Brookside and Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley

Email Responses:

1	Please be advised that if any of the changes to the Stirchley boundaries engender closure of the Sambrook Centre then we wish our objection to be noted.
2	I am commentating for myself, as a parish councillor, and [redacted] for 21 years. I am also in agreement with the SBP committee and any documents sent by the Parish Clerk. I support the attachment 100 per cent. Demographics is key to this review. The Review Committee (RC) in its latest incarnation, has completely ignored clause 3.4 No matter how the RV chops up neighbourhoods to make the population/finances work you will always create more problems. A problem that started 60 years ago by a short-sighted government and in particular the local authority that eventually came into existence. **The problem is Brookside**, always has been, always will be, unless the committee takes extreme measure or gives the appropriate advice to the TWC, and ensures positive action is takes to rectify the problems as explained below. **The original Brookside.** 1. An overflow settlement for Birmingham and surrounding towns. 2. Much of brookside is built on an American design. a. Front doors open onto a community area b. Cars parked many metres away at the rear or a side road 3. Only 1 car per 2 homes 4. No HMOs 5. No bad or absent landlords 6. Families, on the whole, grateful for the opportunity 7. This, I have been told, worked well for the first few decades Brookside Now 8. 2 two 4 cars per household, plus commercial vehicles 9. Excessive HMOs 10. Excessive bad or absent landlords 11. Excessive resentful tenants. 12. The American design is not working now 13. Excessive crime **Brookside Now (BN).** This is a product of TWC mismanagement 14. It is contained in a ring road, Brookside Avenue. 15. There is no room for expansion. 16. It is completely surrounded by mostly freehold properties of much higher quality that the owners have an interest to improve. 17. There are a few small pockets of good housing 18. In the main, it is rundown, neglected, uncared for, trashed 19. It is a hot bed for crime, centred around the community centre 20. The crime figures flatten out considerably at Brookside Avenue

	BN. 21. You can chop up the communities outside of Brookside Avenue as much as you like 22. You can ignore the demographics as much as you like 23. That will never change the empirical evidence that is BN 24. Much of brookside, in my opinion, needs to be flattened and rebuilt on British designs 25. There is an opportunity to build up to 10 stories of flats. Affordable housing in the area is grossly neglected **Brookside should be its own parish.** Looked after and managed by people that know the problems in depth **Cygnet Drive and Lake End Drive do not belong in Brookside.** They are on the wrong side of Brookside Avenue Their demographics do not fit Brookside They belong in Holmer Lake Ward **The Hem** Why has 350 homes not been included? The Hem development must be included in the Stirchley Parish **Brookside and Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley – Annex A**
3	Dear Team Please find attached the response from Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council to the third consultation of the Community Governance Review. I would be grateful for your acknowledgement of this document and that it will be presented to the next meeting of the Boundary Review Committee for their consideration. **Brookside and Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley – Annex B**
4	Good evening Please see attached the formal response from Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council, as agreed by Councillors. The 90 paper copies will be handed to yourselves very early w/c 20th October at a time to be arranged. **Brookside and Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley – Annex C**
5	I have looked at the proposal that has been put forward on the change of the geographical areas of the parish council.

	I honestly can't see how this change has been arrived at. Why are you splitting Stirchley up? With some of it being still with Brookside and us to join with Randlay and Hollinswood. The area is a ridiculous plan, Randlay and Hollinswood already have a large area and many public buildings and open areas to look after, will it mean that Stirchley gets missed (forgotten about) when it comes to groups in these areas being missed or told there is already provision for that on one of the other estates? There is a large population of senior citizens living in Stirchley, close to the Sambrook Centre who don't have a way of getting to other estates, they rely on their mobility scooters etc to get places and would miss out on their social interaction. This could also apply to young people in the area. Please reconsider.

