Muxton

Email Responses:

1	Please find attached my views and comments in relation to Phase 2 consultation of the CGR 2025. Appendix A – Muxton Annex A
2	Hi Please find following my thoughts. First thing... I completely oppose the splitting of Muxton & Donnington as it is not in the best interest of Muxton residents. Ensuring residents get the best support from their parish council is the aim? My response to this is different from others on Muxton Parish Council, so I can only speak for myself here. I've now been on the Parish Council since elected [redacted] and have played a very active role in Muxton Ward. With this I have a good understanding of the needs in the ward. When I first became a Muxton Cllr, when items discussed on the agenda were predominantly about Donnington, a comment I often used was "How about Muxton?"…then I warmed up! Muxton has always very much been heard in the Parish Council and has been heavily represented. Often public who attend the Parish meets are Muxton residents and most items on the agenda are for Muxton. Donnington and Muxton Parish Council has grown stronger over the last couple of years with a great admin team and again, I speak for myself, work closely with the staff as well as the Donnington Parish Councillors. With this team and availability of finance, we have offered services and events for all residents which include an enforcement team, Christmas lights and events such as over 60s seaside trips, family days out, Christmas dinner, Thursday morning coffee meets, table tennis classes…for example. The current parish have an office and the Clerk and team are always available for residents to visit, to discuss matters face to face, which is very frequent. This is a valued service for residents. We added up that last week, the Clerk spent around 8 hours speaking with residents in the office. (Not possible if part-time). I've worked closely with Donnington Councillors with situations where issues cross both Donnington & Muxton where Muxton residents are affected. Clock Tower car meets, safeguarding, bikers, education, Church groups, ASB issues...much more goes on behind the scenes though unable to say all due to confidentiality with residents concerned. Joint funding such as Veterans Café with pride allowance from Donnington Councillors and I, have enabled us to run the veterans café for all residents in the current Parish. The council as it is now works well – an award winning council at that.

	So what would it mean if Muxton is a single Parish splitting from Donnington? I've worked closely again with the admin team to understand facts and figures (as well as SALC) to understand where we stand. Based on the number of houses in Band D council tax (2100 houses) and based on the 'basics' of Parish need, the council tax precept would be £2.86 less per household, per month, than what it is now....sounds great? Keep reading for the not so great stuff! I do have a full detailed list of costings though this precept would cover things like: one part-time member of staff: a parish clerk, working from home (we won't have a council office), street lights, parish ground maintenance, bus shelters, council affiliation subscriptions. As Muxton has no Parish assets, we have no income such as that provided by Casey's and Turreff Hall. As a single Parish and based on the precept, unless the tax is increased dramatically, we would not be able to afford: · A full time Parish Clerk · Christmas lights (estimated £16,000) · Neighbourhood Enforcement Team (https://www.telford.gov.uk/roadworks-transport-and-streets/enforcement/) I have worked closely with on patrols, cameras, signage, street parking issues etc… · Resident trips to seaside and Christmas dinner for over 60s · Local events such as the Christmas Fayre / Santa floats / Children's Christmas party As we have no parish room, we will also have the additional cost of hiring rooms for Parish meetings and unable to hold resident coffee mornings, children's events in the library, free activities as we do in Turreff Hall. The part-time parish clerk will have to work from home so no face to face support when needed unless an appointment booked and room hired for residents to meet. This also means purchasing of office equipment / IT / secure software etc.. Just to throw another spanner in the work; timing. The elections for all the New Parish Councils will take place in May 2027 but to have any money for its first year, (which actually runs from April) the new councils have to tell the Borough Council of its precept in January 2027. This means that in 2026, and if the new Muxton Parish goes ahead, this has to be set up and decisions made by current Muxton councillors, on behalf of the yet to be elected Councillors in May 2027. All councillors have to stand down 2027 and elections begin…another big cost for Muxton to have to pay if on our own. I will stand again as my heart is in helping and supporting the community to the best of my ability – whether I am elected will be in residents hands, though regardless of my position, there will be changes within our Muxton councillors. This could also potentially mean new councillors who haven't got a clue how Parish councils run so without Donnington support, does not sit comfortable with me. We have a good working relationship as Donnington & Muxton Parish Council so I completely oppose the splitting of our Parish and the adage of 'If it ain't broken - don't fix it' comes to mind.

