



Borough of Telford and Wrekin

Boundary Review Committee

4 November 2025

Community Governance Review 2025

Lead Director:	Anthea Lowe – Director: Policy & Governance
Service Area:	Policy & Governance
Report Author:	Anthea Lowe – Director: Policy & Governance
Officer Contact Details:	Tel: 01952 383219 Email: anthea.lowe@telford.gov.uk
Wards Affected:	All wards

1.0 Recommendations for decision:

1.1 It is recommended that the Boundary Review Committee:-

- a) Places on record its thanks to all of those who have responded to the third phase consultation of the Community Governance Review 2025;
- b) Places on record its thanks to Shropshire Association of Local Councils for its support and feedback during the third phase of consultation;
- c) Notes the contents of **Appendices A – H** containing responses in respect of each of the areas that were subject to the third round of consultation;
- d) Notes the contents of **Appendix I** summarising the consultation responses and the draft proposals in respect of the seven areas that were subject to further consultation;
- e) Considers the contents of section 5 of this report in respect of councillor numbers, warding arrangements for some Councils and the proposed boundary for Muxton Parish Council;
- f) Considers the summary contained in **Appendix J** and associated maps in **Appendix K** for the proposed Town and Parish Council arrangements for the entire borough of Telford & Wrekin including councillor numbers, names of Town and Parish Councils, warding arrangements and boundary maps;

- g) Confirms the final proposals to be adopted in respect of Town and Parish Council arrangements for the Borough of Telford & Wrekin; and
- h) Notes the next steps as set out in section 6 of this report.

2.0 Purpose of Report

2.1 The purpose of this report is to provide members of the Committee with further information following the last meeting of the Committee on 4 September. This report includes:-

- Consultation responses in respect of the 7 areas that were subject to a third round of consultation:-
 - Brookside and Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley;
 - Horsehay, Lightmoor, Little Dawley & Aqueduct;
 - Lawley & Overdale;
 - Madeley;
 - St Georges & Donnington;
 - The Gorge;
 - Wrockwardine and Rodington
- Summary analysis of the consultation responses received during that third phase of consultation;
- A document summarising the recommended proposals for each of the proposed Town and Parish Councils within the Borough

2.2 The Committee is asked to consider the information contained in this report and the accompanying Appendices and reach a final decision in respect of the Town and Parish Council arrangements for the entire Borough. Specifically, with reference to **Appendix J**, the Committee is asked to confirm whether or not each of the arrangements set out therein are to be approved to take effect from the ordinary elections in May 2027 notwithstanding the information provided in the Next Steps section of this report.

3.0 Background

3.1 At its meeting of 13 February 2025, the Boundary Review Committee agreed to commence a Community Governance Review in respect of the Town and Parish Council arrangements within Telford & Wrekin. A Community Governance Review is undertaken in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Statutory guidance under the Act provides further information that the Committee is required to take into account when undertaking a review. Earlier reports to the Committee summarise this guidance.

3.2 It should be noted that a Community Governance Review took place in 2023 which, at that time, concluded that no changes should be made to the current arrangements. In some of the consultation responses received during the third phase of consultation, there is some confusion about the reason for commencing another review so soon after the last.

