Wrockwardine Wood, Trench and Oakengates

Email Responses – 9

Good Afternoon, Can I please put the following comments for Oakengates Town Council.The Council should match the ward Seats of Oakengates Wrockwardine and Wood and Trench .Parts of WW and Trench Parish i.e. Moss road ,Johnstone Close etc should be in Donnington St Georges ParishOakengates Town Council Wards Should have the following wards Oakengates Ketley Bank Ward Wrockwardine Wood Ward , Hollyhurst, Trench Lock,Trench Ward The name Trench ward to be used in the wardsAt the moment the Council are consulting with the public with the consultation all-round the Telford and Wrekin can we include Oakengates The wakes also Donnington Turreff hallMuxton and Lilleshall Church Aston Parish to match the Wards a larger single parish to support a larger growing area .
I can confirm that Councillors considered and noted the outcome of the first round of the consultation at a recent Full Council meeting and their response has not differed from their original reply.
Please submit the following views to the Community Governance Review on behalf of Wrockwardine Wood and Trench Parish Council.Following a meeting of Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council, on the 16th June 2025, the chairman Councillor Shirely Reynolds recommended that the parish and borough boundaries should be coterminous.Councillors put forward a submission stating that Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council should merge with Oakengates Town Council, with Wrockwardine Wood East remaining inside our parish boundary. The Kenway Drive Ward would no longer be within the Wrockwardine Wood and Trench parish boundary. All councillors agreed with the decision to merge with Oakengates Town Council and that the boundaries should be coterminous.
It is unclear what there would be to gain in becoming part of Wellington only to penny pinch from us more. Living in rushmoor I would prefer to remain within Wrockwardine Parish Council.Kim Tonks has been exceptionally supportive in addressing issues affecting the Admaston and Bratton community and I would not want to lose this. I would be interesting to hear Kim's views on this!At the moment, Admaston and Bratton retain the rural feel, however, if we become part of Wellington we would get 'swallowed up' as part of the town. Telford is swiftly increasing in population more people more houses, A& E to go completely unacceptable!Now you want to take merge the councils, stop trying to take everything and leave things as they are it works fine! It doesn't get my support or my family's!
I wish to record my objections to the proposed boundary review of Town & Parish Councils, with respect to the alterations proposed for Oakengates. I have detailed the objections, showing where they contravene the Terms of Reference. I have then provided some constructive alternatives.I would be grateful to receive confirmation of recept of this e-mail and would like to attend meetings of the Boundary Review Committee. Could you please advise me when they will take place? I am also prepared to address the Committee, if clarification is needed
on the views of a very small minority. The Parish Council cannot understand why, given that there were only 13 responses from Wellington Town Council's residents from a possible 17,231 electors, that a person or persons within their response suggested moving Admaston & Bratton to Wellington and that this change has now been proposed. However, with only 3,886 electors, Wrockwardine Parish Council's residents managed 11 responses none of which suggested moving Admaston & Bratton to Wellington, but in your own words "articulated a similar position to the Parish Council's submission with support for the existing boundary to remain unchanged and that Admaston and Bratton should remain as part of a Parish Council for Wrockwardine". The Parish Council does not consider it is right that the view of a very small number of