Survey Responses:

1	Breaking up the existing parish councils will have a detrimental effect on the residents in the area. Stirchley and Brookside currently have the biggest youth provision in Telford which is funded by the existing parish council and opens 6 days per week for the younger residents in the area. ASB has significantly decreased since the youth offer in the area has expanded. Brookside is a deprived area and needs consistent people who are trusted by the residents and who understand their needs, to be available and able to help when needed. It is a small area and allowing it to be split from the existing Parish is ridiculous. Extending the Brookside boundary into Stirchley Village also goes against the Borough boundary and will cause confusion. Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council have in recent years really stepped up and consulted with the residents to find out what they need and want for the area. Using councillor resignations as an excuse for this break up is poor. Councillors resign across all Parishes for a number of reasons. Stirchley and Brookside should be kept as it is and not changed in my opinion.
2	The proposal goes totally against the wishes of the huge majority of those that commented in the second consultation. There was clearly no need for a third consultation. Stirchley has more of a shared identity with Brookside than it does with Hollinswood and Randlay. Using Cllr resignations as an excuse to suggest Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council might be failing is just that, an excuse. One resigned because of work commitments, one was elderly with health issues and another had family issues. Hardly anything that reflected on the council. You are suggesting changing the Parish boundaries of Brookside so that they would match the previous Borough boundary, that you changed in 2023. That goes completely against one of your main criteria. This proposed change would have a hugely negative impact on the Parish, with a loss of staff and services, such as the pensioners gardening scheme and the youth provision (currently the best in Telford). Although you can't take this into account, this will have a huge impact on how people in these areas vote in 2027 and will help result in a loss of votes by Telford Labour.

3	The proposal goes totally against the wishes of the huge majority of those that commented in the second consultation. There was clearly no need for a third consultation. Stirchley has more of a shared identity with Brookside than it does with Hollinswood and Randlay. Using Cllr resignations as an excuse to suggest Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council might be failing is just that, an excuse. One resigned because of work commitments, one was elderly with health issues and another had family issues. Hardly anything that reflected on the council. You are suggesting changing the Parish boundaries of Brookside so that they would match the previous Borough boundary, that you changed in 2023. That goes completely against one of your main criteria. This proposed change would have a hugely negative impact on the Parish, with a loss of staff and services, such as the pensioners gardening scheme and the youth provision (currently the best in Telford). Although you can't take this into account, this will have a huge impact on how people in these areas vote in 2027 and will help result in a loss of votes by Telford Labour.
4	this change creates a huge parish the figures do not appear to include the hem which on its own will have a large population, it does not seem the the hem resident numbers have been included within the published figures which gives a blurred picture. I am extremely concerned as to what impact this will have on the youth provision provided by stirchley and brookside pc this is an extremely valuable service that if lost will have a huge impact on the lives of our next generation
5	I do not think all 4 should be put together. It will make too big an area. What is needed in one area wont necessarily be needed in another. I think the area would be too large, in turn making it difficult to assess all areas needs
6	I oppose the alignment of Randlay with Brookside and Stirchley , our local parish looks after the area very well and I can only see our focus bending diluted and services reduced . I work in all the local areas and see the areas like brookside and the deprivation and fly tipping around the estate and worry the areas like brookside would need the most focus and funds to bring the environment to Randlay standards which I am proud to live in , I have lived in Telford all my life and on many of the estates and Randlay is one of the best kepted parishes I have lived in
7	I do not wish for the Parish of Hollinswood and Randlay to merge with other parishes. I feel like Hollinswood and arandlay would lose their identity.
8	I do not wish for the Parish of Hollinswood and Randlay to merge with other parishes. I feel like Hollinswood and Randlay would lose their identity.
9	As a resident of one of the current parishes with relatives and friends in the other, I am thoroughly disgusted by the proposal. The proposal is absolutely ridiculous and should not be being consulted on for a number of reasons. First being that it completely ignores the feedback from the first round of consultations when all parts of both parishes (from residents' consultations) made it clear that they did not want anything to change and that the current two parishes worked as well as having the correct number of councillors. Some of those that disagreed were not from the area and have a general vendetta against parish councils, they post obnoxious content online on social media. It is not fair for anyone not in the area to have a say about what happens to Hollinswood and Randlay and Stirchey and Brookside. Second that you have ignored your own terms of reference. "3. Reason for the CGR 3.1. The Council has a duty to keep parish arrangements under review. This is particularly important taking account of:- changes made by a full Borough Electoral Boundary Review in 2022 which resulted in misalignment between the Borough and Town and Parish Wards;" Your new proposal completely goes against this in so much as splitting Brookside and the expensive houses of Stirchley to be a parish does not match the Ward boundaries in the slightest, in fact you rectified this in 2022 with