- 3.3 For clarity, the 2023 review followed the same process as has been followed in this current review, commencing with a first round of consultation in autumn/winter 2023. Less than 80 were received during that first phase of consultation. Following publication of the second round of consultation responses, there was an increase in the number of submissions received responding to the draft proposals that were being consulted upon. At that stage, the Boundary Review Committee was concerned that the level of engagement throughout both rounds of consultation was insufficient to enable it to make an informed decision. The Committee therefore resolved to conclude the review with no changes but stated that a further review should be commenced in early 2025.
- 3.4 The statutory guidance referred to at paragraph 3.1 provides significant detail on the important role that Town and Parish Councils play within their communities, enabling them to build cohesion, address social exclusion and deprivation and cultivating respect amongst communities. It is clear, from the guidance that, whatever the arrangements, there should be strong and accountable local government and leadership with Town and Parish Councils being able to take the lead on local matters in some cases whilst, at other times, they may act as an important stakeholder or partner to key organisations such as the principal council, police, fire and the private sector. Given the variations in size of Town and Parish Councils, it is clear that they will each have their own priorities, providing services that are relevant to the communities that they serve and will function differently depending upon their size and funding capabilities. Throughout this process, the Committee has been unanimous in its support for Town and Parish Councils and the role that they play within their local communities.
- 3.5 There is no 'one size fits all' approach to community governance with the guidance setting out that in some communities there will be specific characteristics which help to define a parish, for example representing particular groups whilst, in others, the community may coalesce around particular interests such as lifestyle groups or leisure pursuits.
- 3.6 When considering the size and population of local communities and / or parishes, the guidance clearly sets out that it is often these matters that influence whether or not it is going to be viable. It also identifies the range of council sizes at a local level, from small hamlets in which the council represents 50 residents to large towns in which the council may represent more than 40,000 electors. Additional guidance is also available in respect of recommended councillor numbers. This guidance is limited in its usefulness in so much as there are differing views as to optimum councillor numbers and the indicative ranges do not align within the two guidance documents. As a result, when it comes to councillor numbers, wherever possible, the aim is to have equality of representation. However, it is not possible to deliver this in areas which comprise both large, highly-populated urban areas and large sparsely-populated rural areas. That being the case, there is also a need to consider quoracy within Councils and ensuring that smaller Town / Parish Councils are able to transact business.

First phase of consultation

- 3.7 The consultation process is set out in the statutory guidance and has been followed throughout this review.
- 3.8 The first phase of consultation which ran from 17 February 2025 until 14 April 2025 was aimed at inviting as many submissions as possible on what the Town and Parish arrangements should be in the future. At this stage, Telford & Wrekin Council did not provide any potential options for people to consider; rather, it was a case of there being a 'blank canvas' with an opportunity for people to share their views without limitation.
- 3.9 To support those wishing to make a submission in this first phase of consultation, a consultation pack was created setting out information on what a community governance review was, what it could take into account and details around the electorate for each local area within Telford & Wrekin. A survey was also created to help people shape their submission although there was no requirement to submit a survey response for a submission to be valid.
- 3.10 The consultation pack was shared with:-
- Local MPs;
 - Town and Parish Councils within Telford & Wrekin;
 - Community Groups within the Borough;
 - Chief Officer Group;
 - Community Centre Managers;
 - Telford Crisis Network Group;
 - Lloyds Bank Foundation;
 - Shropshire Association of Local Councils;
 - Shropshire Council;
 - Interfaith Council;
 - Strategic Partners; and
 - Ward Members
- 3.11 As well as sharing documents with those listed above, officers held a session that Clerks and Town / Parish Councillors were able to attend during which the community governance review process was explained and attendees had an opportunity to ask questions. Additionally, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Boundary Review Committee, together with officers, met with the Chair, and colleagues, of Shropshire Association of Local Councils ("SALC").
- 3.12 Officers also attended two sessions attended by Town and Parish Clerks during this first period of consultation.
- 3.13 A total of 292 responses were received comprising 219 completed surveys and 73 emails were received during this round of consultation. In addition, 8 emails were received requesting additional information.

Second phase of consultation

- 3.13 At its meeting on 12 May 2025, the Committee agreed the draft proposals to put out to consultation. These proposals were put forward having taken account of the statutory guidance in relation to Community Governance Reviews, the legislation and the responses received in the first round of consultation. The second phase of consultation ran from 19 May 2025 until 14 July 2025.
- 3.14 Again, a consultation pack was prepared which included a set of maps setting out the draft proposed town and parish boundaries and information regarding each area. This consultation pack was shared with the same individuals and organisations as set out in paragraph 3.10 above. Comments were sought on the proposals and submissions could be made by completing an online survey, by email or by letter.
- 3.15 Officers also attended 7 drop-in events where people could find out more information about the proposals. These took place at:-
- Southwater 1 library;
 - Madeley library;
 - Wellington library;
 - Newport library;
 - Brookside Community Centre;
 - Waters Upton Village Hall; and
 - Hub on the Hill, Sutton Hill
- 3.16 The drop-in events were held at alternative times of the day having engaged with the venues to assess their times of highest footfall. Notwithstanding this, with the exception of one event, attendance numbers were low.
- 3.17 In addition, the radio station playing in all Council-owned leisure venues also publicised the review on an hourly basis to raise awareness of the review and to encourage residents to have their say.
- 3.18 Again, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee, along with officers, met with representatives from SALC.
- 3.19 During the second period of consultation more than 1,300 responses were received. These were provided to the Committee at its meeting on 30 July 2025. Whilst those consultation responses are not provided again in this report, they are available to view online using the link at the end of this report. All reports relevant to this community governance review are linked at the end of this report under the “Background Papers” section.
- 3.20 At its meeting on 4 September 2025, the Boundary Review Committee reached a position in principle in respect of many areas of the Borough. There was a small number of areas, however, that the Committee felt warranted further consultation; these seven areas are those set out in section 4 of this report

