

Other

Email Responses - 43

<p>I have lived here for over 25 years and also a previous spell in the flats on Hollinswood when it was still TDC, so I can honestly and expertly say I am definitely opposed to any joining of our parish council with Stirchley and Brookside, it would make the local parish too large and not represent the local needs and concerns of the residents who live here. We are proud of our local area and don't want it pulled apart by the T&W council, so leave it alone, it works well as it is and our parish councillors are approachable and do a good job, why mess it up</p>
<p>As a resident of Randlay, I wish to oppose the proposed merger of our P. C. with Stirchley and Brookside.If the merger went ahead, the resulting council would be too large with too few councillors.The Randlay and Hollinswood councillors continue to do a sterling job for their communities and I wouldn't want to see this dedication 'watered down' as could happen with a larger bureaucratic organisation.I hope my view will be noted</p>
<p>Why merge and save on Parish Councillors. As all the Parish Councillors are unpaid volunteers, what savings are there? Also the area is too big for fewer people to monitor and know about and serve their communities.</p>
<p>The proposed to create a new Parish council to bring together Kynnersley, Preston, Eyton . I oppose this strongly, as I am a resident in Kynnersley we have no connection with Eyton . We Are. Smaller than Preston and feel we will be bullied on most issues, I feel we should stay as we are. [REDACTED]</p>
<p>I wish to state that I do not want Kynnersley parish council to join with Eyton on the Weald moors, whilst the idea of a Weald moors parish council sounds good we have no relationship with Eyton. By road we are not directly linked and our communities are separate they are much closer to wellington and the planned building of 3000 + houses which will make them more urban than us who are very rural with different issues. We have worked with Preston and if we do have to join anyone this would be more appropriate however I strongly believe Kynnersley should remain on its own as we are in a conservation area and we are a separate rural community.I see no value in joining other parishes together who do not share our conservation status</p>
<p>Please ensure that Hollinswood and Randlay parish council remain an entity in their own right, and do not merge with Stirchley and Brookside. We have excellent councillors on Hollinswood and Randlay who act responsibly with allocated funding and are an integral part of our community. Please ensure that there is no merger. By the way, I've tried completing the online form, but got a page not found error, can someone look into this please? Also, can you make it clear that The Nedge is the entry to comment on? It is not clear that Nedge covers the parishes involved,</p>
<p>T&WC is recommending a merger of Erccall Magna with Waters Upton Parish Council.Clearly this is not in the interest of the fee-paying constituents. This should not be allowed to continue.</p>
<p>T&WC is recommending a merger of Erccall Magna with Waters Upton Parish Council.Clearly this is not in the interest of the fee-paying constituents. This should not be allowed to continue.</p>
<p>We've had a letter asking us to express our views on making a new parish council, by combining Kynnersley, Preston and Eyton parish councils.We live in Preston Upon the Weald Moors and we think it's a great idea. We would like to have more people involved in the council from a wider area and we think that it will help to make the parish council more diverse and representative of all the people in these areas.</p>
<p>As a resident of Kynnersley I am writing again to ask you to reconsider the plan to merge my parish council with Eyton.Eyton, with the projected large influx of new builds and consequently a more urban, and higher proportion of younger residents,will have different issues to those of an established tiny rural community such as ours.As now, we should be able</p>

to voice our own concerns without a possible situation of them being drowned out or overlooked by a larger different agenda. I am very concerned, not only about the planned proposal, but that opinions like ours - residents of a small community like ours - will not influence the overall intentions of the Council

I write again to ask you to reverse your plan to merge Kynnersley with Eyton. Eyton with its projected influx of new builds, and consequently more urban and younger residents will have different priorities to those of a settled, established rural community like ours. If the merger were to go through how could we be confident that any concerns about local (to us) issues would be listened to without the possibility of them being drowned out or unheard by a larger agenda. I am very concerned, not only about the idea of this sort of merger, but also that opinions that oppose it will not be able to influence the overall aim of the Council.

REFERENCE CREATION WEALDMOOR PARISH. [REDACTED] I am a resident of Kynnersley Parish, regarding the suggestion that the parishes of Kynnersley Preston Horton and wheat Leasowes be amalgamated into one. I STRONGLY OBJECT. Kynnersley is a 100% rural Parish whereas the others are at best semi urban if the proposed mega housing estate goes ahead at least one will be 100% Urban. Kynnersley Parish is situated entirely on the Weald Moors officially designated as an area of special landscape character, the village itself is built on a sandstone outcrop surrounded by deep peatland, the buildings in the village quite unique for the west side of the country very similar to the Fenland of the east counties, then and now the only industry is agriculture with the farmsteads built within the curtilage of the Village each Farm having some dryer land around the village and parcels of land on the wetter moorland, as livestock farming was the norm cattle had to be moved night and morning to the wetter grassland this Necessitated all the properties they passed had to be well fenced either with stone or brick walls this protected their gardens. this the parish council has been able to maintain through diligent scrutiny of any planning applications, a notable case being when village farmers sold on for development no longer practical old brick and tile buildings they put on conditions that any barn conversions retain there original farmstead layout having just one main driveway servicing each old farm complex. Kynnersley has had its own parish council since the 1920s raising its own precept, The council has five dedicated members claiming no expenses from themselves willing to roll up their sleeves and get stuck in and very often paying for things out of their own pocket all for the good of the parish. The achievements of the parish council are many, we have persuaded the electricity companies and GPO to put their cables underground in the centre of the village and and remove their supply poles, we have successfully lobbied for a new sewage system, we have with the help of Telford & Wrekin obtained a grant to create a quiet lane system on three out of the four lanes coming into the village this has created a wonderful safe access for walkers cyclist and horse riders on the outskirts of Telford where they can see the real countryside and go past Wall Camp the largest Stone Age settlement in Shropshire where artefacts have recently been found dating back 2500 BC With all the work, the council and residence have put in Kynnersley has been made a conservation area the only one of the four parishes mentioned)The parish council has erected three name signs at the entries to the Village, these have being made of local sandstone with former sandstone gate posts donated by local farmers the ornate cast iron nameplates were cast by Bliss Hill museum. Kynnersley has his own Village Hall The parish council Makes a substantial grant towards its upkeep, also paying a private contractor for additional road sweeping, also many others activities planting trees, providing benches, help maintaining the burial ground, maintaining noticeboard, maintenance of signage in Village etc. As you will be aware will never be able to be incorporated into the built environment of Telford because of the deep peat land which acts as a floodplain between Preston and kynnersley, also the unsuitability of the road accesses all prone to subsidence. As you will note from the above Kynnersley has a long history of looking after itself and not being a burden on the purse of Telford & Wrekin. it has suggested by our local district counsellor that if we joined with the other parishes we need a full-time clerk and each of the current parishes be Warded I totally

reject this suggestion, because it would add one more layer of administration between the people of Kynnersley and Telford and Wrekin. I have been a member of Kynnersley Parish Council for 35 years [REDACTED], during the last few years we have put aside a reserve of over £7000 to help rebuild our Village Hall, I consider our Hall a iconic building it started its life before being moved to Kynnersley as a hospital building used in the first world war. I believe passionately that Kynnersley remain a single parish for the benefit of the the residence of Kynnersley and the greater good of Telford, the secret is in its name in old English " Kynnersley means island " as Telford gets larger it offers a safe rural area where people can walk and cycle to without having to get into a car.

I am a resident in Roden and I wish to object to T&W councils proposal to merge Ercall Magna parish council with Waters Upton parish council. If this merger was to take place I strongly believe that there will be no effective or efficient governance across both parishes. Representation of Roden and Poynton, as a warded parish, would be decreased to only one councillor and therefore our voice in community matters would be diminished and potentially disparaged. Roden has its own unique community identity. It would be unfeasible for a councillor from as far as Great Bolas (for example) to know or comprehend the needs of our hamlet from within such an oversized and unmanageable proposed parish. Likewise, a councillor from Roden will have very little idea or contact with residents and the rural community of Waters Upton. I also confirm that it is my wish that Roden remains within Ercall Magna parish council. Please, do not put us in a position of negligible and insignificant representat

REFERENCE HOLLINSWOOD & RANDLAY AND STIRCHLEY & BROOKSIDE MERGER: I wish to register my opposition to the proposed merging of H.A.R.P. and B.A.S.P. and believe they should remain as separate entities which best serves the local community

I write to express my strong objection to the merging of the HARP and BASP Parish councils. I feel that the merger will reduce the strong sense of community we have across the HARP Parish and that the resultant Parish will be too large to engender the same sense of community.

The Parish is aware that there is a meeting tomorrow evening which may be discussing the above. With that in mind please see below the position of the Parish Council as confirmed by the Councillors on May 19th 2025. At the full council meeting on Monday 19th, Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council formally resolved to OPPOSE to the Telford & Wrekin recommendation which is to merge our Parish Council with Starchley & Brookside Parish Council. There was a lengthy debate about the proposal which Councillors believe will create a parish council which is too large and will result in communities losing their identities. There was further concern regarding the reduction in number of Parish Councillors and the change of name of the council – both of which bring into question local representation and democracy. The Parish Council strongly urges everyone in the parishes to respond to the consultation – the Telford & Wrekin Council Boundary Review Committee confirmed that the final decision will be based on the public opinions collected through this consultation process. Please let them know your view on the recommendation. The Parish Council is still collating further views from the residents and a full and complete response will be provided before the 14th July 2025.