	incredibly strong arguments as to why this was done including "a better reflection of the community identity of the area in question." Thirdly, you are pairing those houses in Stirchley that pay the highest precept with the lower bands of the majority of Brookside which is completely unfair. Those parts of the current parish have nothing in common which is why they are currently better served by a parish council that understands their differing needs. Fifth, you use the argument that there were several resignations from Stirchley and Brookside Parish council (" The recent spate of councillor resignations from Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council may be considered to indicate that the arrangements need to be reviewed.") but I would argue that there has been a lot of interest from the public in serving their community as elections were called. It is now that there is a decent set of councillors who are not in it for political gains or their own ends that it is now being run properly. Sixth, you have not even considered the "the growth in certain town and parishes;" as you are ignoring the Hem development. Seven, you are not considering, "ensuring that there is a clear rationale between the organisation and grouping of parishes." there is nothing linking the area in Stirchley with Brookside other than road but you could claim that about any road, including the A442 which connects a whole host of areas of Telford. It seems like you don't believe Brookside can cope on its own without cash input from those paying more precept. Eight, you have mentioned identity of areas as being important and want to rename the 'new' parishes but that would take away their identities. Whatever you call it, it cannot retain the original identity. It appears to me as if the committee were throwing a lot of ideas in to make the process more complicated and forgetting their initial reason for the process. This option is contradictory to the consultation prior to this as well as ignoring the terms of reference.
10	No to change The parish is under enough pressure Changing the boundaries will take away our community and parish Stirchley is a wonderful community with a fantastic mix of people of different ages, cultures and beliefs The loss for me would be devastating in so many ways as well as money still not been spent on stirchley it would be even less. Parish need to be smaller not larger Having the (hem), stirchley, brookside and Holmer lake (with brookside taking most of the the council tax and funds already) we would be left and forgotten. STAY AS IT IS
11	I'm in full support of the suggestion to break up the current Stirchley & Brookside parish council. This council has been failing us for years. They struggle to recruit and keep councillors and have been unable to employ a full time clerk for years. Leaving us to pick up the tab for an overpriced locum clerk. How much as this failing cost us taxpayers over the past couple of years????
12	I believe keeping Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council is very beneficial. Mainly keeping the Sambrook Centre which is in the heart of keeping Brookside, Stirchley and The Village all as one! Having an accessible library which benefits neighbouring schools and nurseries, aiding in education. Our younger members of the community actively use the facilities that the Sambrook Centre has to offer. Especially funzone. It also benefits in a safer community, due to children having an accessible and friendly place to socialise. The events that also ran through the Sambrook centre are so memorable! Helping children in low income families look forward to something when times are hard! These community/event days do bring the community together and also local businesses do profit from it. There's a fair few activities for our older generation ect. Indoor Bowling, boxing, art club and many more. The Sambrook centre truly has a lot to offer! Including a food bank collection point. Recently they were nominated for an award which just shows how important the Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council is.

