a village with a broad range of housing and wide age range of residents. We are essentially a rural community and love being so. In the last couple of years there have been a small number of social events between the villages of Preston and Kynnersley which have brought the two parishes closer together. In contrast there has been no contact with the village of Eyton. Many of the residents of Kynnersley travel through Preston to get to their village and therefore some of the issues affecting Preston, also affect Kynnersley. For these reasons I believe that a new Parish made up of Preston and Kynnersley only would work for residents of both areas.
I do not support the amalgamation of Kynnersley Parish council with Preston and Eyton. There is more than enough issues within Kynnersley that need the attention of the Parish councillors time, By expanding the area to include Preston and Eyton would expand councillors workload and reduce the effectiveness of dealing with issues in a satisfactory way
I would support linking with Kynnersley.

I believe it is in the best interests of the local parishes of Eyton upon the Weald Moors and Kynnersley that they should not be merged into a single Parish.

Community Governance Review 2025

Consultation Response Form

In your submission, please comment on:

- the proposed arrangements for Town and Parish Councils;
- the warding arrangements for Town and Parish Councils;
- the number of councillors proposed in respect of Town and Parish Councils;
- the number of councillors proposed in respect of each ward;
- the proposed name of any Town and Parish Council

This survey is seeking views on draft proposals for town and parish council arrangements across the Borough of Telford & Wrekin. Please refer to the information pack and the terms of reference prior to completing this survey.

If you are supportive of the proposed arrangements, please also confirm that this is the case and the reasons for this view.

Please note, all representations are required by law to be published but, if you are an individual, your name and contact details will not be published.

Your details

1. Title

2. First Name

3. Family Name

4. In what capacity are you contributing?

- [ ] Elected member
- [ ] Parish/Town Clerk
- [ ] Community Group Representative
- [ ] Disability Group Representative
- [ ] Business Representative
- [x] Resident
- [ ] Other Please state

Please state

5. What is the name of your organisation?

6. Email address

7. Post Code

[redacted]

8. Which draft proposed parish/parishes does your submission relate to?

- [ ] Chetwynd & Edgmond
- [ ] Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote & Church Aston
- [ ] Great Dawley
- [ ] Hadley & Leegomery
- [ ] Horton
- [ ] Ketley
- [ ] Lawley & Overdale
- [ ] Lilleshall
- [ ] Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine & Rodington
- [ ] Madeley
- [ ] Muxton
- [ ] Newport
- [ ] Priorslee
- [ ] St Georges & Donnington
- [ ] The Gorge
- [ ] The Nedge
- [x] The Weald Moors
- [ ] Tibberton & Cherrington
- [ ] Waters Upton & Ercall Magna
- [ ] Wellington
- [ ] Wrockwardine Wood, Trench & Oakengates

9. Please set out your comments on the draft proposed town and parish council arrangements below. Please include the reasons for your views.

10. Please click here to upload any supporting information

11. Some town and parish councils will own assets such as community centres, cemeteries, play areas and similar. What views, if any, do you have as to how these assets should be managed should there be any changes to the current town and parish council arrangements?

12. Some town and parish councils will have reserves (similar to savings in a household). What views, if any, do you have as to how these reserves should be managed should there be any changes to the current town and parish council arrangements?

I have no objection to Kinnerley joining with Preston as we already share a facility and are ~~nearby~~ located geographically very well and share some of the same problems as Kinnerley

I do object to joining with Egton as though they are geographically close we cannot walk or cycle to Egton easily without trespassing on private land we share no facilities

Your information will be held by Telford & Wrekin Council and used for the purposes of the Community Governance Review 2025 only. We are required to publish details of representations so please consider this when submitting information.

If you would like to know more about how we process and hold information please visit www.telford.gov.uk/terms

Thank you for taking the time to comment on the draft proposals. Please return your completed questionnaire to:

Community Governance Review
Electoral Services
Telford & Wrekin Council
Darby House
Lawn Central
Telford
TF3 4JA

Community Governance Review 2025

Consultation Response Form

In your submission, please comment on:

- the proposed arrangements for Town and Parish Councils;
- the warding arrangements for Town and Parish Councils;
- the number of councillors proposed in respect of Town and Parish Councils;
- the number of councillors proposed in respect of each ward;
- the proposed name of any Town and Parish Council

This survey is seeking views on draft proposals for town and parish council arrangements across the Borough of Telford & Wrekin. Please refer to the information pack and the terms of reference prior to completing this survey.