Subject: Objection to Proposed Merger of Rodington Parish Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to express my family's strong objection to the proposed merger of Rodington Parish with other parishes situated several miles away. Rodington Parish has a clear identity and plays a vital role in meeting the needs of its local community. To merge it with more distant parishes would undermine its effectiveness and dilute the representation of our community's priorities— particularly in relation to local highways, rights of way, cemeteries, children's play areas, and communal spaces, all of which are currently managed well under the existing structure. There should be no changes. Each parish should remain independent and be able to focus on and budget for its own local needs, not those of a parish located several miles away. Combining parishes with differing priorities and geographic challenges would reduce accountability and

responsiveness, ultimately to the detriment of all the communities involved. We strongly urge that this proposal be rejected in full, and that Rodington Parish be allowed to continue serving its residents as it currently does—effectively and locally.

I refer to the Community Governance Review 2025 and have the following comments: There is no explanation in the report as to how and why the individual parish areas have been defined apart from a broad description in the introduction i.e. based on community identity or to address electoral imbalance. More specifically on the reference to merging Aqueduct and Little Dawley into Great Dawley Council, no information is provided as to the rationale. The review seeks to strengthen community identity however there is a danger that this could have a negative impact as issues relating to the larger settlements of Dawley and Malinslee take precedence. Telford and Wrekin and Shropshire Councils have experience of this at a more strategic level being partners of the West Midlands Combined Authority, where the urban agendas of Birmingham and the Black Country tend to dominate and dictate. The Terms of Reference of the Review refers to other forms of community governance options but does not consider any of these. It assumes that regigging boundaries will be sufficient. Given the low turnout in local elections, general disengagement with politics combined with high levels of deprivation in parts of the Borough, some alternatives would have appropriate giving communities more of a say in how they shape and run their communities. This could include consideration of options mentioned: Neighbourhood management organisations / tenant management organisations / area and community forums and community associations. The role of these is much wider in scope than the narrow responsibilities of the Parish Councils which probably explains the limited local involvement. I do not expect dramatic change however the Council could trial some initiatives particularly in the light of the Government's agenda on devolution.

Telford and Wrekin Conservative Group Response to Community Governance Review Consultation June 2025. Submission from the Telford and Wrekin Conservative Group The Telford and Wrekin Conservative Group welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Community Governance Review Consultation of June 2025. We recognise the importance of strong, effective, and representative local governance to ensure that the voices of residents across Telford and Wrekin are heard and their interests safeguarded. We appreciate the thoroughness of the consultation process and commend the council for seeking a wide range of perspectives before making any decisions on potential changes. It is our collective responsibility to ensure that any revisions to governance arrangements are made in a way that enhances local democracy, improves accountability, and maintains the unique identities of the communities within our borough. We wish to highlight the following key points as part of our response: Local Representation: We support the principle of ensuring all communities have a fair and effective voice. Any proposed boundary changes or amendments to representation should seek to balance population growth with a commitment to community identity and historical ties. Parish and Town Councils: The role of parish and town councils is vital in representing local interests. We urge that any proposals fully consider the impact on these councils, ensuring that no area is left under-represented or disadvantaged by potential boundary changes. Community Engagement: We believe that engagement with residents, community groups, and local stakeholders is essential before any final decisions are made. Transparency and open communication must remain central throughout this process along with a clear explanation of any proposed changes. Changes to governance structures should deliver tangible benefits to local communities. We encourage a careful assessment of benefits associated with any proposed changes. Preservation of Local Identity: It is imperative that the individual character and heritage of our towns, villages, and neighbourhoods are respected and preserved as part of any review outcomes. Some specific comments on the proposals are as a result of consulting with residents, community representatives and sitting Councillors. The review is more extensive than it needs to be at this time. With significant developments included in the local plan a scaled down review would accommodate the more pressing

changes where significant new housing developments have been made e.g. new Parish Councils for Muxton and Priorslee. Specific response to the proposals are as follows:

NEWPORT: Support proposed changes

CHETWYND ASTON & CHURCH ASTON: Support proposed changes

LILLESALL: Support proposed changes

CHETWYND & EDGMOND: Support option 1 (status quo)

TIBBERTON & CHERRINGTON: Support proposed changes.

WATERS UPTON & ERCALL MAGNA: Support option 1 (status quo)

Both communities have a distinct identity and are geographically separated by a significant distance which includes an airfield.

Muxton: Support the separate Parish Council. The boundary of the new Parish Council should be the same as the Borough ward boundary. The new developments on Donnington Wood Way and at the top the Redhill should be included in the Muxton Parish boundary to continue to embrace the new residents as part of 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: Support the separate Parish Council. St. Georges, Donnington, Wrockwardine Wood, Trench and Oakengates: The proposals are not supported. Donnington and St. Georges are older well established communities. Residents of Donnington have more in common with Wrockwardine Wood and Trench whereas residents of St. Georges will identify more with Oakengates. In addition the proposals will split Wrockwardine Wood in two with the traditional areas of Wrockwardine Wood e.g. Summer Crescent, Cockshut Piece and The Nabb being placed in St Georges. A more logical proposal and in keeping with the statutory principles of the review would be to merge Donnington (minus Redhill) with Wrockwardine Wood & Trench; and create a single Oakengates and St Georges Town Council which would better reflect current community identities.

Ketley: Support the proposal.

Eyton, Preston, Kynnersley and Hadley & Leegomery: Amended proposals

Wealdmoor Parish Council to include Kynnersley and Preston, Horton to have its own Parish Meeting being distinct and a predominantly rural community separate from Hadley and Leegomery. Eyton to remain as a Parish meeting due to their distinct and isolated rural location.

Hadley & Leegomery: Remove Horton as above and Apley Castle which is a distinct community with little connection to Hadley & Leegomery.

Great Dawley: Amended proposals. The proposed Great Dawley Parish Council is too large for effective local governance with Little Dawley being 'swallowed up'. Residents would be better served and the statutory guidelines of the review adhered to by maintaining the current arrangements and incorporating the proposals set out by Dawley Hamlets Parish Council.

Lawley & Overdale: Amended proposals. Town Centre (Lawley part) removed to Hollinswood & Randley (The Nedge) as residents will have little affinity to Lawley. Old Park Way is a more logical boundary.

The Gorge: Proposal concerns. Due to geographical considerations the Lightmoor and Horsehay polling districts would be better represented if they were included in the Lawley Parish Council, the A4169 is a more logical boundary.

Nedge Parish Council: Amended proposals. The proposal to set up The Nedge Parish Council will weaken the current local governance, therefore the current arrangements should continue.

Madeley Town Council: Support the proposals

Wellington Town Council: Amended proposals

Admaston, Bratton & Shawburch to have their own Parish Council as they are a distinct urban area with shared local services. Wrockwardine and Little Wenlock are geographically separated by The Wrekin and are two long established distinct communities and therefore should have their own Parish Councils. Rodington should retain its own Parish Council.

In conclusion, the Telford and Wrekin Conservative Group remains committed to working constructively with the council and all stakeholders to help shape governance arrangements that reflect the needs and aspirations of our diverse communities. We look forward to further opportunities to contribute as the review progresses and thank the council for the opportunity to share our views.

I support Preston/Kynnersley/Eyton all rural villages/lots of old properties/listed buildings with similar issues regarding traffic/planning/conservation (Kynnersley) Also many parishioners in Wappenshal attend Eyton church. Eyton Hall linked to history of Wappenshall and has a very old village hall like Kynnersley. Wappenshal canal heritage centre...opening soon is in Eyton as well.

Formal Submission to The Boundary Review Committee regarding the Community Governance Review Phase 2. As previously supplied on the 2nd of July 2025: - "At the full council meeting on Monday 19th, Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council formally resolved to OPPOSE the Telford & Wrekin recommendation which is to merge our Parish Council with Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council. There was a lengthy debate about the proposal which Councillors believe will create a parish council which is too large and will result in communities losing their identities. There was further concern regarding the reduction in number of Parish Councillors and the change of name of the council – both of which bring into question local representation and democracy. The Parish Council strongly urges everyone in both parishes to respond to the consultation – the Telford & Wrekin Council Boundary Review Committee confirmed, at its meeting, that the final decision will be based on the public opinions collected through this consultation process. Please let them know your view on the recommendation." This outlined the Parish Councils' position on the proposal to merge this Parish with Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council. The following is a detailed explanation as to why the position of the Parish remains to oppose this one option. As no other options had been included in this consultation it is taken that either this proposal would be taken forward or the current status quo would remain. As evidenced by the slips filled out by residents that attended our drop-in sessions and completed a slip, an overwhelming majority is opposed to this merger. 99.5% of our Parish residents oppose, 76.9% of residents in Stirchley and Brookside Parish are opposed too. There is NO evidence to suggest that residents of either area are of the view that this is in their interests or would benefit the wider communities. Having taken time to talk to residents in large numbers, there is little to no appetite for the proposals as there are no clear links between the two parish areas. Residents believe that their community identity would be lost – The Nedge name does not convey in any way the historical characteristics or localness of the areas. Many residents expressed concerns that there is no similarity between the needs of the residents or area of Brookside and Hollinswood or vice versa. The distance from Stafford Park to Brookside, for example, is immense and staff / councillors would find it a challenge to represent all the communities being brought together by this recommendation. Having taken time to study the Guidance on community governance reviews published in March 2010, we feel that the following sections would be relevant and appropriate to highlight. Section 215. – There has been limited, if any, new builds on the edge of each of current Parish areas – The Hem being the current largest increase in housing in the area. As we previously suggested, this should be placed within one Parish boundary, but this does not equate nor justify a merging of parishes. 19. – 23. – These points make it abundantly clear that residents' views are the driving force behind any changes proposed. Point 23. clearly states that it is local people's views that should tailor the principal council's view. Having seen the responses to phase 1 this proposal does not meet this criteria. 33. – The consultation should consider views received but this needs to secure and reflect the identities and interest of the community and is effective and convenient. The proposal does not meet this requirement. 34. – This states that the principal local authority should consult with the parish council. It is accepted that some wider consultation has taken place, but not directly with this Parish Council even though it would be dramatically affected by this change. The Parish Council is not aware that either of the two primary schools in its area have been directly contacted nor any of the health bodies who are directly involved in the Parish. This is not a correct use of this process. Section 3 Substantively, points 46-48 refers to how any proposed changes would provide a more cohesive, attractive and economically vibrant community – nothing in the document issued for phase 2 expands or explains the benefits. Even the submission in phase 1 does not offer any ideas of why this

