

The Weald Moors

Email Responses:

1	<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</p>
2	<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.</p> <p>I see no value in joining other parishes together who do not share our conservation status</p>
3	<p>Hello,</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.</p> <p>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>
4	<p>Good Evening,</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. .</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As now, we should be able to voice our own concerns without a possible situation of them being drowned out or overlooked by a larger different agenda.</p> <p>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.</p>
5	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>I write again to ask you to reverse your plan to merge Kynnersley with Eyton.</p> <p>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.</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
6	<p>REFERENCE CREATION WEALDMOOR PARISH</p> <p>My name is [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 .</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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)</p> <p>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,</p>

	<p>also many others activities planting trees, providing benches, help maintaining the burial ground, maintaining noticeboard, maintenance of signage in Village etc.</p> <p>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</p> <p>I have been a member of [REDACTED] [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 it's life before being moved to Kynnersley as a hospital building used in the first world war.</p> <p>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 it's 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.</p>
7	<p>I support Preston/Kynnersely/Eyton all rural villages/lots of old properties/listed buildings with similiar issues regarding traffic/planning/conservation (Kynnersely) 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.</p>
8	<p>Please find attached the response from Kynnersley Parish Council which I was asked to forward to the Chairman of the Boundary Review Committee.</p> <p>Appendix A – The Weald Moors Annex A</p>
9	<p>I am a resident of Eyton Parish and wish to respond to the proposals in the CGR Review 2025.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal to merge Eyton Parish into a larger Weald Moors Parish Council on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are an effective and efficient Parish Council. We meet regularly and respond to local issues as they arise. We are a strong and cohesive community. We may be small in population but we have a strong community identity. We have no connection with, or community identity with, the Parishes of Preston, Kynnersley or Horton. Geographically they are 4 – 5 miles away and there is little social connection between Eyton and these parishes. We just happen to be rural areas in roughly the same geographical area, but we are very different in character. My understanding is that Preston and Kynnersley Parishes do not feel any community Identity with Eyton Parish either! • Eyton Parish Meeting does not raise any precept and we do all our work voluntarily. We should not be penalised for this. We hold regular Parish Meetings which are well attended, we hold regular social events and arrange

	<p>work parties to do work that needs doing in the Parish. We do not want or need to raise money from our residents. This would change if we are part of a larger Parish Council where all the other parishes already raise a precept. We would be paying for the needs of residents far from us, in the Parishes of Kynnersley, Preston and Horton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of a larger Parish Council we would lose our voice and be effectively disenfranchised. [REDACTED] (as proposed) we could have very little influence and our needs will not be represented at Parish or Borough level. Disenfranchisement is not a good result for the residents of Eyton Parish. As the new development proposed in the Local Plan proceeds, Eyton Parish want to be involved in a positive way to influence the development that is likely to proceed over the next 10 years. We will be unable to do that as part of a larger Parish Council, where the other Parishes are not directly affected by the development, as Eyton Parish clearly is. I feel that this again disenfranchises the residents who will be most directly affected by the new development. There was no evidence following the consultation responses at Stage 1 of the CGR that anyone resident in the Parish proposed this merger. As you clearly state in your consultation publicity that the proposals that have been made are based on feedback from the community, I would seriously contest this statement in relation to the proposals for Eyton Parish. <p>As a result of the above points I strongly object to the proposal to include Eyton Parish in a new Weald Moors Parish Council.</p>
10	<p>Please find attached the Response to the Phase Two Consultation on behalf of Eyton Parish Meeting.</p> <p>Appendix A – The Weald Moors Annex B</p>
11	<p>Please find attached my response to the recommendation to form a new Weald Moors Parish Council.</p> <p>Appendix A – The Weald Moors Annex C</p>
12	<p>Please find attached the response to the Community Governance Review from Preston Parish Meeting.</p> <p>Appendix A – The Weald Moors Annex D</p>
13	<p>Kynnersley is a rural area which i am confident is very well represented by Kynnersley parish council.</p> <p>However if the review committee feel the need to change boundaries or amalgamate parishes then Preston is a similar rural village with similar needs.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

	<p>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.</p>
14	<p>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.</p>
15	<p>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.</p>
16	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
17	<p>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.</p>