If you are supportive of the proposed arrangements, please also confirm that this is the case and the reasons for this view.

Please note, all representations are required by law to be published but, if you are an individual, your name and contact details will not be published.

Your details

1. Title

2. First Name

3. Family Name

4. In what capacity are you contributing?

- [ ] Elected member
- [ ] Parish/Town Clerk
- [ ] Community Group Representative
- [ ] Disability Group Representative
- [ ] Business Representative
- [x] Resident
- [ ] Other Please state

Please state

KYNNERSLEY RESIDENT.

5. What is the name of your organisation?

—

6. Email address

[redacted]

7. Post Code

[redacted]

8. Which draft proposed parish/parishes does your submission relate to?

- [ ] Chetwynd & Edgmond
- [ ] Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote & Church Aston
- [ ] Great Dawley
- [ ] Hadley & Leegomery
- [ ] Horton
- [ ] Ketley
- [ ] Lawley & Overdale
- [ ] Lilleshall
- [ ] Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine & Rodington
- [ ] Madeley
- [ ] Muxton
- [ ] Newport
- [ ] Priorslee
- [ ] St Georges & Donnington
- [ ] The Gorge
- [ ] The Nedge
- [x] ~~The Weald Moors~~ → KYNNERSLEY. (Where is this?)
- [ ] Tibberton & Cherrington
- [ ] Waters Upton & Ercall Magna
- [ ] Wellington
- [ ] Wrockwardine Wood, Trench & Oakengates

9. Please set out your comments on the draft proposed town and parish council arrangements below. Please include the reasons for your views.

1) OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL TO JOIN 3 PARISHES.
2) KYNNERSLEY SHOULD MAINTAIN SOMEWHERE & NOT NOTICE to 2.
3) SURROUNDING PARISHES ARE AND WILL INCREASINGLY BECOME URBAN.
4) KYNNERSLEY IS A CONSERVATION AREA & OTHER PARISHES ARE NOT
5) THERE IS NO ROAD OR OTHER COMMUNICATION WITH EYTON SO JOINING WITH EYTON ~~IS NOT~~ WILL NOT BENEFIT KYNNERSLEY PARISH.
6) I BELIEVE THAT COMMENTS SHOULD NOT BE COPIED & PASTED INTO ALL PARISH RESPONSES. THIS IMPLIES I COULD COMMENT IN ALL PARISH CONSULTATIONS WITH MY VIEWS MEANING THE CONSULTATION WOULD BE INVALID. PLEASE REMOVE COMMENTS FROM PEOPLE WHO DO NOT LIVE IN THE PARISH. ~~— THIS SMELLS OF UNDEMOCRATIC BEHAVIOUR — STOP IT!~~

10. Please click here to upload any supporting information

11. Some town and parish councils will own assets such as community centres, cemeteries, play areas and similar. What views, if any, do you have as to how these assets should be managed should there be any changes to the current town and parish council arrangements?

KYNNERSLEY HAS A VILLAGE HALL MANAGED BY THE COMMUNITY WHICH I SUPPORT.

CONTINUED FROM 9

7) A LARGER PARISH MEANS COUNCILLORS WOULD HAVE TO DO MORE WORK, COULD/IT POSSIBLY SUPPORT ALL THE RESIDENTS TO THE SAME DEGREE AS IS THE CASE NOW. — LESS REPRESENTATION IS NOT AGREEABLE TO ME.

12. Some town and parish councils will have reserves (similar to savings in a household). What views, if any, do you have as to how these reserves should be managed should there be any changes to the current town and parish council arrangements?

I AM HAPPY FOR MY PARISH TO HAVE RESERVES. RESERVES CAN BE USED TO SUPPORT A LARGER PROJECT IN THE FUTURE. LEAVE THE MANAGEMENT OF FUNDS IN THE HANDS OF LOCAL PEOPLE I.E. THE KYNNERSLEY PARISH COUNCIL.