would benefit the community as outlined. Community cohesion is central to this whole concept. As shown by the numbers against this proposal it is clear this would have the complete opposite effect.⁵² – The two bullet points identified clearly outline why a proposal should be considered – neither are met by this proposal of a merger. The identities and interests of local communities – 55-61. Nothing about this proposal factor in the majority views of the residents. Identities, place, distinctive and recognisable communities with a sense of identity – The Nedge Parish proposal does NOT meet these criteria. It is worth highlighting point 61. specifically, as this reinforces that the proposed merger is not a correct outcome, as in it is the opposite of what is suggested. Again, nothing in the proposal document argues that these factors would be met.⁶⁵ – As it is widely accepted and has been noted during this process Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council is already achieving these initiatives; a merger would significantly weaken the wider ability of a larger parish to meet the needs of its residents across such a diverse and large area.⁷⁰ – If this proposal were to be forced upon the residents of the parish, trust would be lost in the principal authority to act fairly.⁷⁴ – Community cohesion along with the identity and interests of the local community. This proposal does not correctly explain how this is being achieved. If anything, the opposite could be argued. This specifically states that “It would be difficult to think of a situation in which a principal council could make a decision to create a parish and a parish council which reflects community identities and interests in the areas and at the same time threatens community cohesion.” As stated, there is no evidence that this merger would achieve this point.⁸⁰ – This proposal would create a parish that could be considered too large and covering too many different identities, which again is opposite to what this process should achieve.⁸¹ – This point refers to the fact that bigger is not always better and that as the current parish councils supply and are able to offer services to their local communities, this proposal does not explain how expanding the parish would improve things for the residents. Ultimately, that is key in this process, in that what and how this would be viewed by residents, and what improvements would occur in a larger parish.⁸⁴ – This specifically relates to this proposal – “In many cases a boundary change between existing parishes, or parishes and unparished areas, will be sufficient to ensure that parish arrangements reflect local identities and facilitate effective and convenient local government.”. Our previous submissions to alter the boundaries meet these criteria whereas this proposed merger clearly DOES NOT meet these criteria. As no evidence within the phase 2 documentation explains why this merger should happen, which is explicitly against these criteria, the proposal should not proceed. The section “Recommendations and decisions on the outcome of a community governance reviews” has two pertinent points. 95. & 96. Taken together these clearly outline how the principal council should ensure that the representations received should be supported by evidence allowing the arrangement to meet the 2007 Act. Nothing that the parish council has seen or been able to gather could support the principal councils suggested merger. As most respondents are opposed to any form of merger, with a small minority who did, provides insufficient supporting views for the merger. 100. – This section relates to a decision being made to merge (or not merge). It is difficult, having seen the responses to phase 1 and now with the level of responses from the parish opposed to this current recommendation, to understand how the principal council could justify the reasons behind this proposal. This could imply a forced merger would not be supported by the 2007 Act. Although the principal council would be required to make available a document setting out the reasons for the decision taken (both in the case of the recommendation proceeding or not), from all the evidence available, there is insufficient support for the proposal from local residents. This would sadly imply that a decision to merge will have been made by the principal council against the wishes of the residents and parish councils. Within section 4.114. – This relates to the enlarging or splitting of parish council areas. Community interests are key. The final two sentences are key to the proposed merge “Grouping or de-grouping needs to be compatible with the retention of community interest. It would be inappropriate it to be used to build artificially large units under a single parish council.” Although as noted elsewhere within

the guidance there is not one size fits all nor a suggested size, but most parish councils have a population of less than 12,000. This proposed merger would not, from all the evidence seen, meet this statement. The electoral numbers of 11,324 is a different calculation and would clearly suggest a population of well over the 12,000 figure. 137. – Within this paragraph it states very clearly what sets parish councils apart from other kinds of governance. The inference of this is that it would be clearly incorrect of the principal council to impose a decision on the area unless it is fully evidenced at the review stage, which would allow residents to understand the reasons why a merger could or would benefit them. Nothing in the pack allows that level of informed decision making to support the merger, so the only logical conclusion would be to not support the merger. Conclusion Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council has opposed this merger from its first mention and continues to do so. This stance was formed from a considered and well discussed process, based on community involvement, experience and knowledge of our local area. The Council has not just decided that this would be rejected out-of-hand. The proposal was and has been evaluated based on what is best for the residents, who are represented by the Councillors, taking time to discuss with them and then considerable effort to review all evidence. They also considered the suggested reasons for the merger and concluded: The proposed merger would not make the Parish co-terminous with The Nedge borough boundary – as there would still be two wards within the one new parish. There has been minimal movement in the boundaries – the Ward boundaries have had movement but not the parish boundaries. The existing Parishes do reflect the local community and there is clear demarcation between the areas. These are both hard and soft geographical. Using the A442 as a common transport link is a false statement – the road is a 60mph dual carriage way linking Hortonwood to Sutton Hill. Each of the areas within the two parishes have a clear and identifiable road network, the A442 would not be something residents would even consider as a link between the five areas. The Parish Council has and will continue to offer its assistance to Telford and Wrekin in support of any minor changes to the boundaries to remove the few anomalies that do currently exist and would welcome the opportunity to discuss these ideas with the Boundary Review Committee to assist in regard to these minor changes (Arundel Close, The Hem and Station Quarter). Finally, Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council wishes to make clear that its working relationship with Telford and Wrekin has, in its view, always been a positive and supportive partnership, with its residents' best interests at its core. It is of course hoped that this will continue for many years to come. However, in this specific instance, it is unable to and cannot support this proposal and continues to oppose the recommendation on behalf of the residents.

Please find below the formal response from Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council to the second consultation: At the Full Council meeting on Tuesday 8 July 2025 Stirchley and Brookside formally resolved to OPPOSE the Telford & Wrekin Community Governance Review recommendation to merge the Parish Council with Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council. Opposition to the proposal is based on the following factors: 1. The communities of Stirchley and Brookside have their own identities. This is especially true for Stirchley in terms of its history stretching back to the 12th century. These two communities are believed to be adequately served by the 13 Councillors on the Parish Council and the future inclusion of the Hem will be met by the current 7 Stirchley ward Councillors. It is strongly believed that implementation of the proposal would remove that identity where such community identity is regarded as important to link to a Parish Council and its Councillors. 2. The proposal for a combined Nedge Parish Council does not take into account the developments taking place across the parishes and a future proposed Councillor membership of 18 is considered totally inadequate to properly represent the current and future resident population. 3. It is recognised that both Stirchley and Brookside have areas of deprivation, of which Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council is particularly conscious and aware of and seeks to work in partnership with relevant stakeholders and organisations that can assist. Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council strongly believes that a merged Parish Council with Hollinswood and Randlay will result in the

focus on the deprived areas being lessened and possibly ignored resulting in the residents being further distanced from areas and people of support.4.Adoption of the proposal would result in a parish with extended communities and holding of community events would result in issues for many where the distances and lack of transport across the parish would result in residents feeling denied or ignored in being able to attend “local events”.5.Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council disputes the geographic logic presented by the Review which states that the links to the A442 merit the merger. It is believed that many of the Telford communities have links to the A442 and presenting the logic as stated is not a case for merger.6.Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council strongly believes the proposal under the Review is community damaging and that there is a strong case for the communities of Stirchley and Brookside to continue being served by the Parish Council as it currently stands.7.The proposal for the merger throws into doubt the key delivery areas and operating models between the two Parish Councils. Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council provide a large and strong youth provision and environmental services offering including free gardening service for eligible parish residents. The merger would throw these offerings into doubt and compromise the services and hard work undertaken by the team within Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council.8.Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council endeavoured to gather views of its residents and 43 paper responses were received expressing views on the proposal. Of these, 11 residents supported the proposal whilst 43 opposed. On that basis 76% of the residents oppose the proposal and desire no change to the current setup within Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council.I attach scanned copies of the forms that were completed. I would be grateful for your confirmation that these will be regarded as 43 separate responses in addition to that of the Parish Council.