Wellington residents should take precedent and dictate what happens over the views of its own Wrockwardine Parishioners.2.The sweeping statements made in the rationale for the change are, in the Parish Council's view, incorrect. You state that the "residents of Admaston and Bratton are an extension of the urban community of Wellington […] and look to Wellington for the provision of services including schools, medical and dental services and shopping". The Parish Council would argue that within the Parish boundary there is currently a newly built doctor's surgery; convenience stores; post office and two local primary schools. Just over the boundary in Shawbirch there is a pharmacy; local shops; a further post office counter; veterinary surgery; dentist; public houses and other ancillary provisions. Indeed, a few steps further and there are even more facilities built around the Shawbirch roundabout, including a nursery provision. Rather than "looking to Wellington" the local residents look to what is on their doorstep and if need be, go farther afield to Telford Centre or Shrewsbury. The Parish Council suggests that the local residents couldn't actually be any more disconnected from Wellington and with the continuing growth around Bratton and the surrounding Parish's this will only widen (see your own Local Plan for those details). 3.The Parish Council believes that if Wellington Town Council does take in Admaston and Bratton then it will grow significantly with perhaps over 30,000 residents (rather that the 20,000 electorate) and would still be growing. This would, following investigation, make Wellington Town Council the 45th largest Town Council in England and be substantially bigger than the Wellington Urban Council that was. Such a large increase even with an increase in councillor numbers would mean that local representation would be extremely poor. 4.Resident's in Admaston and Bratton would see a marked increase in their council tax and given that none of them actually wanted to be moved (see point 1) the Parish Council suggests that the Borough might want to advise residents of this fact and give them a real opportunity to comment on the real facts of these proposals.5.The proposal for Wrockwardine Parish Council to merge into a new "rural" Parish Council means that Parish would cover a huge geographical area and, with only 11 seats for councillors, again local representation would be severely weakened and the actual distance councillors and staff would have to travel to serve the Parish would be significant and untenable. The proposal to merge would also result in a loss of precept funding and therefore a loss of services to be provided to its residents.6.The cost of paying redundancy for long-standing clerk's would mean that precepts would need to rise to cover the anticipated costs should these proposals go ahead. 7.If an alternative to the current arrangement is sought, the Parish Council suggests that Admaston and Bratton join with Shawbirch to create a Parish that makes more sense than the ones currently proposed.However, it is the Parish Council's view that Wrockwardine Parish Council remains as it is for this review.
OBJECTION TO BOUNDARY REVIEW PROPOSALS for OAKENGATES for 2027 OVERVIEW•It is proposed that Oakengates Town is taken over by Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish, along with a small portion of the Beveley area of Ketley Parish, in contravention of Terms of Reference 8.17 (grouping …. needs to be compatible with the retention of community interests and it would be inappropriate to use it to build artificially large units under single parish councils);•The existing ten councillors representing Oakengates, Ketley Bank, Wombridge and Middle Pool would be reduced to seven, while their area would be increased (for no apparent reason) by the addition of part of Beveley;•This part of Beveley is mostly still under construction as part of the Ketley Millenium Village. This inclusion is in contravention of Terms of Reference 3.3 (appropriate, equitable and understood by their electorate), 3.4 (reflect the identities and interests of communities and should take account the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion);•It is also in contravention of Terms of Reference 8.5 (boundaries should generally reflect …. physical barriers …. such as railways or motorways), as it is separated from Oakengates by the B4373 on a high embankment;•The existing three councillors representing (Oakengates) North ward would be merged with the