Your information will be held by Telford & Wrekin Council and used for the purposes of the Community Governance Review 2025 only. We are required to publish details of representations so please consider this when submitting information.

If you would like to know more about how we process and hold information please visit www.telford.gov.uk/terms

Thank you for taking the time to comment on the draft proposals. Please return your completed questionnaire to:

Community Governance Review
Electoral Services
Telford & Wrekin Council
Darby House
Lawn Central
Telford
TF3 4JA

Community Governance Review 2025

Consultation Response Form

In your submission, please comment on:

- the proposed arrangements for Town and Parish Councils;
- the warding arrangements for Town and Parish Councils;
- the number of councillors proposed in respect of Town and Parish Councils;
- the number of councillors proposed in respect of each ward;
- the proposed name of any Town and Parish Council

This survey is seeking views on draft proposals for town and parish council arrangements across the Borough of Telford & Wrekin. Please refer to the information pack and the terms of reference prior to completing this survey.

If you are supportive of the proposed arrangements, please also confirm that this is the case and the reasons for this view.

Please note, all representations are required by law to be published but, if you are an individual, your name and contact details will not be published.

Your details

1. Title

2. First Name

3. Family Name

4. In what capacity are you contributing?

- [ ] Elected member
- [ ] Parish/Town Clerk
- [ ] Community Group Representative
- [ ] Disability Group Representative
- [ ] Business Representative
- [x] Resident
- [ ] Other Please state

Please state

[redacted]

5. What is the name of your organisation?

[redacted]

6. Email address

[redacted]

7. Post Code

[redacted]

8. Which draft proposed parish/parishes does your submission relate to?

- [ ] Chetwynd & Edgmond
- [ ] Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote & Church Aston
- [ ] Great Dawley
- [ ] Hadley & Leegomery
- [ ] Horton
- [ ] Ketley
- [ ] Lawley & Overdale
- [ ] Lilleshall
- [ ] Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine & Rodington
- [ ] Madeley
- [ ] Muxton
- [ ] Newport
- [ ] Priorslee
- [ ] St Georges & Donnington
- [ ] The Gorge
- [ ] The Nedge
- [ ] ~~The Weald Moors~~ (KYNNERSLEY PARISH)
- [ ] Tibberton & Cherrington
- [ ] Waters Upton & Ercall Magna
- [ ] Wellington
- [ ] Wrockwardine Wood, Trench & Oakengates

9. Please set out your comments on the draft proposed town and parish council arrangements below. Please include the reasons for your views.

- Major Concern of the Precept should never change for Kynnersley Parish.
- Need 3 councillors per Parish so fair balance of voting.
- Kynnersley is a unique case of having a Preservation order.
- Meetings already consume most of the time without adding another group. The time spent on our parish will be reduced drastically if Eyton joins us. Very unhappy of the three, Present Kynnersley no issues

10. Please click here to upload any supporting information

11. Some town and parish councils will own assets such as community centres, cemeteries, play areas and similar. What views, if any, do you have as to how these assets should be managed should there be any changes to the current town and parish council arrangements?

We look after the Village Hall but grants always help.
Having a conservation order helps delay & avoid any further growth that could destroy the History of the Village.
Eyton has zero connection & understanding what the village community want.

12. Some town and parish councils will have reserves (similar to savings in a household). What views, if any, do you have as to how these reserves should be managed should there be any changes to the current town and parish council arrangements?

Again completely against ~~Elton~~ joining (Preston & Kynnersley).
The Precept should be ringfence for the future for Kynnersley. As Preston should ringfence their money.
Not interested in Town councils.

Your information will be held by Telford & Wrekin Council and used for the purposes of the Community Governance Review 2025 only. We are required to publish details of representations so please consider this when submitting information.

If you would like to know more about how we process and hold information please visit www.telford.gov.uk/terms

Thank you for taking the time to comment on the draft proposals. Please return your completed questionnaire to:

Community Governance Review
Electoral Services
Telford & Wrekin Council
Darby House
Lawn Central
Telford
TF3 4JA