Kynnersley Parish Council was surprised to see in the recommendations that TWC was proposing to form a Weald Moors Parish Council by joining our Parish with Preston and Eyton on the Weald Moors.The Parish Council remained clear in its view, as representatives of the Kynnersley Parish community, that it would prefer to stay as it is. Kynnersley is unique and the recent creation of the Conservation Area supports this as it assists in protecting the heritage of the Village.You will be aware of the number of Listed Buildings and the Significant Features within the Parish.The community is close, it has a Village Hall and a small Village Barrow (shop), serving the community with local produce. It also has a church. However, it does not have a school, public transport or a good road network.Eyton on the Weald Moors is also a unique community, with a church and village hall and just one route in and out from the A442. The community has a strong identity and community cohesion – there is regular attendance at Parish Meetings and events by people across the Parish but not from outside of the Parish.The distance between our two villages is significant (5 miles) and we have absolutely nothing in common. There is no pedestrian or transport link between the two and our respective residents do not share any sense of collective community identity.There is no support or reason for the coming together of Kynnersley Parish with Eyton on the Weald Moors.Whilst Kynnersley Parish Council believes that the majority of Kynnersley residents would prefer it to stay as it is, there are some who believe that a coming-together with Preston on the Weald Moors may have some benefits.We do share the same road system and local issues and the children all have an opportunity to attend Preston Primary School. We also appreciate that the new housing in Preston village has increased the numbers of residents which may be better represented by a Parish Council than a Parish Meeting. However, Preston on the Weald Moors Parish Meeting is effective and efficient and has represented the community well and may wish to continue to do so.If the Boundary Review Committee is minded to confirm the creation of a new Parish, then bringing Kynnersley & Preston (only) together may be supported by the community.We found the recommendation to be misleading. We understand that the Boundary Review Committee members made it clear that they would want to make their decision based on the residents’ opinions. The survey on the telford.gov.uk website did not include our Parish in the list – we understand that this list was of the recommended parishes, but a lot of residents were put off responding for two reasons:1.Some believe that as The Weald Moors Parish was listed, that a

decision had already been made (predetermined)². Some did not respond because their Parish was not listed. When printed copies of the survey / questionnaire were made available, they were not suitable for a hard copy version as the wording in places was relating to the online version. Kynnersley Parish Council wanted its residents to know that although the recommendation was for the Weald Moors Parish Council (including Eyton), the Boundary Review Committee had confirmed that the 'status quo' was still an option and that they would also receive alternative suggestions through this consultation period. Therefore, a drop-in session took place in Kynnersley Village Hall on Monday 23rd June from 7pm until 9pm. It was well attended by local residents and some from Horton and Eyton on the Weald Moors. We had A3 size maps on display showing the current and proposed boundary and we offered copies of the recommendations, document, survey and ensured that people had the direct email address (reviews@telford.gov.uk) to let you know their views. We were able to confirm that the BRC had confirmed at a meeting that they would make their decision based on the residents' views – so we sincerely hope you will have received a significant number of responses. In order for the Parish Council to respond to this consultation, we offered the residents who attended the drop in session an opportunity to give their postcode and confirm whether they were in support of the recommendation or if they opposed it. Over 50 people attended and from those who completed a slip, 32 opposed the merger of Kynnersley, Preston and Eyton to form a new Parish known as The Weald Moors Parish Council and 4 were in support. There was some opposition to the coming together of Kynnersley with Preston (only). We will be including the completed forms, for your information, as many of the comments are very interesting in support of their views. With regards to the number of Councillors per Ward, it is vitally important that Kynnersley and Preston have the same number of elected Members. To bring together two communities and not for them to have the same number of Councillors is not democratic – it will be seen as giving one an advantage which is not a good way to start to build a new Parish with Civility and Respect. The area that this merged Parish of Kynnersley & Preston (which should retain both names) is vast and will need a significant number of Councillors to represent the entire community and the extensive area. It is believed that at least 8 Members will be needed, and maybe even 10. There should be equal numbers from each, regardless of the electorate numbers.³ It is disappointing that no one from Telford & Wrekin Council visited areas and parishes to discuss the proposals and to get to hear from the communities direct at any stage of the process. The recommendation was not proposed by local residents and the Boundary Commission, when setting up the process, confirmed that the communities must be at the heart of the decision. We sincerely hope and EXPECT that the members of the Boundary Review Committee take into account the residents' opinions and views, from Kynnersley, Eyton on the Weald Moors and Preston on the Weald Moors when making their decision as per their mandate and in accordance with the legal guidance.

Response of Eyton Parish Meeting to Phase Two Consultation on draft proposals for Telford & Wrekin Council Community Governance Review 2025. The Parish Meeting and residents are opposed to the proposal to merge Eyton Parish into a newly created Weald Moors Parish Council and strongly believe that the Parish should remain unchanged. Briefly the reasons for this view are as follows:

- Community Identity – the Parish has a clearly defined community identity. There is no community identity between Eyton and the Parishes of Kynnersley and Preston.
- Feedback received - The consultation material clearly states that the proposals are based on feedback received. There is no feedback from residents of Eyton parish, or from the other Parishes, which supports the proposals made.
- Representation/Disenfranchisement – Residents are currently proactive and effectively represented by the Parish Meeting. They will lose this effective representation and be disenfranchised as a result of these proposals.
- New development and influence - The proposals in the local plan for new development at Wappenshall require an effective, proactive and consultative approach from the Parish that will be lost under the proposed arrangements. In support of this position, we have expanded on these points and we would refer the Committee to the following.

1. Community Identity Eyton

Parish is a rural community, and contains a mix of small villages, hamlets and farms. Eyton and Wappenshall also have an important industrial heritage and a large number of listed buildings. Despite Eyton being the smallest parish in the Borough, by population, and that population being scattered across a relatively large geographic area, there is a strong sense of community identity and cohesion throughout the Parish. Residents from across the whole Parish regularly attend Parish Meetings, social occasions and volunteering activities. However, it should be noted that there are few geographical links between Eyton and the other Parishes around the Weald Moors. Although quite close as the crow flies, road links are lengthy. It is 3.6 miles by road from Eyton to Preston, 3.5 to Horton, and 4.6 to Kynnersley. Therefore, there is no community cohesion or everyday connection between the villages and hamlets in Eyton Parish and the larger villages of Preston and Kynnersley. Understandably, the respective residents do not mix, share community events or feel any particular sense of collective community identity. We believe that the comments contained in the Proposal and Rationale section of Appendix A of the draft proposals considered by the Committee in the meeting on 12 May 2025 are based on a misunderstanding of the dynamics of the Weald Moors parishes and a misconception of the community identities that exist in the area. It was stated that “the three areas [Eyton, Preston and Kynnersley] have a strong rural identity and this proposal is focussed on retaining that character and community identity.” For the reasons set out above we fundamentally disagree with this assessment. The only characteristic shared by the three areas is that they are all rural parishes, which is not a compelling reason for merger given that we can see no advantage and definite disadvantages for Eyton in the proposal. Eyton on the Weald Moors Parish has been a Parish Meeting since 2004 and has held regular meetings since then. The Parish has been very proactive in responding to issues and has involved the whole community in decisions relating to the Parish. Parishioners are currently proactive in running the Parish Meeting and responding to needs by volunteering rather than charging a precept (there is currently no precept for Eyton Parish). The officers are unpaid and do not claim expenses; any work that needs doing is carried out voluntarily. For example, by having work parties to clear vegetation or carry out repairs at the village hall, organising parish events and fund raising events when required. This is the true spirit of community identity. Please note that as Eyton Parish Meeting is well established, proactive and represents a strong and cohesive community, the Parish wishes to continue with the current arrangement. Para 59 of the Local Government Boundary Commission Guidance on community governance reviews (the “Boundary Commission Guidance”) states that “parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity.” We believe that retention of the existing arrangements best achieves the intent of that provision.

2. Consideration of Feedback The Boundary Commission Guidance requires, of course, that Councils consult local people and take account of any representations received in connection with the review, and the Council has stated that the changes contained in the draft proposals are based on the feedback received. However, in the case of the proposals affecting Eyton, Preston and Kynnersley this is not apparent. We have studied the responses received to the Phase One consultation and can find virtually no support for merging Eyton into an enlarged Weald Moors parish. In the review of the feedback from Kynnersley in Appendix A it was noted that “the Parish Council argued that there was no support for a larger Weald Moors parish.” Also, it was reported that “the primary theme from the other representations were that the existing arrangements should remain as they reflect the community’s rural identity. If a larger parish were to be created, that should be Kynnersley and Preston and not with other areas such as Eyton, Horton, Wheat Leasowes as they have different characteristics and identity.” In the feedback from Preston it was noted that the Preston Parish Meeting submission focussed on two proposed options for future parish arrangements. These were “to retain a Preston Parish Meeting or join with Kynnersley Parish Council to form a larger parish. The rationale for this was shared rural community identity.” The clear majority preference view in Eyton as expressed in a Parish Meeting held to discuss the proposals was for retention of the

existing arrangements.3.Representation and Disenfranchisement.Residents are very concerned about the potential for Eyton Parish's identity and needs to be swallowed up by other larger parishes in any new parish council arrangement. There is no physical or community connection with the parishes of Kynnersley and Preston. The needs, interests and issues of Eyton Parish are not necessarily those of the larger villages of Preston and Kynnersley, which are geographically distant and who have very different priorities. Eyton is unlikely to be able to exert much influence or effectively promote its own issues or views through a single councillor on an expanded Parish Council. Eyton residents would be disenfranchised!The effectiveness of the existing governance arrangements for Eyton would be materially adversely affected by being subsumed into a proposed Weald Moors parish.4.Interest in and Influence over proposed developments.The Wappenshall SUE development in the new draft Local Plan will directly affect the residents of Eyton Parish. Eyton Parish Meeting wants and needs to be able to continue and develop its strong, positive and consultative relationship with TWC planners and the developers over the next 10+ years as the development progresses. Any direct influence Eyton Parish may have had will be lost in the proposed new arrangement as the Parishes of Kynnersley and Preston are not as affected by the proposals, and the influence of, potentially, a single individual Councillor will be small. Therefore, the voice of the residents most affected will be lost. Again, the feeling of the residents is that, in practice, they would be effectively disenfranchised.5.Boundaries The current draft Local Plan envisages substantial new housing and other commercial development within the southern boundary of the Eyton Parish. It is strongly felt that such intensive developments have an entirely different identity and interests, more aligned with the existing built-up area of Telford, rather than the essentially rural character of the Eyton (and other Weald Moor) parishes. Such developments would have no community cohesion with or similarity to the existing small rural villages and hamlets.For these reasons we support the principle informing the comments contained in the Proposal and Rationale section of Appendix A that, "to ensure that the new parish retains its rural character, it is proposed that, if and when, the proposed development in the draft Local Plan is built out, then a localised community governance review will be completed to enable this development to be incorporated into another more urban parish arrangement."6.Effectiveness and ViabilityThe Boundary Commission Guidance (also reflected in the Council's own Terms of Reference) confirms that the Council is required to ensure that parishes "reflect community identity and interest" and that they are "viable and democratic units". Further, community governance should be "effective and convenient".The current draft proposals would not achieve these objectives for Eyton which has operated for many years as an effective, convenient, viable and democratic administrative unit. These attributes would only be reduced or lost if it were to be merged into an artificial and logically incoherent Weald Moors parish.Furthermore, any grouping needs to be "compatible with the retention of community interests", which this would not be, and we strongly endorse the principle that it is "inappropriate to use it to build artificially large units under single parish councils". (Para 114 of the Guidance and Para 9.18 of the Terms of Reference)