13	As a resident I cannot see any benefit to the residents of the Hollinswood and Randlay Parish. There is nothing within the information supplied from TWC that identifies any benefits to the existing parish. It is interesting to note that monies have been allocated to Brookside from TWC, and that significant sums have been provided to other areas - with this context it is difficult to not take from that, that this decision to separate Brookside into its own area is due to the monies being invested in this area (I wish to be very clear that I have no objection to any monies being invested and that this is a positive to our town) - however in light of this, i cannot see how messing with boundary of H&RPC is fair. We have all seen the request for residents to say how they would like the monies spent in that area by the local MP! There is still a very unclear reason to the new suggested boundaries for the parishes, especially looking at why the houses at the bottom of Aquaduct Lane are cut off in such a way. Why the decision not to propose the following (or similar):- Brookside Parish as current but to include Holmer Lake - any properties to the south of Holmer Farm Road Stirchley Parish - to match the exsiting boundaries minus Arundel Close but include all of The Hem Leaving H&RP (with Arundel) as it is had not been considered as one the options from phase 2 is just bizarre. This was not the direct phase 2 proposal but would have been a far closer and more reasoned result of the phase 2 consultation and the responses! Not another one affecting this parish, as it was clear the residents do not want any changes to H&RPC. To use the reasoning of councillor resignations as justification for any form of merge, really is an insult to the existing S&BPC. Separating that Parish into 2 areas, could reasonably be deemed a suitable solution, as each Parish can then focus directly on its own residents and not be affected by any frustrations regarding support for one area or another - by implication, allowing a small area to be merged into an existing parish could potentially result in friction within that new parish, at no fault to the residents of either area. Finally, when one of the key objectives of this process has been to ensure better co-terminous of the parish and ward boundaries, there is nothing within this proposal that achieves that objective, if anything it succeeds in doing the exact opposite. But having a Brookside Ward (1 Ward Councillor), Stirchley Ward (1 Ward Councillor) and a new Ward called, i dont know, say The Valley (2 Ward Councillors) solves all of those issues!
14	Various points as follows :- 1. The CGR members seem obsessed that the current two parish councils must be changed. Firstly, the previous consultations introduced The Nedge as though it already was an entity when it wasn't. Even the first round doesn't use the existing parish names, but consciously breaks them up as though a change has to be made, it doesnt. 2. Has the CGR investigations received any real evidence that the resignations referred to are because of parish boundary organisations. If not, then does this referred to that changes to be made because someone has resigned. If the boundary organisation was specifically referenced then exactly what was the issue? You seem to have concluded that there were resignations and parish boundaries are responsible and must therefore change. 3. You have cited there were views expressed in the past, why are they relevant, they were in the past, you should only be looking at views by residents now. You had hundreds of those in round 2 which said do not make changes, but you still seem to think that changes must be made, THEY DON'T. 4. I still haven't seen anything that says here is a problem and by making this change it will be resolved. 5. Each of the four areas has a different identity and culture and the two parish councils have worked hard to bring the areas they are neighbours to together, making the changes you are proposing will destroy that as Hollinswood and Stirchley are not neighbours. 6. The new three area parish will be physically to spread out, making the sharing of services difficult. Not everyone has a car to move around the parish in. In summation, I totally oppose the proposed changes to the current Parish Council outlined in this third round of changes.

15	We should remain a small parish council, centred around our community values in which they listen to regularly, not what the central council want to leverage themselves into better positions politically. I myself have an allotment through the parish council and my daughter attends and assists on the funzone project, all funded through the parish, which will no doubt have no funding should this change. Please let our community decide for ourselves.
16	Stupid no need to change. My address is Brookside but we access school and services in stirchley as they're closer. I can't see any reasoning for moving any of these provision away from the locals
17	Although the proposal has now been amended to amalgamate only Stirchley with our existing Holinswood & Randlay Parish , I would still consider this is not a good proposal. The overall size of the Parish would be too large for management purposes and would undermine the excellnt work that our Parish Council Clerk and her team do to provide ameneties in our area .The help from our PC towards our Friends of Hollinswood & Randlay Valley group is invaulable , and this cannot be guaranteed should the boundaries and workload change. Although the definition of a parish in non-clerical terms is often different in urban areas as opposed to Rural ones , the intended result should be clearly to create an area where people feel a shared sense of responsibility towards contributing to maintaining a nice , safe , well looked after place to live and work . The numbers of people and area within that parish should reflect a "traditional" rural parish as much as possible and increasing ours to the size you propose would distinctly change that feeling of belonging . Please reconsider changing things - they run perfectly well as they are .
18	We have resided in Stirchley for over 13 years and firmly advocate for the establishment of an independent parish in Stirchley. Stirchley has been significantly underappreciated for at least three decades, and there has been a noticeable decline in the community areas, such as the regular upkeep of the grass, roads, and general maintenance throughout the estates..make it look unloved and feel an unsafe place to live. Money has created new housing and 2 schools.. this is amazing process! Additional financial resources could significantly enhance the overall condition of the Stirchley community! The establishment of additional parking facilities surrounding Church Way areas, would be beneficial for the Community Centre, which serves as a vital link between the elderly and the younger generation. It would also provide support and assistance, along with the indispensable kids' club, ensuring the safety of our children and promoting their social interaction. Reinstating the park near church way. Upgraded bus shelters equipped with seats for the disabled and elderly to ensure their comfort and accessibility. Potential recreational area? Healthy and energetic children, please stay away from any potential hazards Let's transform Stirchley into a joyful, secure environment, fostering unity within the community. Also includes The heart of the Community , the Community Centre, Older Council housing estates, Streets, More Available Street Car parking, Shops, (park taken away near church way) many children enjoyed that park! Any new Bus Stops with seats for the ageing and disabled community. As a family with a vulnerable disabled teenager