eight councillors of W.W.&T. Trench ward and reduced in number to seven;•The existing (Oakengates) Hollyhurst ward and (W.W.&T.) Wrockwardine Wood West ward (Middle & Urban Roads etc.) with one councillor each would both be replaced by a new Wrockwardine Wood South ward with one councillor.OBSERVATIONS•It seems that these proposals are trying to eradicate the Historic area of Oakengates! •The proposal looks like you are looking at the Borough Council Boundaries, to form the 'Proposed' new Parish council. Which it should not. See Terms of Reference 8.17, below•It should be Oakengates, Wrockwardine wood and Trench, as Oakengates was the Historic centre of the area. BUT, this would be in contravention of the terms of reference 8.17 '… it would be inappropriate to use it to build artificially large units under single parish council. (Super Parish Council)•Would Oakengates be taking on the debt and inadequacies' of Wrockwardine Wood, as shown in their 'AGAR' Annual report. (Worth thinking about)•Oakengates Town Council (OTC) seem to have a very large reserve, where Wrockwardine Wood, has a 'Fluid' reserve, thus taking on possible debt of Wrocwardine Wood and Trench, which would be unfair to the OTC residents.•There are 13 Oakengates Town Councillors, and 11 Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Councillors, at this time. The proposals only allow for 15 Councillors in total, a very large reduction, with 10336 Electors. Considering the proposed Water Upton and Ercall Magna 2453 Electors = 12 Councillors, also Ketley, which has 3731 Electors, and 11 proposed Councillors. Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote, and Church Aston, 1438 Electors = 10 Councillors. This is just three of proposed parish councils with a greater amount of Councillors, in proportion to the size of electorate. •I believe the areas that should be looked at, are the smaller Parish Councils•All this is part of my ObjectionALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS1.There is no logical reason for a small part of Beveley to be moved into the new Wrockwardine Wood, Trench & Oakengates Parish (For historical reasons, it Should have been 'Oakengates, Wrockwardine Wood, and Trench'). Historically, Beveley has always been part of Ketley and it has no road links at all to the rest of the proposed parish, except by going through Ketley. It is completely separated from the rest of the proposed parish by the main railway line and the B4373 on a high embankment. The Borough Council's proposal for the remainder of Ketley parish is to have 11 councillors representing an average of 339 electors each, while the new W.W.T&O parish would have 15 councillors for a whopping 10,336 electors – an average of 689 each and stretching all the way from the M54 to Hortonwood. This would again be in contravention of Terms of Reference 8.17 (grouping …. needs to be compatible with the retention of community interests and it would be inappropriate to use it to build artificially large units under single parish councils);2.The Borough Council's proposals suggest that the existing Oakengates Town and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish share a common identity. However, Oakengates is an old town at its core, with long-established council estates in Wombridge and Ketley Bank. These areas all look to Oakengates town as their obvious centre. W.W.&T is an area originally based around the Wellington to Newport road, with much less obvious links to Oakengates, especially since the B4373 Wrockwardine Wood Way cuts the area in two. Much of the Trench ward of W.W.&T is a 1970s Telford Development Corporation estate and looks to shops and facilities in Trench.3.The existing (Oakengates) Middle Pool ward of the Trench Lock area is newly built housing and is also cut off from Oakengates by the high embankment of the B4373. It would be much better linked to a parish of either Hadley or Trench.4.The proposal to merge Hollyhurst (Oakengates) ward with Wrockwardine Wood West (W.W.&T.) ward is welcome, as the existing boundary down the middle of New Road has long been illogical but should be entirely within Oakengates Town.5.The Borough Council is not averse to splitting Polling Districts, as is evidenced by its proposal to split District TOB in Beveley. Instead, it would be logical to remove the Station Hill, Cockshutt Road, Willows Road, The Nabb and Silkin Way areas from the TSG and TSB wards of Saint George's. This small area contains the former Oakengates Police Station and Oakengates Methodist Chapel and its residents look to

