

Other

Email Responses:

1	<p>Good Evening</p> <p>Attached is the Conservative Group Response to the Community Governance Review.</p> <p>Appendix A – Other Annex A</p>
2	<p>Please can you bring this response to the attention of Members of the Boundary Review Committee?</p> <p>Appendix A – Other Annex B</p>
3	<p>Please find attached the consultation response from SALC to the stage two consultation.</p> <p>Many thanks for the opportunity to engage in the process. We look forward to receiving details of the outcome of the consultation and the recommendations to the BRC at the end of July.</p> <p>We hope this helps and thanks again.</p> <p>Appendix A – Other Annex C</p>
4	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Please find my response to the Community Governance Review proposals below:</p> <p>Admaston & Bratton</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>My recommendation is that a new parish council should be created for Admaston, Bratton and Shawburch.</p>

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 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.

	<p>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.</p> <p>My recommendation is to create a Muxton Parish Council that is co-terminus with the boundaries of the borough ward.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>My recommendation for Donnington is to create a standalone Donnington Parish Council.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>My recommendation is to leave both parishes intact.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>My recommendation is to merge Wrockwardine and Rodington into one parish and leave Little Wenlock as a standalone parish council.</p>
5	<p>Further to the above, please find attached my response to the current proposals. I would appreciate written confirmation of my submission.</p> <p>Appendix A – Other Annex D</p>