Third phase of consultation

- 3.21 This third phase of consultation in respect of the seven areas commenced on 29 September 2025 ending on 19 October 2025. Again, notification was sent to the distribution list set out in paragraph 3.10 above and an information pack was prepared to support those wishing to comment.
- 3.22 Consideration was given to the holding of further drop-in sessions but, given the low attendance rate in relation to those held during the second consultation phase, it was felt that this would not support wider engagement.
- 3.33 Details were also included in a Telford & Wrekin Council e-newsletter which has an audience of more 18,000 recipients. Details of the third phase of consultation were also reported in the local press and by Town and Parish Councils, particularly in those areas affected.
- 3.34 As was the case during the first and second phase of consultation, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee, along with officers, met with the Chair and Vice-Chair, together with colleagues of SALC.
- 3.35 Unsurprisingly given the small number of areas being consulted upon, a smaller number of responses was received during the third phase of consultation. The response rate varied between the areas with the highest number of responses being received in respect of Brookside and Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley. The consultation responses in respect of each area are contained in **Appendices A – H** – one for each of the seven areas and one response that covered multiple areas.
- 3.36 Some responses have been included in more than one area based upon the comments they contain. Where a submission also included an attachment, this has been added as an Annex.

4.0 Themes arising from consultation responses

- 4.1 Whilst **Appendix I** provides a summary analysis of the responses, and the subsequent proposals for the Committee to consider, this section of the report touches upon some of the key points for the Committee to note.

Brookside and Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley

- 4.2 At its last meeting, the Committee considered various options in relation to this area and decided to consult on a proposal to create two new Parish Councils; a standalone Brookside Parish Council and then a larger Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley Parish Council.
- 4.3 Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council also undertook a survey of residents which included an extract of the report presented to Committee in September. There were around 120 survey responses collected by Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council (note, this number differs from that quoted in their formal submission as

more were received following receipt of this submission). The overwhelming response (more than 99%) was to reject the proposals set out at paragraph 4.2 above. The main reasons that came through in the consultation were:-

- The current Parish Councils perform well;
- Making changes would result in a disproportionate split of assets and liabilities and would this would detrimentally impact upon the proposed Brookside Parish Council in terms of sustainability;
- The proposed changes don't reflect community identity;
- Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council provides a strong youth offering which is well attended;
- Concerns around accessibility, particularly in the proposed Hollinswood, Randlay and Stirchley Parish Council with a perception being that Hollinswood & Randlay would dominate the Council's priorities.

4.4 Of all of the responses, there were a small number (single figures) who supported the proposals.

Horsehay, Lightmoor, Little Dawley & Aqueduct

4.5 This area generated around 25 responses in total. In general, there was support for the proposals contained in the consultation document with their being appreciation of the previous proposals not being progressed.

4.6 The majority of the responses were in favour of retaining the name Dawley Hamlets Parish Council as it was felt that this reflects the heritage of the area and that to make changes would incur unnecessary costs for changing things such as signs stationery etc.

4.7 There was a small number of responses (again, single figures) who supported a change in name to South Telford Villages Parish Council reflecting the fact that the area is made up of a number of village areas; Lightmoor Village, Horsehay Village, Doseley Village etc.

4.8 There were some submissions regarding the area of Ellis Peters Drive which, currently, sits in the Great Dawley Town Council area. Those submissions advocated for it moving into the Dawley Hamlets area (whatever that may be called) as it was part of Aqueduct and looked to Dawley Hamlets Parish Council for its services. Some of the comments referred to the difference in Council Tax precept between the two councils but, as Members are aware, this is not something that can be taken into account in a community governance review. The area of Ellis Peters Drive generated some discussion in the review carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England on Borough wards. Although there were some comments regarding this area in the consultation, given the number of responses overall (across all three consultations), and the relatively small number of comments regarding Ellis Peters Drive, it is not proposed to change the arrangements for this area.