19	I am writing in strong opposition to the draft proposal within the Telford & Wrekin Community Governance Review to divide Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council; specifically, the suggestion to place Stirchley with Hollinswood & Randlay, and Stirchley Village within a separate Brookside Parish. This submission sets out the reasons why such a change would undermine established community identity, reduce local government effectiveness, create unnecessary financial burdens, and be opposed to local opinion. 1. Community Identity and Interests Stirchley & Brookside has functioned as a shared community for decades, bound by common facilities, services, and a shared sense of belonging. Residents of both areas use and identify with the same schools, library, shops, post office, sports fields, youth facilities and community centres – the majority of which are based in Stirchley Centre but serve the entire parish effectively. These are not simply service points, but genuine community hubs that foster social interaction, belonging, and cohesion across both neighbourhoods. Youth provision offers a particularly strong example of this shared identity. Programmes such as Funzone bring children and families together from across Stirchley and Brookside, and their success depends on a unified parish structure. A separation would risk undermining this provision, fragmenting funding and governance, and ultimately disadvantaging young people in Brookside who currently benefit from shared youth resources. Geographically, Randlay Avenue forms a clear, long-established physical boundary between Stirchley and Randlay. This boundary reflects genuine differences in community identity. Stirchley residents do not naturally look to Hollinswood or Randlay for their local facilities or sense of belonging. Similarly, Hollinswood operates as a wholly separate community, with its own facilities, playing fields, shops and community centres that Stirchley residents neither use nor identify with. There is no practical or social link that justifies merging the two. Finally, Stirchley Village residents strongly identify with Stirchley, not Brookside. Placing Stirchley Village within Brookside would erase that distinct identity and force residents to identify administratively with an area they do not live in, undermining the community's integrity. 2. Effective and Convenient Local Government The current parish structure is efficient and well understood by residents. It ensures that local services, facilities and representation are easy to access, and it reflects clear, logical boundaries recognised by residents. Splitting the parish as proposed would create confusion about which council provides which services, risk duplication of administrative functions, and potentially disrupt established maintenance responsibilities. It would also be impractical to split polling districts across parish lines. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) concluded in 2023, after extensive consultation and an Act of Parliament, that polling district TTT (formerly TBZ) should move away from Brookside and enter The Nedge ward. To now disregard those findings would be inconsistent and disingenuous, undermining the integrity of that process conducted by the commission on the request of Telford & Wrekin Council just a few short years ago. 3. Value for Money & Financial Considerations The current combined parish achieves economies of scale, allowing resources to be shared efficiently across both Stirchley and Brookside. Community grants, community interest organisations, and youth programmes all benefit from joint management and funding. If the areas were divided, both parishes may face increased administrative and staffing costs, duplicated governance structures, and reduced capacity to deliver community projects. It would also be unreasonable for Stirchley residents' council tax precepts to subsidise Hollinswood facilities they do not use. With significant housing development planned on The Hem, the responsibilities for maintenance, play areas,