Following your updated Governance review proposal with regards to proposed Parish Council changes, Little Wenlock Parish Council has again gone out to our residents to gain their feedback on this proposal and would respond as follows:Based upon clear responses to our Phase one survey and your updated proposal, we felt that our residents and Telford and Wrekin governance review team are best served by us asking a very simple question with a yes/No answer to provide the clearest response.Please see attached our Phase Two survey results, we also attach our Phase One survey resultsfor clarity. Based upon our survey results it is clear to Little Wenlock Parish Council that our residents do not want this proposed change, 100% of those responding gave a clear answer that they do not want this change and want to remain as an independent Parish council. The Phase One survey demonstrates that our residents are passionate about our identity as an independent community and they feel that the

proposals will have a negative impact on the service level offered by Councillors. As the current Councillors for Little Wenlock we gladly give our time and efforts to support the community of which we are so proud, it will be with huge regret that if Telford and Wrekin Borough council insist on proceeding with the proposals as detailed, this being directly against 100% of those residents responding to the survey and that of the Councillors of Little Wenlock Parish Council wishes, They will have no choice but to resign with immediate effect. Little Wenlock Parish Council strongly believes that the proposals will see a degradation of services within our community and loss of identity. Little Wenlock Parish Council sincerely hope that the Governance review team will listen to residents and PARISH COUNCIL on this matter.

I am a Wellington Town Councillor [REDACTED] and wish to give my views on the proposed alterations to this consultation which will affect this Town Council. Haygate Fields. The area known as Haygate Fields including Lewis Crescent should be incorporated into Wellington Town Council. Residents already consider themselves part of Wellington as their area is already surrounded by Wellington's Haygate Ward and would improve community cohesion. Wellington is where they shop and use medical, dental, schools and leisure facilities. Admaston and Bratton. This area should be included in Wellington Town Council because of the strong links they already have with Wellington. They also look to Wellington to shop, use medical, dental, schools and leisure facilities. Meadow Ward. This Ward should be incorporated into the proposed Admaston and Bratton Ward. Wrockwardine is clearly a rural area and the Wards named above have grown into a more urban environment and the time has now come to include them into Wellington Wards. These proposals would mean an increase of Wellington Town Councillors to 25 to align with 9 Parish Wards aligned with the proposed Borough Council Wards.

For the attention of the Boundary Review Committee THE PROPOSED MERGER OF ERCALL MAGNA PARISH COUNCIL WITH WATERS UPTON PARISH COUNCIL Of all the proposals contained in the recommendations, this proposed merger of these long-established, extremely effective rural parishes was not only the most surprising, but also the most unexpected by both Parish Council and residents. I would like to draw your attention to Chapter 3, Paragraph 87 of the Local Government Boundary Commission Advice which specifically covers this proposal and protects functioning existing parish councils from grouping or de-grouping. I believe that the principal authority would be disregarding the Act and Advice if the recommendation was to be approved. As this had not been mentioned previously, in either the 2023 or first phase of the 2025 consultations, whoever or wherever this suggestion came from must demonstrate that they have little idea or understanding of rural communities and it appears to residents that they do not recognise the value that they provide to their respective communities. I have been asked, does TWC realise the financial contributions, input and support offered to the principal authority over many years? It is questioned, does it respect their history, identity, interest or viability – or more importantly, the effectiveness of the governance that is provided by both local councils? The explanation in the document containing this recommendation is seen by many as derogatory as it states “this proposal would allow for the parish council to remain a viable council capable of providing services to its residents whilst maintaining community identity and proposed warding arrangements will support effective community governance and provide good representation across the community” Actually, residents strongly believe that this merger will have the opposite effect! The statement alone supports my earlier assertion that there is no understanding by whoever of what rural communities and rural governance is actually about. This is not about the precept. This element is considered extremely carefully by a body of volunteers, who live, work and employ from their community in which they were elected to serve. They have, without question, an intimate understanding of their communities and the locality, the infrastructure and needs and how important community engagement is in providing good governance and effective, good value service delivery. Each council encourages diversity in its representation. The proposed Warding arrangements have not even considered this or recognised other villages or hamlets that make up both parishes. The two

communities are split by the A442 from Waters Upton to Sandyford, Cold Hatton. Both parishes produced local neighbourhood plans – which represent each of the communities and their views. If we are to break down the population figures, and they are similar across both parishes, the revised Local Plan actually identifies greater growth in Waters Upton than High Ercall or the Ercall Magna Parish. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – 11TH JULY 2025. Both parishes have achieved significant investment and this has been possible by close community engagement and respect for the knowledge and views of the local residents. The upcoming completion of the resurfacing and inclusion of a crossing on Shrewsbury Road is a good example and Ercall Magna Parish Council is contributing £25,000 to TWC for the scheme – this is significant. Similarly, the residents of Waters Upton Parish raised by fund-raising and contributions £30,000 to buy the Village Green as part of a Section 106 agreement – this is community participation at its best. It is feared that community engagement and participation will become less and diluted, this could be due to the distance and logistics of travel across the Parish, over an increased size and local residents have shared their concerns about having to travel such a distance to attend parish council meetings – both councils have good community attendance at meetings and involve local residents in decision-making. There is no evening public transport to assist in these journeys or to attend parish events when held in the various villages. My conclusion, and that of many local residents, is that this recommendation is neither understandable or workable. I believe that this is in direct opposition to what a Community Governance Review (according to the White Paper, 2007 Act and the Boundary Commission guidance) was intended to provide:

- Protection of community identity
- An assurance that the communities interests are understood and delivered
- Cohesive communities
- Communities that are effectively engaged and participate in decision making
- Sustainable communities.

At present, these two parish councils have demonstrated historically excellent governance, community understanding and interests, community engagement and both have retained their important individual identities. I therefore respectfully ask that the BRC does not accept this recommendation and allows these two parish councils to carry on the good work independently, in the knowledge that they will come together when in the best interests of the residents for such projects as the speed on the A442 which runs through both. Having retained the two Parishes of Ercall Magna and Waters Upton independently, I would echo the recommendation from the Parishes in that Ercall Magna be warded further to enable Ellerdine and Rowton to have representation so, taking on board a request to reduce the number of councillors, I would support the following:

ERCALL MAGNA • Poynton & Roden 2 Councillors
High Ercall & Walton 5 Councillors
Ellerdine & Rowton 3 Councillors.
WATERS UPTON • Waters Upton 5 Councillors

For the attention of the Boundary Review Committee. As with the previous Community Governance Review (CGR) which began in 2023, and ended abruptly with a recommendation for 'no change' I would respectfully request that certain proposals in this consultation should not be considered at this time:

- Meger of Ercall Magna with Waters Upton
- Creation of the Weald Moors Parish bringing together Kynnersley, Eyton on the Weald Moors and Preston on the Weald Moors
- Merger of Chetwynd with Edgmond
- Retention of Horton in Hadley & Leegomery Parish.

I make this request as it is not in accordance with the 2007 Act which places upon principal authorities when undertaking a CGR, that they have a duty to have regard to secure that any recommendation, for the area under review, reflects the identities and interests of the local communities in that area. It is my argument that the proposals are not reflective of the communities named above as they do not reflect either their identities or their interests due to a lack of understanding or knowledge of the areas and their communities, or even their local governance arrangements at this time (as is a requirement of the Act and Boundary Commission advice). Working through the proposals, the principal authority (especially those responsible for the recommendations) have either misunderstood or misinterpreted what a CGR is expected to deliver for the communities affected which includes to protect their identities, interests and history. In each of the recommendations for the parishes listed, the

principal authority has attempted justification with little understanding or recognition of the main component of the White Paper, Act and Guidance in that parish councils and parish meetings, being the grass roots of local democracy and closest to the people:•A Shared Vision•A Sense of Belonging•A Focus on what new or existing communities have in common, especially recognising the value of diversity•Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds•Trust that local institutions act fairlyThe CGR proposals do not appear to meet the requirements of the regulations and are either based on assumptions and without knowledge of our rural communities.The responses from each of the rural communities, articulate this far more effectively that I can and must be read by the Committee Members before any decision is made or recommendation ratified.Decisions must be made on size, representations, community identify, community cohesion and how they have functioned over decades and not predicated on numbers alone.Merging or abolishing parish councils and meetings will not underpin those bullet points above which are simplified in three wordsCohesion Identity Interest

Response from the Officers of Preston upon the Weald Moors Parish Meeting.The subject of the Community Governance Review has generated more conversations amongst village residents over the last three months than almost any other subject!We are mindful of the desire by the Council to reduce the number of Parish's within the Borough and appreciate the intention, following the feedback from the first consultation, to maintain the rural integrity of our Parish.Preston held a Parish Meeting recently and the proposal following the first consultation to merge Preston with Kynnersley and Eyton was discussed in detail. Our residents feel very strongly that we have little contact with the village of Eyton and although the boundary of their parish is adjacent to the parishes of Kynnersley and Preston, access to their village is via a four or five mile route from Preston.In conclusion, the village of Preston would consider that a merger with Kynnersley to be acceptable but a merger of Preston, Kynnersley and Eyton would not be appropriate or acceptable. We are aware that the Parish of Kynnersley would consider a merger with Preston acceptable but they are also against a three way merger with Eyton. We also believe the Parish of Eyton do not wish to merge with either Preston or Kynnersley.The proposal to call the new Parish the Weald Moors Parish would seem to be a fitting name for a merger of Preston and Kynnersley Parish's. In regard to the number of Councillors per Ward, we believe it would be fair to have an equal number for both Preston and Kynnersley. This would avoid any feeling of disadvantage as a result of the amalgamation and promote equality and a sense of shared vision for the new Parish. We have encouraged the residents of Preston to respond to the review as requested and although we have had numerous verbal approvals for the partnering of our two villages, it would be a pity if this second round of responses did not adequately show that this is the view of the majority as was expressed at our meetings.We trust that our views will be taken into consideration and look forward to seeing the results of the first consultation.