Lawley & Overdale

- 4.9 There were very few responses in relation to this area with the Parish Council welcoming the proposals that were set out in the second round of consultation. The Parish Council put forward an alternative councillor number and some warding arrangements. Whilst the reason for these proposals is understood, the warding arrangements proposed by the Parish Council would result in significant electoral inequality. However, **Appendices I and J** set out some alternative warding arrangements which would provide the councillor numbers suggested and better electoral equality.

Madeley

- 4.10 There were only one response in respect of these proposals which was from the Town Council and was supportive of the proposals. However, the proposals regarding The Gorge required further consideration, as set out in **Appendix I** and so this has resulted in a change from the proposals to bring about better electoral equality for the two Town / Parish areas.

St Georges & Donnington

- 4.11 Of three responses, two were in favour of the proposals. They both put forward suggested alternative warding arrangements. The one response that was against referred to concerns around competing priorities between Donnington and St Georges and felt it would be detrimental to bring two parishes, with similar challenges and opportunities, together.
- 4.12 However, throughout the phase 2 consultation, there was broader support for the proposed St Georges & Donnington Parish Council.

The Gorge

- 4.13 Although generating only a small number of responses, upon considering the impact of the proposals further, there is concern about the electoral equality of both Madeley Town Council and The Gorge Parish Council, something which was mentioned in the last report to Committee. That being the case, **Appendix I** sets out some amendments to the proposal with the changes proposed being the Nightingale Walk are moving into The Gorge Parish Council rather than Madeley Town Council area, the Academy ward moving from Madeley Town Council into The Gorge Parish Council area and the area of Roberts Road moving into The Gorge Parish Council area also. The move of the Academy Ward will reflect the current Borough ward arrangements. Movement of Nightingale Walk and Roberts Road will provide good electoral equality as set out in Appendix I. It will also ensure the sustainability of both The Gorge Parish Council and Madeley Town Council moving forward.

Wrockwardine and Rodington

- 4.14 Just over 20 responses were received with the majority view being that the proposals were not supported. This was for the following reasons:-

- Concern about a dilution of priorities between the communities;
- Concerns about Rodington being underrepresented on a merged Parish Council;
- Not reflective of community identity;
- The geographical make up of the two areas are not conducive to efficient representation;
- Concern about accessibility for residents in one area or the other in terms of being able to attend meetings;
- Both Parish Councils are currently well-run and there is no need for changes to bring about improvements;
- It has been challenging ensuring alignment between Rodington and Longdon-on-Tern and to extend the boundaries to include Wrockwardine will compound this

4.15 It is clear from the submissions that some of the proposals contained in the second phase of consultation were particularly unwelcome whilst others attracted more support. It is worth reminding Committee members that, in cases such as these, obtaining unanimity in submissions is highly unlikely to occur and that the responses received during consultation are just one element that needs to be taken into account when deciding the outcome of the review.

4.16 Furthermore, it also worth mentioning that every change made will necessitate further changes elsewhere in order to ensure that the 'jigsaw' of the Borough's geography fits together as it should. Clearly, therefore, there might be instances where some changes are supported and clearly have benefit which result in consequential changes that are less well supported. This is the balancing exercise that the Committee needs to undertake when reaching a decision.

5.0 Other matters

5.1 Whilst Members have, in principle, agreed to the proposals in respect of a number of areas, the Committee will be asked to confirm final proposals at its next meeting. That being the case, there are some other matters that Members are asked to consider, set out below.

Councillor numbers and wards

5.2 Since the last meeting of the Boundary Review Committee, correspondence has been received in respect of two existing parish councils raising concerns about councillor numbers and the need for a meeting to be quorate. These are set out below:-

Kynnersley Parish Council – currently has a membership of 5. They have had a situation recently where, due to sickness and holiday, the meeting of the Council was only quorate. There is concern that this membership could present challenges around quoracy and a request has been received to increase the number to 6. It should be noted that, where a Parish Council is unable to be quorate, the Borough Council is required to appoint Members to it so as to enable the Parish Council to transact business.