Oakengates as their District Centre, [redacted] rather than up the steep hill to Saint George's. They use Oakengates as their postal address and they should be allowed to return to that town.The boundary of the existing Oakengates Town is currently under the A442, only a few feet from the town centre and should be moved to include these roads which were historically part of the town.It would also be sensible to move the Central Park development, out to Kiyokuni to the Prioreslee Roundabout/A5, out of Oakengates Town (from which it is isolated by the A442 dual-carriageway) and into Saint George's.SUMMARY1.Oakengates should remain with its own Town Council, consisting of Polling Districts TOE, TOH, TOO, TOW and an estimated 250 electors from wards TSB & TSG. Based on the Borough Council's Polling Places, Polling Districts & Polling Stations Review 2023 (The most recent figures available online), this would give:TOE (Ketley Bank)1964 electors TOH (Hollyhurst)348 electorTOO (Oakengates & Wombridge)2217 electorsTOW (Wrockwardine Wood West) 364 electorsTSB & TSG (estimated from Saint George's)250 electorsTOTAL for proposed Oakengates Town Council5143 electorsThis could be served by 10 councillors, around 514 each on average, preferably with as little division into separate wards as possible.2.Ketley parish would retain its TKY (Ketley) ward and all of its TOK and TOB (Beveley) wards, which would give:TKY (Ketley)(from current review figures)2693 electorsTOB (Beveley)(from Polling Places 2023 review)659 electorsTOK (Beveley)(from Polling Places 2023 review)325 electorsThe figures from the Borough's current boundary review shows that the figures for TOK and part of TOB are already up to 1036, so the total would be higher, although the current review does not show how many electors it was proposing to transfer into Oakengates. No suggestion is made here for the total number of Ketley councillors, nor how that should be split between wards.3.The area known as Wrockwardine Wood runs round three sides of the hill known as The Cockshutt. The West side of the hill is linked to Oakengates and its TOW polling district is already proposed to re-join Oakengates. The North side (Chapel Terrace, etc.) is already part of the existing W.W.&T. parish, while the east side is already part of Saint George's. Therefore, retention of the name "Wrockwardine Wood" in parish terms is not helpful.4.This would allow for a Trench parish of TWR and TWT, with the possible addition of Middle Pool ward TOT, which would give:TWR & TWT (Trench) (from current review figures)693 electorsTOT (Middle Pool) (from Polling Places 2023 review390 electorsTOTAL for proposed Trench Parish Council5083 electorsNo suggestion is made here for the total number of Trench councillors, nor how that should be split between wards.5.No alterations are proposed here for Saint George's, except that Station Hill and the roads there-off should be transferred to Oakengates, while the Central Park estate should be transferred from Oakengates into Saint George's.

OBJECTION TO BOUNDARY REVIEW PROPOSALS for OAKENGATES for 2027 OVERVIEW•It is proposed that Oakengates Town is taken over by Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish, along with a small portion of the Beveley area of Ketley Parish, in contravention of Terms of Reference 8.17 (grouping …. needs to be compatible with the retention of community interests and it would be inappropriate to use it to build artificially large units under single parish councils);•The existing ten councillors representing Oakengates, Ketley Bank, Wombridge and Middle Pool would be reduced to seven, while their area would be increased (for no apparent reason) by the addition of part of Beveley;•This part of Beveley is mostly still under construction as part of the Ketley Millenium Village. This inclusion is in contravention of Terms of Reference 3.3 (appropriate, equitable and understood by their electorate), 3.4 (reflect the identities and interests of communities and should take account the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion);•It is also in contravention of Terms of Reference 8.5 (boundaries should generally reflect …. physical barriers …. such as railways or motorways), as it is separated from Oakengates by the B4373 on a high embankment;•The