Kynnersley is a rural area which i am confident is very well represented by Kynnersley parish council.However if the review committee feel the need to change boundaries or amalgamate parishes then Preston is a similar rural village with similar needs.Horton, Eyton and Wheat Leasowes areas which border Kynnersley are industrial/urbanised areas especially with new developments planned for Wheat Leasowes in the local plans.Kynnersley is a village in a local conservation area, so considering community identity and cohesion to include Horton, Eyton, and Wheat Leasowes in any boundary change would be challenging as they have little in common and the area would be vast.As a resident of Kynnersley i would prefer Kynnersley to remain an independent parish, however if TW feel changes to the parish boundaries are required going forward to merge with Preston would be the logically conclusion.

Kynnersley is very well represented by our current parish council.However if the review committee decide to amalgamate parishes, then Preston is a similar rural village with similar requirements.Horton, Eyton, and Wheat Leasowes are more industrial/ urbanised areas with different requirements to Kynnersley.Kynnersley is a conservation area, so considering

community identity and needs, to include the above named villages in any boundary review would be challenging. The challenges of each village would vary greatly and the new parish area would be vast. As a resident of Kynnersley, I would prefer to remain independent or amalgamated with Preston.

I write to register my strong objection to the councils proposed merger of Waters Upton Parish Council with Ercall Magna. As a parishioner of Waters Upton, I can see no benefit to locals and only a dilution of our representation from the removal of an extremely dedicated set of local parish councillors, who both live locally and action the needs of local residents, ensuring our best interests are represented. There is clearly no financial benefit to be had from these proposals and if confirmed will only result in a dilution of our local representation to which I and I know many others feel is undemocratic.

I understand that Telford and Wrekin Council are proposing a Weald Moors Parish Council in place of present local parish councils or meetings. I can see no reason for this unnecessary change. In my own case we have Eyton on the Weald Moors Parish meeting; this works very well for local inhabitants and there is no justification for changing it. Please therefore take this email as my submission that there should be no change in the present arrangement in this regard.

I am a resident of Eyton on the Wealdmoors and I wish to oppose the proposed merger of the parishes of Eyton, Preston, Kynnersley and Horton. My reasons are as follows. Although a small parish The residents of Eyton and Wappenshall are extremely active in seeking the best possible future for the parish and its residents. This is especially so given the constant threat of encroachment of the new town which is only one or two fields away. Whenever the council make proposals or seeks views of the parishes your records will show that a full and reasoned response is always submitted. This parish has little in common with the others mentioned in the review and most importantly the threats that affect this parish are not the same as those for the others. Given the imbalance of populations, Eyton being the smallest and therefore likely only to have one councillor compared to 2 each for the others mentioned then our views are unlikely to be put forward in any consultations/ reviews etc and therefore the residents of Eyton parish will lose their voice and effectively be disenfranchised and lose their community identity. At present Eyton is a Parish meeting and therefore receives no funding from Telford and Wrekin, if these proposals are followed through then the cost to the council will be increased. I understand that TW&C allege that the proposals for change are based on feedback from the community, I have to say that from my experience there is no pressure for change from this community nor from the others affected.

The local government review proposal to merge three parish councils because they are villages shows a lack of understanding of local communities. The villages of Rodington, Wrockwardine and Little Wenlock have few connections. They are distinctly different in size and demographic. Rodington parish council already includes two villages Rodington and Longdon on Tern. Its councillors are local and know the issues concerning residents here. Merging villages together because they are villages shows a lack of understanding of how these communities work. Community engagement happens when initiatives are local and involve villagers, a bigger council would be more remote and there would be fewer local representatives. Why wasn't there a consultation with residents before the proposal was put together? Surely looking at the links that villages currently do have might have been a better starting point? Bigger doesn't always mean better!

As part of the Eyton Parish I would just like to say that I am against the merging of Eyton with Preston and Kynnersley. We are well represented by our Chairman and Secretary who cover all aspects of concern for Eyton with highly efficient feed back for our Parish Meetings.

Consultation Response from the Shropshire Association of Local Councils (SALC) on Telford & Wrekin Council's Community Governance Review 2025 The Shropshire Association of Local Councils (SALC) welcomes the opportunity to respond to Telford & Wrekin Council's

Community Governance Review (CGR) 2025, as outlined in the published Terms of Reference and Information Pack [1]. We recognise the importance of ensuring that community governance arrangements across the borough are reflective of local identities, provide effective and convenient local governance, and support community cohesion. SALC supports the principle of regular reviews to ensure governance structures remain fit for purpose, particularly in areas experiencing demographic or developmental change.

Key Points of Response:

- 1. Engagement and Awareness.** SALC notes the Council's intention to improve engagement following feedback from the 2024 review. We strongly support the two-phase consultation approach and encourage the Council to ensure that all parish and town councils are fully informed and supported throughout the process. Clear, accessible communication and early engagement are essential to ensure meaningful participation.
- 2. Representation and Warding.** We welcome the review of councillor numbers and warding arrangements. However, we urge the Council to consider the unique characteristics of each parish and avoid a one-size-fits-all approach. Local knowledge and community identity must be central to any proposed changes.
- 3. Timing and Implementation.** The proposed timeline, concluding before summer 2025 with changes effective from May 2027, is appropriate. However, we recommend that any significant changes be accompanied by transitional support and guidance for affected councils.
- 4. Support for Status Quo** SALC echoes the Council's reminder that those who support existing arrangements should also make their views known. We encourage all member councils to participate in both consultation phases, regardless of whether they seek change.
- 5. Future Collaboration** SALC remains committed to working collaboratively with Telford & Wrekin Council to ensure that the outcomes of the CGR reflect the needs and aspirations of local communities. We are available to assist in facilitating dialogue and supporting our member councils throughout the review process. We appreciate the opportunity to contribute to this important review and look forward to continued engagement. We also appreciate the opportunity to engage with the Council as part of the process and for the support of Officers and Members have given to enable this.

However, we have significant concerns about aspects of the current proposals.

Concerns Regarding Parish Council Mergers. SALC is concerned by proposals that involve the merger of existing parish councils, particularly where such changes may lead to:

- **Loss of local identity:** Smaller parishes often have distinct histories, cultures, and priorities. Merging them into larger administrative units risks eroding this identity and weakening the connection between residents and their local representatives.
- **Reduced democratic representation:** Larger councils may struggle to maintain the same level of responsiveness and accessibility that smaller, more localised councils can offer.
- **Insufficient community support:** We urge the Council to ensure that any proposed mergers are based on clear evidence of community backing, not just administrative convenience.

SALC is concerned by the proposal to abolish Dawley Hamlets Parish Council. We believe this proposal raises several serious issues:

- 1. Loss of Local Identity.** Dawley Hamlets has a distinct historical and community identity, with its own traditions, priorities, and sense of place. Merging it into a larger town council risks diluting this identity and undermining the principle of localism.
- 2. Democratic Representation** Smaller parish councils like Dawley Hamlets provide residents with direct access to their elected representatives. A merger could reduce the visibility and accessibility of councillors, particularly in more rural or peripheral areas.
- 3. Community Engagement and Accountability.** Local councils are most effective when they are close to the communities they serve. Dawley Hamlets Parish Council has demonstrated strong community engagement and responsiveness. Abolishing it could weaken local accountability and reduce opportunities for residents to influence decisions that affect them.
- 4. Public Consultation and Transparency.** We are concerned that the rationale for this merger has not been clearly communicated to residents. It is vital that any proposal to abolish a parish council is based on robust evidence and widespread community support—neither of which appears to be present in this case.
- 5. Precedent and Wider Implications.** The abolition of a functioning and engaged parish council sets a troubling precedent. It may discourage civic participation and raise fears among other small councils about their long-term viability.

SALC

urges Telford & Wrekin Council to:

- Reconsider this proposal in light of the community's distinct identity and governance needs.
- Ensure that any structural changes are supported by clear evidence and meaningful public consultation.
- Uphold the principle that local governance should be as close to the people as possible.

Based on community response, SALC also shares concern about the proposal to merge Hollinswood & Randlay with Stirchley & Brookside to create The Nedge. It appears from the consultation there is overwhelming support to retain the current arrangements. Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council strongly opposes the proposed merger with Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council, citing overwhelming local opposition (99.5% in their parish and 76.9% in Stirchley & Brookside). The Council argues that the merger would create an oversized, disconnected parish lacking shared identity, cohesion, or practical governance benefits. Residents fear losing their community identity, especially under the proposed name "The Nedge," which it feels does not reflect local heritage or character. The Council criticizes the consultation process for lacking alternative options, insufficient direct engagement with key stakeholders, and failing to meet the criteria outlined in the 2010 guidance on community governance. It argues the proposal contradicts principles of effective, convenient, and representative local governance, and would reduce democratic accountability by cutting councillor numbers. The Council also disputes claims of shared infrastructure, noting the A442 is not a meaningful community link. Instead, the Council supports minor boundary adjustments to address anomalies but reject wholesale restructuring. They emphasize their positive relationship with Telford & Wrekin Council and express willingness to collaborate on sensible changes. However, it firmly opposes the current merger proposal, asserting it lacks justification, community support, and alignment with statutory guidance. SALC urges the BRC to reconsider this proposal in light of the distinct identity and governance needs of these communities and to accept there is little evidence or support for the current proposal, which will also reduce democratic accountability. The Government's guidance (2010) is clear that abolition or merger of parishes should not be undertaken unless clearly justified and supported by sustained local consensus (paras. 117–124). We are not aware that such justification has been demonstrated in the current proposals.