18	<p>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.</p> <p>Hence neither Eyton or the proposed new housing estate should be merged with Preston & Kynnersley.</p> <p>I have no problem with Preston & Kynnersley being merged into one parish as they have long been associated with each other.</p>
19	<p>Received via letter:</p> <p>Appendix A – The Weald Moors Annex E</p> <p>Appendix A – The Weald Moors Annex F</p>

Survey Responses:

1	<p>I feel the total parishes offer no services to residents just a job for their friends and should be merged as shown in hand draft recommendations Bigger parishes with wider representation will offer better services for its residents, my parish hasn't even signed the armed forces covenant what a waste of time they are</p>
2	<p>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</p>
3	<p>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</p>

	<p>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.</p>
4	<p>I agree with the proposed Weald Moors Parish on the basis that when any revised Local Plan that allows significant development within Eyton upon the weald Moors area as part of this plan is excluded from the Weald Moors Parish. I further agree with a Weald Moors Parish if each Church retains control over it's ongoing independence over local government controls and also that common community areas and village halls retain their own governance. In order for this to work local warding arrangements should be adopted within the framework of the new Parish.</p>
5	<p>I do NOT agree with the merging of the parishes Kynnersley & Preston with Eyton. The villages of Kynnersley and Preston face very different local challenges to Eyton. Eyton has a huge new build development programme so issues of infrastructure, local amenities, local connection will dwarf those of Kynnersley & Preston</p>
6	<p>I believe an overhaul of the parish councils is needed. Eyton is represented by only a few village members as the local councillor only welcomes those to the group that will follow his lead and do as he says. He operates a "command and control" system that only allows the voices of those he agrees with to be heard, and is often only of benefit to the few families who he will communicate with. An opportunity for others to be welcomed and able to be part of a larger less intimidating group can only be for the greater good of the community.</p>
7	<p>I don't believe that Weald Moors Parish should include Eyton. In the 6 years I have lived in the village of Preston I have never visited Eyton but have visited Kynnersley on a regular basis. Many of the Kynnersley residents travel through the village of Preston in travelling to Telford and surrounding areas and therefore they have an understanding of the village of Preston and events which take place in the village. I appreciate that the boundary of Eyton parish are adjacent to Kynnersley but I believe that is the only connection the two villages have.</p>
8	<p>Having read the recommendations from the first consultation, it appears that the bulk of our views have been disregarded. Given Kynnersley sent in 32 responses, (pro rata one of the highest) these were not expressed in the subsequent conclusions and recommendations you provided. However, you did include a view from someone not connected to the village who was able to have their identical copy and pasted views included for each area in your report! We specifically said we do NOT wish to join with other areas, and do NOT wish to be called anything similar to Weald Moors Parish - which you have already adopted for the area drop down selection of this very survey! You appear to have cherry picked answers, ignored others and not given a true</p>