existing three councillors representing (Oakengates) North ward would be merged with the eight councillors of W.W.&T. Trench ward and reduced in number to seven;•The existing (Oakengates) Hollyhurst ward and (W.W.&T.) Wrockwardine Wood West ward (Middle & Urban Roads etc.) with one councillor each would both be replaced by a new Wrockwardine Wood South ward with one councillor.OBSERVATIONS•It seems that these proposals are trying to eradicate the Historic area of Oakengates! •The proposal looks like you are looking at the Borough Council Boundaries, to form the 'Proposed' new Parish council. Which it should not. See Terms of Reference 8.17, below•It should be Oakengates, Wrockwardine wood and Trench, as Oakengates was the Historic centre of the area. BUT, this would be in contravention of the terms of reference 8.17 '… it would be inappropriate to use it to build artificially large units under single parish council. (Super Parish Council)•Would Oakengates be taking on the debt and inadequacies' of Wrockwardine Wood, as shown in their 'AGAR' Annual report. (Worth thinking about)•Oakengates Town Council (OTC) seem to have a very large reserve, where Wrockwardine Wood, has a 'Fluid' reserve, thus taking on possible debt of Wrocwardine Wood and Trench, which would be unfair to the OTC residents.•There are 13 Oakengates Town Councillors, and 11 Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Councillors, at this time. The proposals only allow for 15 Councillors in total, a very large reduction, with 10336 Electors. Considering the proposed Water Upton and Ercall Magna 2453 Electors = 12 Councillors, also Ketley, which has 3731 Electors, and 11 proposed Councillors. Chetwynd Aston, Woodcote, and Church Aston, 1438 Electors = 10 Councillors. This is just three of proposed parish councils with a greater amount of Councillors, in proportion to the size of electorate. •I believe the areas that should be looked at, are the smaller Parish Councils•All this is part of my ObjectionALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS1.There is no logical reason for a small part of Beveley to be moved into the new Wrockwardine Wood, Trench & Oakengates Parish (For historical reasons, it Should have been 'Oakengates, Wrockwardine Wood, and Trench'). Historically, Beveley has always been part of Ketley and it has no road links at all to the rest of the proposed parish, except by going through Ketley. It is completely separated from the rest of the proposed parish by the main railway line and the B4373 on a high embankment. The Borough Council's proposal for the remainder of Ketley parish is to have 11 councillors representing an average of 339 electors each, while the new W.W.T&O parish would have 15 councillors for a whopping 10,336 electors – an average of 689 each and stretching all the way from the M54 to Hortonwood. This would again be in contravention of Terms of Reference 8.17 (grouping …. needs to be compatible with the retention of community interests and it would be inappropriate to use it to build artificially large units under single parish councils);2.The Borough Council's proposals suggest that the existing Oakengates Town and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish share a common identity. However, Oakengates is an old town at its core, with long-established council estates in Wombridge and Ketley Bank. These areas all look to Oakengates town as their obvious centre. W.W.&T is an area originally based around the Wellington to Newport road, with much less obvious links to Oakengates, especially since the B4373 Wrockwardine Wood Way cuts the area in two. Much of the Trench ward of W.W.&T is a 1970s Telford Development Corporation estate and looks to shops and facilities in Trench.3.The existing (Oakengates) Middle Pool ward of the Trench Lock area is newly built housing and is also cut off from Oakengates by the high embankment of the B4373. It would be much better linked to a parish of either Hadley or Trench.4.The proposal to merge Hollyhurst (Oakengates) ward with Wrockwardine Wood West (W.W.&T.) ward is welcome, as the existing boundary down the middle of New Road has long been illogical but should be entirely within Oakengates Town.5.The Borough Council is not averse to splitting Polling Districts, as is evidenced by its proposal to split District TOB in Beveley. Instead, it would be logical to remove the Station Hill, Cockshutt Road, Willows Road, The Nabb and Silkin Way areas from the TSG and TSB wards of Saint George's. This small area contains the former