3	It appears to be an inappropriate time to be even considering changes to Parish Boundaries when the Local Plan is still in a state of flux. It is also clear that any changes to Parish Boundaries will have consequences, mostly financial, for residents. I object to the CGR proposal for a New Muxton Parish. Donnington & Muxton has been a successful and viable Council for many years and was awarded Gold Standard in the Local Council Award Scheme. It's working well - why change it? An independent Muxton Parish would have no offices or staff and there would be fewer residents to pay for setting up these services. I would say that there is justification for leaving this Organisation as it is. This is change for change sake. The only other acceptable alternative would be to merge Muxton with Lilleshall who already have council offices and staff. This would reduce the costs for Lilleshall and would be a lower cost to Muxton residents. Muxton and Lilleshall share the same views on the retention of the " Lilleshall Gap" to prevent a festival of greedy developers land grabbing. There appear to be no benefits to a stand alone Muxton Parish and it's residents will lose many facilities they now have. I believe this does not make financial sense and that Donnington & Muxton Parish Council should be allowed to continue their good work for their residents
4	I attach my comments on the Community Governance Review specifically in relation to the proposals for Muxton. Appendix A – Muxton Annex B
5	My comments on the Community Governance Review 2025 consultation are attached. Appendix A – Muxton Annex C
6	I object strongly to the proposed split of Muxton from Muxton and Donnington council this move is totally politically motivated by Telford labour to strengthen their hold on TWC borough council by pushing to the margin smaller conservative voting areas and making safe larger labour voting areas consolidating it's hold on power this council behaves like a dictatorship. Takes no notice of residents wishes or comments it's all about it's a political agenda it TWC simply doesn't care about the consequences to local residents. Examples of this dictatorial behaviour include ignoring local plans ,local petitions and the mass of objections about development in the Muxton area. Again Muxton suffers to get a labour MP elected as 95 percent or so of additional housing requirements in the new local plan appeared to be shuffled into the other constituency to enhance his election and enhance the labour party standing in Telford at the detriment to the quality of the local plan to enhance maximum economic growth. It has reached a stage were these abuses of power needs to be referred to the ombudsman. I am neither a committed labour or conservative voter I am a floating voter but the politics in Telford is sick and does absolutely nothing to enhance residents lives in Muxton simply [redacted] squabbling.

	I see nothing that Muxton residents gain from these changes- financially we will be worse off with poorer services as Muxton is squeezed further to the margins . We have [redacted] all in Muxton as it is compared to other parish councils. I don't believe the views of [redacted] etc that Muxton will be better off[redacted] [redacted] all the time I have lived here 30 years[redacted] [redacted] nothing to make Muxton better it's all political child play. I strongly support the views of[redacted] that this proposal should not happen as it will prove detrimental to Muxton Provision of services and add on additional costs to Muxton residents.
7	Please find attached submission. This is a joint submission from members of the current Donnington & Muxton Parish Council; Appendix A – Muxton Annex D

Survey Responses:

1	I fully support the proposals for muxton, donnington & St. George's, the Weald moors and church Aston and Chetwyn Aston although I do think Horton should stay with Hadley
2	I recognise the importance of effective local governance. Any changes to the current Town and Parish Council boundaries should, first and foremost, be designed to strengthen local representation, improve accountability, and maintain the unique identities and historical ties of the communities within the borough of Telford & Wrekin. For any proposed changes to the current arrangements, the Council should explain clearly how those changes would address each of those points. Telford & Wrekin Council should engage further with residents, community groups, and other local stakeholders before any final decisions are made. My comments on the Council's draft proposals have been informed by conversations and correspondence with Town and Parish Councillors, Borough Councillors, and other interested parties. The Community Governance Review is more extensive than it needs to be at this time. With the latest version of the draft Local Plan still to be published, a more targeted review to accommodate significant new developments in Muxton and Priorslee would be sufficient, while a more comprehensive review could be conducted following the publication of the final version of the Local Plan. Waters Upton and Ercall Magna – I support maintaining the current boundary and governance arrangements. Both communities have a distinct identity and are geographically separated by a significant distance. Muxton – I support the proposal for a separate Parish Council. The boundary of the new Parish Council should be the same as the Borough Council ward boundary. The new developments on Donnington Wood Way and at the top the Redhill should be included in the Muxton Parish boundary to include the new residents in the existing community. The extra care facility on Donnington Wood Way was approved with community facilities for Muxton included in the planning application. Donnington Wood Way, Redhill and the A5 are the obvious and logical boundaries of the new Muxton Parish as opposed to the arbitrary proposed boundary which divides the existing community. Priorslee – I support the proposal for a separate Parish Council. Donnington, Wrockwardine Wood, Trench – I do not support the current proposals. Donnington and St. Georges are older, well-established communities. Residents of Donnington will associate more with Wrockwardine Wood and Trench, whereas residents of St. Georges will identify more with Oakengates. The proposals as currently drafted would split Wrockwardine Wood in two, with Summer Crescent, Cockshut Piece and The Nabb being moved into St Georges. A more logical