Support for the Creation of New Parishes. Conversely, SALC welcomes proposals that seek to create new parish councils in areas that are currently unparished or where communities have expressed a desire for more localised governance. We believe that:

- New parishes empower communities: Establishing new councils gives residents a stronger voice in local affairs and fosters civic engagement.
- Local governance should grow with communities: As Telford & Wrekin continues to develop, especially in areas of new housing and population growth, new parishes can help ensure that governance structures keep pace with change.
- Community identity is strengthened: New parishes allow emerging communities to define their own priorities and shape their future.

The Government's guidance supports this approach, stating that the creation of new parishes is a key tool for community empowerment and local democratic engagement (paras. 12–14, 45–47).

Impact on Rural Parishes. SALC is particularly concerned about the potential impact of the proposals on rural parishes, which often have:

- Long-standing historical identities
- Distinct community needs
- Limited capacity to absorb structural changes without losing representation.

The guidance (para. 125) recognises that 90% of England's land area is covered by parishes, most of which are rural. It stresses that changes should not upset historic traditions and should reflect genuine shifts in community identity. Proposals that centralise governance or reduce the number of rural councils risk undermining the principle of subsidiarity and the vital role rural parishes play in community cohesion and service delivery.

Examples of rural parish concerns include:

- Wrockwardine Parish: A historically rural parish with a strong sense of identity and active community engagement. Proposals that might merge it with more urbanised areas could dilute its rural character and reduce the effectiveness of local representation.
- Ercall Magna Parish: Covering a large rural area with dispersed settlements, Ercall Magna relies on its parish council to maintain local services and represent its unique needs. A merger could centralise decision-making and make it harder for residents in outlying hamlets to have their voices

heard. The Parish Council strongly opposes the proposed merger with Waters Upton Parish, arguing it would reduce effective governance, weaken community representation, and offer no clear benefits. EMPC highlights that the proposal lacks justification, background, or evidence of deficiencies in current arrangements. The council emphasizes its strong governance, financial health, and community engagement, including a full complement of councillors and a history of successful local projects. EMPC asserts that Ercall Magna and Waters Upton have distinct identities, facilities, and community interests, and that merging them would dilute representation and potentially disenfranchise residents due to increased travel distances. The council also criticizes the proposed reduction in councillor numbers and the unequal warding structure, which it argues violates Local Government Boundary Commission guidance. EMPC recommends no changes to parish boundaries or identities but supports internal reform by reducing its councillors from 13 to 10 across three wards—Ellerdine, High Ercall, and Roden—based on population and geography. This structure would maintain effective representation and align with community identity. EMPC urges the Boundary Review Committee to respect local opinion and adopt its proposed warding adjustments instead of pursuing an unwanted and unjustified merger.

•Edgmond Parish: Edgmond has a long-established identity since the 1600s, supported by its architectural diversity and the Edgmond Conservation Area created in 1981, and its parish records date back to 1898, emphasizing its distinct community history. The Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan referendum in 2018 had a high turnout of 45.2% with 4.2% voting in favour, exceeding average neighbourhood plan participation rates which is indicating strong local cohesion and engagement. Chetwynd does not have a NP, leading to governance anomalies until 2028. A 2025 housing needs survey finalised this month focused solely on Edgmond, showing 23.4% community participation, further differentiating it from Chetwynd and complicating unified planning responses post-merger. Besides transportation routes and some local landmarks, Edgmond shares few common elements with Chetwynd. The parish of Edgmond has no shared history or commonalities that link the two parishes. Merger would enlarge the parish and at the same time reduce the number of councillors, which ultimately would reduce the effectiveness of the ability to engage with residents.

Waters Upton Parish: Waters Upton Parish Council strongly opposes the proposed merger with Ercall Magna Parish, citing a lack of shared services, facilities, or community identity. Although the two parishes share a boundary, they operate independently with separate schools, churches, village halls, shops, and Neighbourhood Plans. The Council emphasizes its strong community cohesion, demonstrated through successful fundraising and development projects like the Parish Centre and Village Green, achieved without increasing the precept. The Council argues that the proposed merger would create an unmanageably large and dispersed parish, undermining effective and convenient governance. It also criticizes the suggested reduction in councillor numbers, noting that rural representation requires more councillors due to geographic spread. The proposed warding, which allocates fewer councillors to Waters Upton than to High Ercall, is seen as undemocratic and unfair. Local engagement has shown no support for the merger, with residents expressing concerns and opposition. The Council appreciates the additional consultation event but highlights difficulties faced by residents in accessing and completing the online survey. They urge the Boundary Review Committee to respect local opinion and maintain the status quo, suggesting that a future review in 10–15 years may be more appropriate if circumstances change.

•Tibberton & Cherrington Parish: A small but active rural parish that has expressed concern about being grouped with larger, more urbanised neighbours. Residents fear that their priorities—such as rural transport, agricultural land use, and conservation—may be overlooked.

•Little Wenlock: Little Wenlock Parish Council firmly opposes the proposed changes in the Community Governance Review, citing unanimous resident opposition. A Phase Two survey showed 100% of respondents rejected the merger, reaffirming strong community identity and preference for remaining an independent parish. The Council warns that the proposed changes would degrade local services and erode community cohesion. Councillors expressed deep concern, stating they would resign if the merger

proceeds against residents' wishes. The Council urges Telford & Wrekin to respect the clear and consistent feedback from both surveys and uphold the community's desire to remain self-governed.

- Eyton:** Eyton Parish Meeting strongly opposes the proposal to merge with a new Weald Moors Parish Council, citing a lack of community cohesion with neighbouring parishes. Eyton values its distinct rural identity, active volunteer-led governance, and historical heritage. Residents fear being disenfranchised and losing influence, especially regarding local developments like Wappenshall SUE. The Parish argues that the draft proposal misrepresents community dynamics and lacks local support, as shown in Phase One feedback. They advocate retaining current arrangements, aligning with Boundary Commission guidance that governance should reflect community identity, be effective, and avoid artificially large groupings that dilute local representation.
- Kynnersley:** Kynnersley Parish Council opposes the proposed merger with Eyton and Preston into a new Weald Moors Parish Council, citing a lack of shared identity or connections with Eyton. While some residents see potential benefits in merging with Preston alone, the majority prefer maintaining the current arrangement. A local consultation showed overwhelming opposition to the three-way merger. The Council criticizes the consultation process as misleading and poorly executed and stresses the need for equal representation if any merger occurs. They urge the Boundary Review Committee to prioritize residents' views, as required by guidance, and reject imposed, top-down restructuring.

Compliance with Government Guidance

SALC has reviewed the proposals in light of the Government's official Guidance on Community Governance Reviews (2010) and notes the following:

- Identity and Interests of Local Communities:** The guidance (para. 52) requires that governance arrangements reflect local identities. Mergers that dilute distinct community identities may not meet this test.
- Effective and Convenient Local Government:** The guidance (para. 62) emphasises accessibility and responsiveness. Larger, merged councils may struggle to deliver this, especially in rural or dispersed areas.
- Community Cohesion:** The guidance (paras. 67–75) links governance to cohesion. Proposals that are perceived as top-down or that remove local representation may damage trust and cohesion.
- Abolition of Parishes:** The guidance (paras. 117–124) makes clear that abolition should be exceptional, justified by strong evidence, and supported by sustained local consensus.
- Rural Sensitivity:** The guidance (paras. 125–127) stresses the importance of preserving rural identity and ensuring that changes do not disrupt long-standing governance structures without compelling reason.

Final Remarks.

SALC urges Telford & Wrekin Council to:

- Reconsider** any proposals to abolish or merge parish councils without clear and sustained community support.
- Ensure** that all proposals are demonstrably aligned with the statutory criteria and Government guidance.
- Continue** to support the creation of new parishes where there is local demand and evidence of community identity.
- Engage** rural communities with sensitivity and respect for their unique governance needs.

SALC is also concerned in the overall reduction in number of parish and town councils across the Borough. A reduction in the number of Councils and Councillors need not necessarily lead to effective and convenient local government and will lead to a democratic deficit. Any changes as per the above should reflect community identity, cohesion and be supported locally.

Following a meeting in June of Wrekin Area Committee and with representatives of Telford & Wrekin Council, SALC submitted a number of questions regarding the review which as yet have still to be answered. We remain available to support both existing and emerging councils throughout this process and to advocate for governance arrangements that reflect the needs and aspirations of local communities across the Borough. Thank you for the opportunity to engage with and support the process. We look forward to the response to the consultation and that the final decisions will reflect the concerns, needs and aspirations of all the communities across Telford & Wrekin.

Friends Of Hollinswood and Randlay Valley Response to Community Governance Review Draft Proposals 2025.

Our Friends Group was created to offer support to the Parish Council and work to improve the Randlay Valley area and to provide a safe outdoor space. The valley is an official Local Nature Reserve (LNR). We work as volunteers to litter pick and to cut back shrubs

and bushes, to keep paths clear and areas accessible. We do this through regular volunteer days. We also hold meetings and events to organise the group and raise money and advertise the benefits of the Valley. Money is also raised through grants obtained from local companies and organisations. Although welcoming the opportunity to respond to the draft proposal, we have severe reservations about its possible effects upon our group and the future of Randlay Valley. At Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council the 5-year strategy is continuous, and longstanding, and includes support for the Randlay Valley Area. This support includes but is not limited to: •Administrative help; •Publicity ; •Cooperation; •Encouragement of the staff to take part in and support FoHRV events and environmental upgrades; •Grant financing; •Provision of meeting spaces ; •Provision of storage areas for tools and materials; •Lobbying with outside bodies. Without these elements of support, we believe that it will be far more difficult for our group to carry out its tasks and reach its objective - to maintain access to the Valley for the local population. Our concern is that a new council, not having this previous knowledge and experience, will not support the Friends' actions until such time as the council can develop its own set of priorities, if at all. This would tend to be detrimental to the well-being of the population in Hollinswood and Randlay who would see reduced accessibility to the Valley into the future.