Oakengates Police Station and Oakengates Methodist Chapel and its residents look to Oakengates as their District Centre, [redacted] rather than up the steep hill to Saint George's. They use Oakengates as their postal address and they should be allowed to return to that town.The boundary of the existing Oakengates Town is currently under the A442, only a few feet from the town centre and should be moved to include these roads which were historically part of the town.It would also be sensible to move the Central Park development, out to Kiyokuni to the Prioreslee Roundabout/A5, out of Oakengates Town (from which it is isolated by the A442 dual-carriageway) and into Saint George's.SUMMARY1.Oakengates should remain with its own Town Council, consisting of Polling Districts TOE, TOH, TOO, TOW and an estimated 250 electors from wards TSB & TSG. Based on the Borough Council's Polling Places, Polling Districts & Polling Stations Review 2023 (The most recent figures available online), this would give:TOE (Ketley Bank)1964 electors TOH (Hollyhurst)348 electorTOO (Oakengates & Wombridge)2217 electorsTOW (Wrockwardine Wood West) 364 electorsTSB & TSG (estimated from Saint George's)250 electorsTOTAL for proposed Oakengates Town Council5143 electorsThis could be served by 10 councillors, around 514 each on average, preferably with as little division into separate wards as possible.2.Ketley parish would retain its TKY (Ketley) ward and all of its TOK and TOB (Beveley) wards, which would give:TKY (Ketley)(from current review figures)2693 electorsTOB (Beveley)(from Polling Places 2023 review)659 electorsTOK (Beveley)(from Polling Places 2023 review)325 electorsThe figures from the Borough's current boundary review shows that the figures for TOK and part of TOB are already up to 1036, so the total would be higher, although the current review does not show how many electors it was proposing to transfer into Oakengates. No suggestion is made here for the total number of Ketley councillors, nor how that should be split between wards.3.The area known as Wrockwardine Wood runs round three sides of the hill known as The Cockshutt. The West side of the hill is linked to Oakengates and its TOW polling district is already proposed to re-join Oakengates. The North side (Chapel Terrace, etc.) is already part of the existing W.W.&T. parish, while the east side is already part of Saint George's. Therefore, retention of the name "Wrockwardine Wood" in parish terms is not helpful.4.This would allow for a Trench parish of TWR and TWT, with the possible addition of Middle Pool ward TOT, which would give:TWR & TWT (Trench) (from current review figures)693 electorsTOT (Middle Pool) (from Polling Places 2023 review390 electorsTOTAL for proposed Trench Parish Council5083 electorsNo suggestion is made here for the total number of Trench councillors, nor how that should be split between wards.5.No alterations are proposed here for Saint George's, except that Station Hill and the roads there-off should be transferred to Oakengates, while the Central Park estate should be transferred from Oakengates into Saint George's.
Review of Town and Parish Councils.Thank you for this further opportunity to feed into the community governance review consultation. As the Borough Councillor for Wrockwardine Wood & Trench my Ward is split between two councils Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish and Oakengates Town Council. This causes confusion for residents and difficulties for myself as residents do not understand why these boundaries are not co-terminus with the Borough Ward and subsequently residents receive different services and facilities, to those available to their neighbour over the road, this seems neither fair nor equitable.It would enhance Community cohesion as there are strong, historical and community links between Wrockwardine Wood, Trench and Oakengates. Families living in Wrockwardine Wood & Trench use services in Oakengates, Doctors, Schools, Dentists, Shopping, Market, Library and Leisure Facilities. Many of the residents already use the Wakes community building taking part in Senior Socials and find it difficult to understand why they can't go on the Senior Citizens outings and this is further compounded when individual roads are served by two different