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

10	<p>We were pleased to see that the second iteration of the plan for this area, did not include Horton and the Horton Wood industrial area. We have always viewed ourselves as an essentially rural village in a face to face community. In this manner, over the 47 years that we have lived here in Preston upon the Weald Moors, the Village Meeting has met most of our needs. However, life is much more complicated nowadays and the new residents who have moved into the village have an expectation of service and accountability that needs a more professional approach, and more people taking up responsibilities within a Parish Council. For this reason we think that an amalgamation with Kynnersley parish would serve both communities better into the future. This would be an easy transition for us if Kynnersley was willing, they already have all the procedures of a Parish Council in place, so new Councillors would be at a huge advantage in this respect. The one problem we can see in the second draft plan which incorporates Eyton with Preston and Kynnersley, is out lack of contact with Eyton as place that is physically distant, and a community that we do not know, nor have had any contact with during our time here in Preston. We think that the new Parish should be warded with an equal number of Councillors for Preston and Kynnersley, then hopefully all residents will feel they have an equality of support and influence.</p>
11	<p>I wish to register my OPPOSITION to boundary changes proposed to include Kynnersley. My family and I moved into Kynnersley 27 years ago and have been extremely happy here. The village has its own character and charm which will be lost forever if the changes were to go ahead. It was a personal choice to live in a small, rural settlement, I have no desire to live as part of a larger community. Councils should not be changed unless they have recognised failures. I can't help but think that by making non Labour areas smaller, it doubles the size of Labour areas - very undemocratic. The information online is extremely lengthy and complicated, simplification would be beneficial to most residents in order for them to give a considered response. Each small village has its own special characteristics which is why they should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.</p>
12	<p>I strongly object to the merging of Eyton parish with Kynnersley & Preston parishes. Although we are the smallest parish by population we are proactive at responding to things that need attending to in the parish. There is a very strong community identity, we regularly hold social events and volunteering activities. We have held working parties to tidy up around the village hall and hold events to raise funds when required. Our officers are unpaid and do not claim any expenses instead carry out work voluntarily because there is a strong sense of community. There is no sense of community identity between Eyton and Kynnersley & Preston which are both 4-5 miles away & we do not mix with them at community events etc. It is proposed that Eyton will have 1 councillor within the new proposed arrangements which is no different except that a precept will be charged and the councillor will claim expenses when it is done voluntarily at the moment, why change that!! Also it is unlikely that they would be able to exert much influence in promoting issues in Eyton within the new parish with 6 to 8 councillors. I would like Eyton to remain as a stand alone parish as it works very well and there is no need to amend that.</p>
13	<p>This relates to the proposed merger of Eyton on the Weald Moors with Kynnersley and Preston. I see no reason for this merger as none of these parishes are next to each other, the residents of each have no connection with each other and do not attend the same events, churches and share no sense of community. Much of the work that takes place within Eyton is done on a voluntary basis [REDACTED], this is the sort of things that local residents carry out as part of the community which I feel would be lost if Eyton loses its own sense of identity.</p>
14	<p>As a resident of Eyton on the Weald Moors I strongly believe that the Parish should remain unchanged for the following reasons: We are a very proactive parish and</p>

	<p>respond to issues quickly and involve the whole community in all decisions relating to the parish. We are small, but vocal and active, with a strong sense of community identity which I feel would be lost in such a merger. On that note it is unlikely that someone in Kynnersley for example would have any sense of community with Eyton and the reverse is also true.</p>
15	<p>After moving here over 10 years ago we have enjoyed the strong community spirit and identity fostered within the parish. Regular parish meetings and emails ensure that all residents are kept up to date and are involved in the decision making process. Although a small population we have a large geographic area that has a strong community identity, fortified by social occasions run by a hard core of volunteers. Our parishioners, who are all volunteers themselves, are highly pro-active and instill a very real sense of pride and caring within the village. My concern is that the Eyton Parish will lose its very essence if merged with any of the other Parishes. We have no community connection with either Kynnersley, Preston or Horton, whose needs differ from our own parish, and who are geographically distant. I also feel our representation of only 1 councilor, on a Parish council of 6 or more, would not allow our councilor much of a voice with which to exert much influence, promote/defend our community issues, and would leave Eyton residents feeling "out in the cold". The Wappenshall SUE development is of major concern to many of the Eyton residents and our council has had a positive consultative relationship with T & W Council and the developers. As the development progresses over the next 10 years or so, I am concerned that any direct influence Eyton Parish may have on this process will be lost if the new arrangement of parishes goes ahead, as Kynnersley and Preston are not affected by the proposals. This again would lead to our community being disenfranchised.</p>
16	<p>Having attended the Eyton Parish Meeting to discuss Those Two Consultation on the draft proposals I am strongly opposed to the merger of Eyton Parish into a newly created Weald Moors Parish Council for the following reasons: 1) Community Identity: Eyton Parish is a rural community with important industrial heritage and a large number of listed buildings. We have a strong sense of community and cohesion throughout the Parish and we have no geographical links nor community cohesion with Preston, Horton or Kynnersley. As a Parish, we are very proactive in responding to issues & making decisions as a group, and we meet the needs of the Parish through volunteering rather than charging a precept (there is no precept for the Parish). As per the Local Government Boundary Commission Guidance, which states "parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity" the existing arrangements best achieves the intent of the latter provision. 2) Consideration of Feedback: The Council has stated that changes contained in the draft proposals are based on feed back received, as per the Boundary Commission Guidance requires. In the case of the Weald Moors proposal, this is not apparent. Our study of responses received to Phase One consultation finds no support for the merger from Eyton, Preston nor Kynnersley. 3)Representation and Disenfranchisement: Residents are concerned that the Eyton Parish's identity & needs will be subsumed by other parishes in any new arrangement, as it is the smallest of the three. The effectiveness of governance arrangements for Eyton would be martially adversely affected by being subsumed. 4) Interest and Influence over Proposed developments: The Wappenshall SUE development in the new Local Draft Plan will directly affect the residents of Eyton Parish. We want and need to be able to continue and develop its strong, positive and consultation relationship with TWC planners. This direct influence will be lost in the merger as the Kynnersley and Preston are not as affected by the proposals. 5) Boundaries: The current draft Local Plan envisages substantial new housing and commercial development within the southern boundary of Eyton Parish. The intensive developments have an entirely different identity and interest which will be more aligned with the existing built-up area of Telford and not the rural character of Eyton Parish. The Proposal and Rationale section of Appendix A</p>