	bus stops (17 of 25 within Brookside), and community spaces will only increase, requiring strong, unified local governance rather than fragmentation and confusion. 4. Local Support There is no evidence of local demand for this change. On the contrary, local opinion is overwhelmingly opposed. During recent canvassing for the Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council elections in August 2025, I encountered widespread opposition to both the previously proposed Nedge Parish Council (since rejected) and to the idea of merging Stirchley Village into Brookside. Residents consistently expressed pride in living in Stirchley, and a desire for their identity and representation to reflect that fact. It is therefore clear that the proposal does not have community support and, if implemented, would generate significant opposition. Conclusion The proposed reorganisation is unnecessary, divisive, and inconsistent with the principles of community identity, effective governance, and value for money that underpin the Community Governance Review process. Stirchley & Brookside has a long, successful record of joint working, shared services, and community cohesion. Splitting it would deliver no identifiable benefit and would instead undermine the social, financial, and administrative integrity of both communities. I therefore urge the Committee of the CGR to reject this proposal and instead retain the existing boundaries of Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council, and Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council. With regards [redacted] – Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council
20	The current arrangements should stay the same. The services Brookside and Stirchley provide for the community and youth sector are next to none and merging with other areas, having a shuffle, or changing will only see services struggle across all sectors. Stirchley and Brookside work well together, they are in appropriate walking distance for services and provisions to be merged. Personally, Brookside will struggle as its own 'area' due to the negative thoughts on the area! Things as they are work well and provide support to both areas residents.
21	Stirchley is more then Brookside and it caters for everybody. if it was to close the facilities would not be accessible everywhere else. The parish council is a big part of the community where everybody meets and the veterans get support and this is nowhere to be found elsewhere. The youth would not have any services which would be out causing mayhem and we know they need the support. Overall it needs to stay open as it is so we can keep functioning as a community.
22	If it was to close because of my Daughter who has autism we would lose the support from youth club which helps mixing with other children. The center helps me with support when i need it and advice due to citizens advice ect being there on a weekly basis. The center should not close as it supports so many people and families who need help and support. The groups that are run vary with ages and give socialization to all and enable people to meet other and get out of the house saving them from loneliness. Brookside is not the safest area and people dont feel safe going there so if it was our only option it would real shame.

23	All the concerns and objections raised about the previous proposal are still applicable. This revised proposal doesn't satisfy any of the requirements of a Community Governance Review: ie the size and population will adversely affect both community cohesion and the identities and interests of the communities and will be neither effective nor convenient for council employees or residents. The proposed Brookside parish mainly fits the requirements (although the partial inclusion of Stirchley & particularly Holmer Lake is not conducive to maintaining these communities' identities. The proposed Hollinswood, Randlay & Stirchley parish is no better than the original proposal as it still creates one huge, non-local parish which covers the whole distance from Hollinswood through to Holmer Lake and the sprawling new estate on the Nedge/ Halesfield. It would be around 3 times the physical size & more than twice the population of both the current parishes and the proposed Brookside one. This proposal will adversely affect community cohesion as the proposed parish excluding Brookside is too big to reflect the identities and interests of the communities – each of the communities have separate identities and are focused around different centres which provide for the specific needs of the local community. The communities of Hollinswood and Randlay are currently strong, sustainable and supported well by the parish council. Stirchley is also well supported with the local centre providing support & services to the community with familiar faces known to & trusted by residents who use the services. The Brookside centre also provides essential targeted support to its residents which is specific to the area because of its nature & demographic of the residents. The vast area and population covered by the proposed Stirchley, Hollinswood & Randlay would mean that it isn't possible to manage it effectively and cannot be convenient for either the council employees or for residents. No consideration appears to have been made for the large increase in population /electorate which will result from the large development on the Nedge. (still shown as greenfield on the maps). 300 dwellings will increase the electorate by at least 600, and the population of the area by 1000 or more. (most properties are 3 or 4 bedroom) Why does the proposal create such an uneven split by isolating Brookside and force the merger of the other three parishes unless there's some ulterior motive such as politics (which isn't a valid reason) or to isolate the government levelling up funding – which is relatively short term (10 years) & doesn't stand up anyway as it includes part of Stirchley & Holmer Lake. It doesn't make sense to split either Holmer Lake or Stirchley between 2 parishes. Neither does it make sense to split a polling district (TTT) – I assume this is either Holmer Lake or Stirchley. It is also illogical to have the Station Quarter (either the Town Centre side or the railway station side in Lawley & Overdale as the new housing is nowhere near any other housing in the parish (whereas the former Boyd House site is physically adjacent to Hollinswood and the section across the A442 (Railway side) aligns geographically with either Stafford park (part of Hollinswood & Randlay) or St Georges. It would make more sense to create 3 Parishes, formed of either: - Brookside as per the proposal minus Holmer Lake Stirchley & all of Holmer Lake plus the new Nedge development Hollinswood & Randlay – ideally plus the new Station Quarter on the site of the former Boyd House. (actual boundaries may be adjusted to include complete roads in one parish) OR - Brookside plus all of Holmer Lake All of Stirchley (including the part that's currently in the Brookside proposal) plus the Nedge development. Hollinswood & Randlay – plus the new Station Quarter on the site of the former Boyd House. (actual boundaries may be adjusted to include complete roads in one parish eg using Stirchley lane & south end of Randlay Ave as the boundary) - Or if the intention is to isolate Brookside for whatever reason, then create 2 parishes consisting of all of Stirchley plus all of Holmer Lake, and Hollinswood & Randlay, with possible boundary adjustments. I believe this would create more evenly sized & manageable parishes, with an area which it is reasonable for councillors to be familiar with and to carry out their duties as local focal points for their community. The statement in the documents that "The recent