councils, roads such as Teagues Crescent and Wombridge Road, this evidences the fact there is a natural flow from the one parish council to the other town council. There are actual next-door neighbours who cannot benefit from the same services, not only social and community services but also the Neighbourhood Environmental Team and Enforcement. By merging the two councils of Oakengates and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench there would be a natural synergy which reflects the former Oakengates Urban District Council. The Wakes is the only Community Centre that serves both councils. The Community Centre provides provision for HHAH, Senior Socials, Family Hub, and many other activities of which there is no provision in Wrockwardine Wood and Trench. It is Oakengates that residents attend not Donnington or St Georges as they have no natural affiliation to those areas. I believe the current number of councillors for these two councils totalling 24 (13+11) is too many and they should be sufficient in number to ensure each ward has representation across the new boundary. Many of the existing Borough Councillors for Oakengates & Ketley Bank and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench currently sit on both Town and Parish Councils to ensure representation of their residents, this is an anomaly between these two councils. Amalgamating the two town and parish councils would save on the number of councillors required and therefore save on running costs.These savings would enable the combined council to provide new services and activities for the residents and these savings relating to staff, buildings, running costs and meetings together with an improvement in the Community Action Team which would be the same for both areas and a reduction in precept that can be passed onto the residents.This new enlarged Oakengates Town Council (renamed Greater Oakengates & District Town Council) will provide better representation for the community and provide parity of services for all residents across the area. If the merger of Oakengates Town Council and Wrockwardine Wood Parish Council were not to be considered I would urge that Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council is left as a single parish and not merged as suggested with Donnington & St Georges. Currently my borough ward is split between a Town and Parish Council, as the boundaries do not correlate with the borough ward. the merger of Oakengates Town Council and Wrockwardine Wood Parish Council therefore would provide clearer and more equitable services under one council. I would ask most strongly that you consider following the existing parish boundary of Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council when merging the two councils. I currently have a substantial amount of ward work from residents who live near the Cockshutt, the Summer Crescent/Mafeking Drive area, who naturally assume that they belong to the Wrockwardine Wood ward and not St Georges, this area was formerly in the Wrockwardine Wood Borough ward and should remain within the new boundaries after the governance review.Further to the former draft proposals that were published, I continue to object to the proposed new Central Parish Ward through the merging of St Georges, Donnington, and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Councils. Donnington and St Georges could still be considered for a merger if this were felt suitable for the residents in those areas.There are areas within my Borough Ward which are very deprived, families without access to transport who walk the short distance to Oakengates to use the nursery and schools for their children and use the community centre (The Wakes) which offers many social activities which support wellbeing and reduce isolation. These families would find it exceedingly difficult if the proposed changes went ahead. They would not be able to access community services in Donnington or St Georges as there are no transport links, there is not a regular bus services available for families to use, unlike the current bus service between Wrockwardine Wood & Trench and Oakengates.Whilst there may be some merit in the merging of Donnington and St Georges, this does not apply to the inclusion of Wrockwardine Wood and Trench. Wrockwardine Wood and St George’s are not natural bedfellows with the area cut in two by Moss Road and St Georges Road itself.The merging of Donnington, St Georges, and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench, rather than simplifying the ward and parish boundaries, would make matters more complex, not only is there no

community cohesion, but they are also distinctly different areas and within different borough ward and parliamentary constituencies. The suggested proposed Central Parish would be taking from areas across 3 different borough wards, separating communities even further.I also want to respond to the proposals around the Trench Lock. Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council have suggested that this area moves into their parish, I can only stress that this area should remain within the Oakengates Town Council area and that the boundary should reflect the borough ward boundaries. Considering this, we also ask that the other part of Trench Lock which is currently in Hadley & Leegomery Parish should in fact move into Oakengates Town Council like their neighbours, so the whole of the Trench Lock estate is in Oakengates Town Council mirroring the borough ward, the current situation for residents again causes confusion, Residents of the whole of Trench Lock are within the borough ward of Oakengates & Ketley Bank and the constituency of Telford, but the area is split at parish level, residents can be within Oakengates Town Council and the Telford Constituency but their neighbour is under Hadley & Leegomery Parish and in the constituency of the Wrekin. This inconsistency of boundaries is wrong. Trench Lock historically has always been part of Trench, with the incline plane, the locks, canal as can be seen in the old map below, the L.N.W.R. the Wellington and Coalport branch line being the natural boundary between Trench and Hadley. The Trench Lock housing area is now built on this area within the Trench boundary. The map below shows the boundary line, the L&NWR Wellington & Coalport branch line. The photograph below shows the area with the incline plane and canal in situ within Trench, this community has always been aligned to Oakengates and Trench and was part of the former Oakengates Urban District Council rather than the Hadley and Leegomery area, which was part of the Wellington Urban District Council.Looking further to the Community Governance Review, whilst I have initially recommended the merger of Oakengates Town Council and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council, there are difficulties with boundaries for residents. The Millenium Village is already in the Oakengates & Ketley Bank borough ward but not in the Oakengates Town Council ward, this I believe should be rectified during this governance review. Much of Ketley has natural synergy with Oakengates, again this is where residents use services and facilities in Oakengates such as Doctors, Schools, Dentists, Shopping, Market, Library and Leisure Facilities. Many of the residents already use the Wakes community building taking part in Senior Socials and find it difficult to understand why they don’t qualify for Senior Citizens outings etc. The benefits of amalgamating the parishes of Oakengates Town Council, Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish and to also consider Ketley Parish are:Greater Efficiency and Effectiveness: By combining resources, the three parish councils can streamline administrative processes, reduce duplication of efforts, and enhance service delivery. This will lead to cost savings and more efficient use of residents’ money.Enhanced Representation: Larger, combined councils will have a stronger voice in Telford & Wrekin Council. This increased influence can help them secure support for local projects that might have been overlooked if they were acting alone. Broader Skill Sets: The new Greater Oakengates & District Town Council can benefit from a wider range of skills and expertise among its members. This diversity can lead to more innovative and effective solutions to community issues. Improved Services: By pooling resources, the new council can offer a broader range of services and improve existing ones. This can include better maintenance of public spaces, enhanced recreational facilities, and more robust support for local events and initiatives. Cost Savings: Shared administrative functions can lead to significant cost reductions, freeing up funds for community projects and services.Stronger Community Engagement: Larger councils can foster a greater sense of community by bringing together diverse groups and encouraging more active participation in local governance. Increased Resilience: A larger council can better withstand external pressures such as funding cuts or changes in legislation, ensuring continued service delivery to residents. The new Greater Oakengates & District Town Council should be