	and The Boundary Commission Guidance both confirm that the Council is required to ensure that parishes "reflect community identity and interest" and that they are "viable and democratic units". Furthermore, any grouping needs to be "compatible with the retention of community interests". Clearly the proposed merger does not recognise these attributes with the merger into an artificial and logically incoherent Weald Moors Parish.
17	I strongly disagree re the amalgamation of wards. I feel we are unique in our issues both existing and looking ahead to the proposed development next to our village. I feel our voice would be lost. Our parish has made great efforts to stay abreast of the developing plans with frequent formal and informal feedback to residents. I would therefore like to register my nonsupport for this proposal.
18	I am very happy with the representation we have through our parish meeting, the team are well informed and fully represent our unique needs. There is a large proposed development on our doorstep which makes many of our issues re traffic and footfall unique. I do not feel that an amalgamation would benefit our needs. We do not have large community spaces, street lighting maintained by the council an amalgamation would see us paying for services we do not have or would benefit our small cimmunity.
19	I do NOT support the draft proposal for a new Weald Moor Parish Council merging Eyton, Kynnersley and Preston parishes. A combined parish would not reflect the community identity or interests of Eyton. There is no community cohesion or day to day connection or interaction between Eyton and the larger parishes of Kynnersley and Preston, and Eyton's interests and priorities - especially with regard to proposed residential and commercial development in the southern area of the parish - are different to those of Kynnersley and Preston. There is no material benefit for Eyton in a merged Weald Moors parish and obvious disadvantages in terms of direct representation and practical disenfranchisement. Eyton Parish Meeting is an effective, convenient and viable administrative unit and the current arrangements should be retained.
20	I agree that the suggested merger of Preston upon the Weald Moors with Kynnersley and Eyton would be satisfactory. Both are historic villages which must retain their unique status, which would be lost if merged with other neighbouring villages. [REDACTED]. Many thanks for your kind attention.
21	As a tiny village we need to retain our identity and voice. By forcing us to join other much larger areas we lose this. None of the other areas you wish to impose on us have conservation areas within their parishes as we do. None have the 16th century history of our village and by amalgamating us with numerous other larger areas which have vastly different issues and problems, our own will just be swallowed up and disappear. The corridor and level of development from Eyton through Wappenshall to Horton will mean an immense area of housing with no similar issues to Kynnersley. This is NOT what we want
22	Kynnersley voice will be lost. However if this means there won't be a polling station at the village hall and the school that is great news - complete waste. Just keep the hall let the children have their education!
23	I have lived in the village of Kynnersley for all my life i am [REDACTED] and i want us to stay just as we are not a minority what is wrong that the powers that be have to ruin it leave it alone i wstchef in horror how things have changed and ok i may be old but i am not some silly old fool that has to sit back and say nothing
24	Firstly, your survey is misleading. There is no Weald Moors Parish - to state such indicates a level of pre-determination. I wish Kynnersley to remain as it is. However, I expect that there is already a predetermined plan to merge Parish Councils and, if this is the case then a merger with Preston could be achievable. There is no community adhesion between Kynnersley and Eyton. There are no links with Eyton, either with transport links or any form of community links - we are totally seperate

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