	spate of councillor resignations from Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council may be considered to indicate that the arrangements need to be reviewed." appears to be the Borough Council taking the easy way out of the problem! If there is an issue, the Borough Council should look into the cause(s) and support the parish in addressing & resolving the issue(s). Instead the Borough Council is just offloading the problem onto the proposed new combined parish council and likely transferring the problem which will cause disruption to the wider area.
24	Brookside and stirchley parish council is beyond amazing the help they do for the community goes beyond and the work they do for the children with the youth clubs and days for the kids is just amazing it gives them all a place to be safe warm and if I'm honest fed because some children locally don't get what they need but youth club provides all of those, my children go to the youth clubs and they absolutely love it I honestly don't know what they'd do without it it's so lovely knowing their in a safe environment seeing friends having fun not worrying about them walking round the streets
25	I've been a [redacted] for over 20 years for Stirchley and Brookside parish council. We have worked so hard in building up a fantastic youth club for the community and the number of kids coming through our doors has exceeded our expectation.
26	Our parish council do a brilliant job and in my opinion amalgamating would be detrimental to us.
27	As a long-standing resident of Stirchley, I am writing to strongly oppose Telford & Wrekin Council's proposal to divide Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council — specifically, the suggestion that Stirchley should be placed within Hollinswood and Randlay Parish, and that Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park should form a separate Brookside Parish. I believe this proposal would damage the identity of our area, reduce the effectiveness of local government, and create unnecessary confusion and financial strain for residents. The current structure works — it's fair, familiar, and community-driven. Splitting it would solve no real problem and would instead undo years of progress in building a cohesive, active, and supportive local community.
28	As a councillor for Stirchley Ward, I oppose the proposal to divide Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council. Moving Stirchley into Hollinswood and Randlay, and Stirchley Village and Park into Brookside, would harm our community's identity, weaken services, and create unnecessary costs. Stirchley, Holmer Lake and Brookside have long worked together as one community. Residents share the same schools, youth clubs, library, and community spaces, most based in Stirchley Centre and used by everyone. Our parish structure supports that unity. Splitting it would only fragment funding and leadership. The boundary between Stirchley and Randlay is clear, both geographically and socially. Stirchley residents do not look to Hollinswood or Randlay for facilities or representation. Likewise, Stirchley Village and Park have centuries of history and strong identity — moving them elsewhere