restructured, with new councillors to be elected in May 2027 representing the new community. This unified approach will enhance the voice of residents, ensuring that all areas work together to address shared challenges. This will also allow for more cohesive planning and development efforts, ensuring that all areas continue to grow and thrive as interconnected communities. Looking around the borough, I see natural connection and distinctiveness for areas, Priorslee with its recent growth should have its own Parish council, this would allow St Georges to merge with Donnington, they both have many characteristics in common. Muxton having split from Donnington could be considered for merger with Lilleshall, they are both distinct and have geographical connections. The Gorge should be considered for merger with Madeley, historically the old ‘Madeley Wood’ included the Ironbridge area, and both areas share a uniqueness being within the World Heritage area which is not present anywhere else in the borough.

Survey Responses - 5

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.

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.

Fully support the proposals for the parishes, but need to see a change in council numbers and warding. St Georges & Donnington should be 13 and Priorslee 7 and Muxton 7, and I fully support Wrockwardine Wood merging with Oakengates. identity is key warding for key areas, Redhill, St Georges, Snedshill, Donnington Wood, Donnington, The Humbers, Oakengates, Ketley Bank, Wrockwardine Wood, Wombridge and Trench etc i dont like big numbers of cllrs but like to have enough to make governance happens
I agree that the demographic and identities of Donnington and Muxton are very different and that both communities could be better served by separating their community into two Councils. However, I feel that the communities of Wrockwardine Wood and Trench would be better served joining the Council of Donnington & St Georges. Wrockwardine Wood and Trench has a hard boundary of the A442 between them and the town of Oakengates. Wrockwardine Wood and Trench residents already use services and attend a significant amount of events in Donnington which are organised by the current Parish Council which serves Donnington. Having taken the opportunity to speak with a number of residents who live in Trench, they feel a stronger identity with Donnington rather than another town council quite a distance away.
I write in reference to Dawley Hamlets Parish Council. As a resident in the parish I find it illogical for the T&WC Review Committee to recommend the abolition of Dawley Hamlets PC and deem it acceptable that residents within the parish will willingly accept the transfer to neighbouring councils. Why should we accept that when our parish council cares for its residents, and is extremely active throughout the year. The DHPC has the welfare of its residents to heart and works tirelessly on our behalf. Would we get the same care and thought if transferred to a larger parish? I think not. Has the Review Committee identified the benefit to residents of its proposed move, or the loss, as the case may well be? There is an old adage. If it's not broken, don't fix it. Very apt in this situation. My message to all those sitting on the Review Committee is quite simple. Leave well alone and withdraw your proposal. We residents are more than happy with Dawley Hamlets Parish Council continuing its excellent work for many years to come.