

Wrockwardine Wood, Trench and Oakengates

Email Responses:

1	<p>The Council should match the ward Seats of Oakengates Wrockwardine and Wood and Trench .</p> <p>Parts of WW and Trench Parish i.e. Moss road ,Johnstone Close etc should be in Donnington St Georges Parish</p> <p>Oakengates Town Council Wards Should have the following wards Oakengates Ketley Bank Ward</p> <p>Wrockwardine Wood Ward , Hollyhurst, Trench Lock ,</p> <p>Trench Ward The name Trench ward to be used in the wards</p> <p>At the moment the Council are consulting with the public with the consultation all-round the Telford and Wrekin can we include Oakengates The wakes also Donnington Turreff hall</p> <p>Muxton and Lilleshall Church Aston Parish to match the Wards a larger single parish to support a larger growing area</p>
2	<p>I can confirm that Councillors considered and noted the outcome of the first round of the consultation at a recent Full Council meeting and their response has not differed from their original reply.</p>
3	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>Please submit the following views to the Community Governance Review on behalf of Wrockwardine Wood and Trench Parish Council.</p> <p>Following a meeting of Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council, on the 16th June 2025, the chairman Councillor Shirely Reynolds recommended that the parish and borough boundaries should be coterminous.</p> <p>Councillors put forward a submission stating that Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council should merge with Oakengates Town Council, with Wrockwardine Wood East remaining inside our parish boundary. The Kenway Drive Ward would no longer be within the Wrockwardine Wood and Trench parish boundary.</p> <p>All councillors agreed with the decision to merge with Oakengates Town Council and that the boundaries should be coterminous.</p>
4	<p>I wish to record my objections to the proposed boundary review of Town & Parish Councils, with respect to the alterations proposed for Oakengates. I have detailed the objections, showing where they contravene the Terms of Reference. I have then provided some constructive alternatives.</p> <p>I would be grateful to receive confirmation of receipt of this e-mail and would like to attend meetings of the Boundary Review Committee. Could you please advise me when they will take place? I am also prepared to address the Committee, if clarification is needed.</p> <p>Appendix A – Wrockwardine Wood, Trench and Oakengates Annex A</p>
5	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>Attached are my objections to the proposed Parish boundary changes to Oakengates.</p> <p>PLEASE Send an acknowledgement on receipt of this email and attachment.</p> <p>Appendix A – Wrockwardine Wood, Trench and Oakengates Annex B</p>

6	The attached forms my objections and comments on the draft proposals. Appendix A – Wrockwardine Wood, Trench and Oakengates Annex C

Survey Responses:

1	As a resident living on the boundary between Newport and Chetwynd Aston parishes (boundary goes through my garden), I thoroughly support the extension of Newport parish's southern boundary. The area affected "feels" like Newport, is now increasingly urban, and if you talk to people who live there, they say they live in Newport, not Chetwynd Aston. It also makes sense for borough and parish wards to align. I also support the move of Admaston and Bratton to Wellington parish. I visit reasonably frequently, and they feel as much part of Wellington as neighbouring Shawburch does. Indeed it shares services with Shawburch and it is difficult to know where Admaston ends and Shawburch begins. Very much in the orbit of Wellington, and will be beneficial for residents to have a say in the running of the town.
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

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