Ercall Magna Parish Council – currently has a membership of 12. There is a request to introduce new warding arrangements made up of High Ercall / Walton – 6, Ellerdine / Rowton – 4, Roden / Poynton – 2. It is felt that this would result in better representation across the three distinct communities that make up Ercall Magna.

Muxton Parish Council (new proposed Council)

- 5.3 Members will recall that there was a discussion at the last meeting of the Boundary Review Committee of the proposed boundary for the Muxton Parish Council. A suggestion was made that the southern boundary should extend down School Lane, then head east along Granville Road to Lodge Road.
- 5.4 Whilst, on a map, the current proposed boundary looks unusual, it can be confirmed that it is based upon existing polling districts and it is good practice to use existing polling district boundaries wherever possible.
- 5.5 Members are asked to confirm the decision in relation to the boundary for Muxton Parish Council.

6.0 Next Steps

- 6.1 When the Committee makes its final decisions in relation to the Town and Parish arrangements for the Borough, if changes are made, there will be a need to support affected Councils to navigate the change. This commences with the setting up of “advisory groups” made up of councillors drawn from the existing Town / Parish Councils that are affected. These advisory groups will look at the distribution of assets (if relevant), Council Tax setting, staffing, contracts and similar in advance of the first round of elections in May 2027.
- 6.2 Officers have had preliminary meetings with some Town and Parish Clerks to explain the next steps and this will be followed up with any affected councils by sharing project plans and more details around what is needed throughout the transition. Understandably, there is some apprehension about ensuring that this is done right with Town and Parish Clerks keen to ensure they have an understanding of the impacts of the proposals on their existing Councils.
- 6.3 Elections to the new Town and Parish arrangements will take place in May 2027 at the next scheduled local elections. Until then, any vacancies that arise will be elected to based upon current arrangements. This will apply unless any vacancies arise in the 6 month period leading up to the scheduled elections in May 2027 in which case, the vacancy will be ‘held’ until that election.
- 6.4 Upon conclusion of the review, a legal order will be prepared to give effect to any new arrangements.

7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 Depending upon the final arrangements that are agreed by the Boundary Review Committee, there may be a need to consider the impact on any Special Fund arrangements in respect of Town and Parish Councils.
- 7.2 Additionally, it should be noted that, where new Town or Parish Councils are created, the legislation sets out that they are able to delay the setting of their precept until October of the year in which the new Council takes effect. This is due to the fact that elections to the new Council will only take place in May 2027. Having said that, in the approach to May 2027, there will be a need for any new Town / Parish Councils to work in 'shadow form' to ensure that matters arising from the review are dealt with.

8.0 Legal and HR Implications

- 8.1 The legal implications are as set out in this report.

9.0 Ward Implications

- 9.1 The final arrangements decided upon by the Boundary Review Committee may have implications for particular Borough wards. These will be confirmed once the final arrangements have been confirmed.

10.0 Health, Social and Economic Implications

- 10.1 Whilst the communities served by the current Town and Parish Councils have diverse needs, there are no direct health, social or economic implications arising directly from the proposals contained in this report other than already set out in the body of this report.

11.0 Equality and Diversity Implications

- 11.1 There are no groups that are disproportionately affected by the proposals contained in this report.

12.0 Climate Change and Environmental Implications

- 12.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report.

13.0 Background Papers

- 1 Consultation Pack (phase 1)
- 2 [Report to Boundary Review Committee 13 February 2025](#)
- 3 [Report to Boundary Review Committee 12 May 2025](#)
- 4 Consultation Pack (phase 2)
- 5 Presentation to Boundary Review Committee 3 July 2025
- 6 [Report to Boundary Committee 30 July 2025](#)
- 7 [Report to Boundary Committee 4 September 2025](#)
- 8 Consultation Pack (phase 3)

14.0 Appendices

- A – H Consultation Responses in respect of the seven areas consulted upon and any which commented on multiple areas
- I Summary of consultation responses
- J Proposed Town and Parish Council arrangements for Telford & Wrekin Borough
- K Proposed boundary maps

15.0 Report Sign Off

Signed off by	Date sent	Date signed off	Initials
Legal	27/10/2025	27/10/2025	RP
Finance	27/10/2025	27/10/2025	ER