	would erase that heritage and alienate residents. The current parish is efficient, fair, and widely understood. Shared resources mean lower costs and stronger services, such as the Sambrook Centre, youth provision through FunZone, and environmental maintenance. Dividing the parish would create confusion, duplicated administration, and a risk to services residents depend on. Local opinion is overwhelmingly against this proposal. People value the unity and progress we've achieved and see no benefit in change. I therefore urge the Review Committee to reject the proposal and retain the existing Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council boundaries — protecting our community's identity, efficiency, and cohesion.
29	I categorically do not support the merging of these parish councils; the needs of each are different and the compromise-decisions that would need to be reached would not best serve the requirements of each parish. I welcome challenging how these established institutions operate however this consolidation approach does not serve the communities best interests and would ultimately lead to a reduction in the quality of life for residents, businesses and community groups.
30	I write , on this occasion , [redacted] Friends of Hollnswood and Randlay Valley The Friends oppose teh suggested merger of Hollinswood and Randlay tParish with parts of Stirchley and Holmer Lake to create a new parish and parish council Our Friends Group was created to offer support to the Parish Council and work to improve the Randlay Valley area and to provide a safe outdoor space. The \valley is an official Local Nature Reserve (LNR) We work as volunteers to litter pick and to cut back shrubs and bushes, to keep paths clear and areas accessible. We do this through regular volunteer days We also hold meetings and events to organise the group and raise money and advertise the benefits of the Valley. Money is also raised through grants obtained from local companies and organisations. Although welcoming the opportunity to respond the draft proposal, we have severe reservations about its possible effects upon our group and the future of Randlay Valley At Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council the 5-year strategy is continuous, and longstanding, and includes support for the Randlay Valley Area. This support includes but is not limited to: • Administrative help • Publicity • Cooperation • Encouragement of the staff to take part in and support FoHRV events and environmental upgrades • Grant financing • Provision of meeting spaces • Provision of storage areas for tools and materials • Lobbying with outside bodies Without these elements of support, we believe that it will be far more difficult for our group to carry out its tasks and reach its objective - to maintain access to the Valley for the local population Our concern is that a new council , not having this previous knowledge and experience, will not support the Friends actions until such time as the council can develop its own set of priorities, if at all. This would tend to be detrimental to the well being of the population in Hollinswood and Randlay who would see reduced accessibility to the Valley into the future
31	The draft proposal is NOT a tweak to the previous proposal but a significantly different proposal, necessitating the creation of two new parish council to replace the present two . The previous proposal would have created one parish council to cover a sprawling geographical area. This proposal creates two new parish councils one much smaller than the other , so this is not a tweak. The short period of the consultation for this new proposal is insufficient for meaningful consideration by the community and gives little opportunity for the Borough to obtain meaningful feedback. This proposal , as before, means that the 5 year strategy adopted by Hollinswood and Randlay Parish council , and teh services we provide are put at risk. This strategy has been built up over 17 years from representations via the local community and annually updated leading to major improvements to teh services provided by the council from SNAC to allotments , to multicultural community events, from the Valley , to leases taken on for the muddy , pavilion , improved new community centre and huge progress to reaching net zero by 2030. This is all at risk

	Further , the new H , R and S council would still be providing services for a large unconnected, unwieldy set of communities as the distance between Holmer Lake and Hollinswood without interconnected links and differing economic outlook would make the council less cost effective. In all , this is proposal is likely to lead to deteriorating , more costly services for the communities and would be step backwards for Hollinswood and Randlay
32	The last proposal to merge Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council was overwhelmingly rejected with 97% of residents opposing the proposal when presented with the case for it provided by the borough Council. The present proposed merger, to merge the council area with parts of Stirchley has even less support - 99% of respondents are opposed to this proposal . This proposal does not appear to have been formulated from discussions with the community or with the council . Such communication has been very limited . In our conversations with the residents, the most common comment is that the Parish Council is doing a good job ,is not broken and does not need to be fixed Within, the parish council, this proposal is even now, leading to employment uncertainty for its staff , putting pressure on them when they are expected and desire to give their best within the roles they hold. [redacted] a duty of care towards all staff and am concerned in the event of this proposal being enacted, for how a longer period of uncertainty ,until the new council is created , might affect their well being and services they provide for our community. The proposed new council's number of councilors will affect the ability of councillors to represent the community and this will be worsened by the increased geographical spread of the whole council area. The proposal will lead to the risk that the plans the council have developed to further the objectives we have agreed with the community in Hollinswood and Randlay , over many years, will be in whole or partly rejected by the new council. This would be a waste and and against the interests of the residents. We are not opposed to any change in the parish boundary. We have, for example, previously suggested that Arundel Close and Botfield close be moved into the parish of Hollinswood and Randlay as they are both part of the geographical areas of Randlay (the Stirchley sign is beyond both) however, the suggested scope of this proposal is too vast to enact without significant , and deleterious , effects on the community and I strenuously oppose them