	proposal would be to merge Donnington (excluding Redhill) with Wrockwardine Wood & Trench; alongside the creation of a single Oakengates and St Georges Town Council which would better reflect community identities. Eyton, Preston, Kynnersley and Hadley & Leegomery - Wealdmoor Parish Council should include Kynnersley and Preston. Horton should have its own Parish Meeting as it is a predominantly rural community which is clearly distinct from Hadley and Leegomery. Eyton should retain a Parish Meeting due to its distinct and isolated rural location. Apley Castle should not be included within the Hadley and Leegomery Parish, as it is a distinct community with little connection to Hadley & Leegomery. Wellington Town Council - Admaston, Bratton & Shawbirch should have their own Parish Council, separate from Wellington, as they constitute a distinct urban area with shared local services. Wrockwardine and Little Wenlock – these villages are geographically separated by The Wrekin and are long established distinct communities. They should each have their own Parish Council. I know that Little Wenlock Parish Councillors have serious concerns about the proposals to merge the Parish Council with other areas, as they feel that would create a loss of identity and influence for their community. I am told that, in response to a recent survey carried out by the Parish Council, a majority of Little Wenlock residents supported keeping a separate Parish Council for Little Wenlock. Rodington – this village should retain its own Parish Council. I would welcome further opportunities to contribute as the Community Governance Review progresses.
3	At present Muxton and Donnington run as a single council organising events and days out for local residents, there doesn't appear to be any need to section off Muxton. A much smaller council with a part time clerk would be at best ineffective and at worst a disaster for local residents.
4	I do not believe that resignation of Muxton is beneficial. Currently Donnington and Muxton Parish Council works well. Bith efficient in costs and achieving good actions/results for residents. Our current councillors are proactive and visible, known, members of our community who have the best interests of the residents in mind. Our costs would likely rise whilst a significant decrease in service, and access to those services would decrease. Our current parish council works well for residents - why is change being proposed?
5	Im apposed to the idea of muxton being separate. Muxton will lose out financially. Leading to cuts.
6	I don't see any need to split Muxton from Donnington. Everything works well as it is now. The councillors and staff have a very effective system and work well together. Assets and expertise are shared. The old adage 'if it ain't broke don't fix it' comes to mind.
7	The review should be based on parish council performance and meeting the needs of its population. Shifting the power base to force through planning applications and reduce the strength of its voice is not democratic in any way. However, if it is deemed that change is necessary, perhaps an idea would be for Muxton to join Lilleshall, which could facilitate a group with 12 councillors, maintaining the voice for residents.
8	Culturally the new estates off donnington wood way feel more aligned with muxton (think Granville links through to muxton are way stronger) New builds near Redhill/ priorslee should be priorslee not Donnington/st George's
9	Fully support the proposals for the parishes, but need to see a change in council numbers and warding. St Georges & Donnington should be 13 and Priorslee 7 and Muxton 7, and I fully support Wrockwardine Wood merging with Oakengates. identity is key warding for key areas, Redhill, St Georges, Snedshill, Donnington Wood, Donnington, The Humbers, Oakengates, Ketley Bank, Wrockwardine Wood, Wombridge and Trench etc i dont like big numbers of cllrs but like to have enough to make governance happens
10	I don't want Donnington and Muxton to be split. It is not broken so why change it, silly idea. We also know the councillors that represent us, I haven't a clue who the

	councillors are at St. George's. SO I SAY DO NOT WASTE MORE MONEY CHANGING IT. A foot note, this is a P/R exercise and it doesn't matter what people say Telford and Wrekin Council will throw money at it and then go a head and do what they like. That's my opinion.
11	Whilst I am in broad agreement with the creation and warding arrangements of a St Georges and Donnington Parish and Muxton Parish, I disagree with the inclusion of the Humbers polling district (WMH) within the St Georges and Donnington Parish. I would argue that for the following reasons, the Humbers should remain aligned with Muxton under any future parish council arrangements There is no rationale provided within the information pack to justify including the Humbers polling district within the proposed St Georges and Donnington Parish. It feels like the residents of this particular polling district are once more being used as an expedient makeweight for balancing voter numbers rather than proper consideration being given to the identity and needs of this community. Consisting of a new build housing estate less than 20 years old, former MOD housing now in private ownership as well as military behind the wire accomodation, the area has very different characteristics from Donnington and has even less in common with St Georges. The residential areas of the polling district are located to the North West of the A518 and are closer to the proposed Muxton and existing Lilleshall parishes than they are to any residential part of Donnington. Residents of this area look to Muxton before Donnington for local services. The nearest shops are located in Richards Road (Lilleshall parish) and Wellington Road/Fieldhouse Drive (Muxton parish). The closest pharmacy is located in Fieldhouse Drive and many residents are registered with the Linden Hall branch surgery in Muxton. The proposals would result in mixed messaging regarding democratic accountability. At a borough level the area would be a part of Muxton Ward but at a parish level would be part of St Georges & Donnington parish. The area is already overlooked at a borough and parish level in favour of the more populous areas of Donnington and Muxton on the other side of the A518 and I feel that the inclusion of the area in parish that includes St Georges would only further exacerbate the situation when it comes to allocating resources.