Please find my response to the Community Governance Review proposals below: Admaston & Bratton. I strongly oppose the proposal to move Admaston & Bratton into Wellington Town Council. The claim that they look to Wellington for services is a false one. Children in Shawburch attend the primary school in Bratton and children in Admaston & Bratton attend the pre-school in Shawburch. Shawburch GP surgery is actually located in Admaston & Bratton. Admaston, Bratton and Shawburch is a community in its own right. They form a contiguous urban area with shared services across all three villages and a shared community identity. The local residents' group on Facebook is for Shawburch, Admaston & Bratton and informally-gathered recent feedback on the proposals in that group was unanimously against moving Admaston & Bratton into Wellington and not one resident of any of the three villages identified with Wellington. The Dothill & Shawburch LNR sits between Wellington and Admaston, Bratton and Shawburch and provides a physical separation of the two distinct areas. Admaston, Bratton and Shawburch will never form a contiguous area with Wellington unless housing is allowed to be built in the nature reserve or part of Wrockwardine ward is carved out and given to Wellington. My recommendation is that a new parish council should be created for Admaston, Bratton and Shawburch. Weald Moors I support the proposed creation of a Weald Moors Parish Council and for it to replace Eyton and Preston Parish Meetings, Kynnersley Parish Council and include Horton. Horton does not have a strong community link with Hadley. It has an historic link with Hadley in the same way that Hadley has an historic link with Wellington. Horton is detached from the rest of Hadley & Leegomery parish and if it is excluded from the proposed Weald Moors Parish Council it will be unreachable by road from the rest of Hadley & Leegomery without leaving the parish. The local plan will see in excess of 5,000 new homes being built along the Weald Moors, the majority of which will fall under the proposed Weald Moors Parish Council. The Parish Meetings that are currently in place will not be able to effectively represent the interests of their residents during the planning and development of what is effectively a whole new town. This is evidenced by the fact that Eyton Parish Meeting asked Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council to act on its behalf in opposing the building of a toilet roll factory on the land adjacent to Shawburch roundabout as it had neither the capacity nor capability to navigate the planning process itself effectively. The argument has been put forward that Horton would benefit from remaining in Hadley & Leegomery as it receives services such as the CAT team through being part of an urban parish. Horton will be in the midst of an urban parish by 2040 under the local plan, this argument is not valid. My recommendation is that a Weald Moors Parish Council is created that incorporates Eyton, Preston, Kynnersley and Horton. Apley Castle I oppose the continued inclusion of Apley Castle in Hadley & Leegomery parish. Apley has a distinct identity and this separate identity has

grown stronger as Apley has grown. This reinforces the view that Apley does not have a shared identity with Hadley & Leegomery. Other than two Labour parish councillors who live in Apley, I have not encountered a single Apley resident who feels part of Hadley & Leegomery parish and wishes to continue being part of it. There is a general dissatisfaction with being part of Hadley & Leegomery and the feeling that Apley is merely a source of funding for Hadley and Leegomery. Apley does look to Hadley & Leegomery for services such as GP and pharmacy and community centres. However, it also looks to Shawburch and Admaston & Bratton for those services - the catchment area for Shawburch GP surgery includes Apley, for example. I would offer two proposals for Apley Castle. The first is that a parish council is created for Apley Castle as a standalone parish. It has a defined area, it has a clear and logical boundary, it has a distinct identity and a population that is viable for a parish council. The second is that Apley Castle and the majority of the old Hadley Castle ward (Hadley Park Road, Okehampton Road and the A442) are served by a new Castle Parish Council. Again, it has a clear and logical boundary and a viable population for a parish council. When development of the Weald Moors begins, both communities will have a strong shared interest as they collectively form the boundary with it along the A442. Muxton. I support the creation of a Muxton Parish Council but am opposed to the proposal to exclude parts of the Muxton borough ward from it. The proposed parish council should be co-terminus with the borough ward. My recommendation is to create a Muxton Parish Council that is co-terminus with the boundaries of the borough ward. Donnington Merging Donnington into a parish council with St Georges and Trench goes against guidelines that strongly discourage parishes crossing parliamentary boundaries. Donnington has a large enough population for its own parish council. My recommendation for Donnington is to create a standalone Donnington Parish Council. Waters Upton and Ercall Magna. I oppose the proposed merger of Waters Upton and Ercall Magna Parish Councils. They have no shared identity and its size would be so large as to fundamentally undermine the purpose of parish councils which is to provide local representation and decision making. My recommendation is to leave both parishes intact. Wrockwardine, Little Wenlock and Rodington. I oppose the proposed merger of Wrockwardine, Little Wenlock and Rodington. Whilst there is some shared identity between parts of Wrockwardine and Rodington, there is none between Wrockwardine and Little Wenlock and its size would be so large (20 miles across) as to fundamentally undermine the purpose of parish councils which is to provide local representation and decision making. My recommendation is to merge Wrockwardine and Rodington into one parish and leave Little Wenlock as a standalone parish council.

Rodington Parish Council Response to the Community Governance Review 2025. Rodington Parish Council strenuously objects to the proposal to combine Little Wenlock, Wrockwardine and Rodington. The supposed rationale for this proposal is community identity, but the proposal would erode the identity of each parish. There is no shared community identity between the three parishes proposed for merger. The current arrangements allow the Parish Council to focus on local issues and drive forward a number of initiatives in a cohesive community. The Parish Council has achieved several awards for its work in the local area, which demonstrates how well the Council serves its local residents. Combining Rodington Parish with a community 9 miles away will obviously dilute the focus on the priorities in the parish, the connection with our residents and the effective delivery of local services. This proposal goes against the prevailing direction of thought which advocates decentralizing decision making because local decision making is more nimble and more able to respond to local needs. Rodington Parish Council and its residents urge Telford and Wrekin to reconsider this proposal for the reasons detailed above. If Rodington Parish Council must be amalgamated with another, the Parishes of Ercall Magna or Waters Upton should be considered as viable alternatives as opposed to Wrockwardine and Little Wenlock. Practical considerations must also be considered, and the Parish Council has not had clarification on the following issues:

- The role of the clerk and associated practical issues i.e. travelling to meetings across the county
- The impact of increased hours for one clerk and possible job losses for other

Clerks•The environmental cost of increased travel through the county•The lack of knowledge of Councillors regarding areas in different parts of the county which impacts on their ability to fairly represent its electorate.The management of playing fields and a cemetery contributes to the strenuous objection of Rodington Parish Council to this proposal.Rodington Parish Council invests heavily in the cemetery at Rodington, and this is a priority for residents of Rodington and Longdon. The cemetery requires ongoing maintenance which the Parish Council pays for. The Clerk is the Burials Officer for the Parish and significant hours are devoted to the cemetery. This would not be possible if one Clerk is working for all three Parish Councils.Rodington Parish Council also hosts an annual Christmas Fair which is attended by residents, the Mayor of Telford, and local schools. This is an important event for the Parish requiring sizeable financial outlay and a considerable proportion of the Clerk's hours. This event would no longer be able to take place if the three Parish Councils amalgamated, as it would require a disproportionate distribution of funds.It is hard to see how, with fewer local councillors, the commitment to all of these projects could be maintained. With funds shared with other villages, there will be less commitment to the priorities of Rodington and Longdon-on-Tern.Rodington also has a Climate and Nature Strategy Group which is heavily supported by the Parish Council. This has contributed significantly to the development of Rodington Parish Council's approach to biodiversity and sustainability. These are gains that could easily be lost by merging with other parishes at this time due to budgetary pressures.

I object to the changes

I would like to raise my concerns over the proposed merger, Eyton has little in common with Preston & Kynnersley, also the proposed new housing estate has nothing in common with Preston & Kynnersley.Hence neither Eyton or the proposed new housing estate should be merged with Preston & Kynnersley.I have no problem with Preston & Kynnersley being merged into one parish as they have long been associated with each other.

I am writing to yourselves in response of the TWC's Community Governance Review regarding your future possible plans of :- • creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes • the naming of parishes and the style of new parishes and the creation of town councils • the electoral arrangements for parishes (for instance, the ordinary year of election; a council's geographical size; the number of councillors to be elected to the council, and parish warding) • grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes • other types of local arrangements, including parish meetings. I would like to strongly object to these future possible plans as I feel that the current system of local governance at parish level is satisfactory, including the number of parish councillors. It's appears to me that the possible merging or abolishing of Parish Councils is nothing more that a consolidation of power. This restructuring of Parish councils will lead to the people of smaller parishes such as Rodington, having very little or no say in any important matters regarding our village. It's very important that people have a democratic say in important matters regarding their local area, and I feel these proposed future plans will take away people's democratic rights, or at the very least, water them down.

Please find below the response from St Georges & Priorslee Parish Council regarding the proposed changes:The Council recommends increasing the number of councillors for the proposed Priorslee Parish from 5 to 7, to be spread across two wards, reflecting the growing population and ensuring fair representation.Additionally, it is recommended that the number of councillors for the proposed new St Georges & Donnington Parish be reduced from 17 to 15. The Parish should also be warded appropriately to reflect and represent the distinct communities within its boundaries.