

## **BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on Thursday 26th September 2013 at 6.00 pm in Darby House, Lawn Central, Telford**

**PRESENT:** Councillors R Sloan (Chair), K Blundell, S Davies, A Eade and R Overton

**IN ATTENDANCE:** P Griffiths (Democratic Services Manager) and P Smith (Democratic Services Team Leader).

A number of residents from Lilleshall were also in attendance.

#### **BRC-09 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

#### **BRC-10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillors N Dugmore and A McClements

#### **BRC-11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

#### **BRC-12 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – LILLESHALL, DONNINGTON & MUXTON PARISH: TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Committee received the report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection concerning the terms of reference for a Community Governance Review (CGR). The CGR had been triggered following the submission of a valid petition calling for a separate parish to be formed for the Lilleshall ward of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council.

The Chair reported that he would allow the lead petitioner – Mr P Hawkins – and the Chair of the Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council – Mr A Baker – to speak for up to five minutes each. This was to allow the Committee an opportunity to hear views from the local community about the petition and any representations relevant to the proposed terms of reference.

Mr Hawkins referred to his submission that was appended to the report. It was stated that there was clear support within the Lilleshall Ward for a review for the purpose of considering forming a separate Parish for the ward. A review of the whole Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton parish had not been requested, and if the Review was widened, it would fundamentally alter the basis of the request and would not reflect the wishes of the petitioners. It was also important that the Review's findings were based on sound evidence.

Mr Baker stated that the existing Parish Council had served the area well over the last 70 years, and that there were no new circumstances that justified another

Community Governance Review only two or three years after the last one. He read out a number of comments that had been made by local people who were against a separate parish council for Lilleshall. It was felt that, like the previous CGR, the Review could not take place without considering the likely impact a separate parish for Lilleshall would have on the rest of the existing Parish. The Parish Council had organised a public meeting in Lilleshall on 14 October for the issues to be fully discussed.

The Democratic Services Manager then presented the draft Terms of Reference document that was appended to the report. In effect, the document set out the Council's policies for the conduct of the Review. It reflected the legislative framework against which the Review must operate, as well as providing background information to help to allow electors and other interested organisations to make informed submissions. The Council had a duty to ensure that community governance within the area under review met the 'Community of Identity' test, and should:

- Reflect the identities and interests of the community of that area;
- Be effective and convenient;
- Take into account any other, non-parish, arrangements for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in the area.

The draft Terms of Reference also set out the consultation strategy and timetable for the Review. The Council would endeavour to ensure that the consultation process was straightforward and cost effective, but all parties needed to recognise that the Council was under severe budget constraints and had fewer resources than at the time of the last CGR for the area. The Committee also needed to be mindful of the current review of Ward boundaries by the Local Government Boundary Commission, the outcome of which might impact on this CGR.

In response to Members' questions regarding the scope of the Terms of Reference, the Democratic Services Manager advised that, like the previous CGR for the area, it was unlikely that Lilleshall could be reviewed in isolation without considering the impact that a separate Lilleshall parish might have on the other Wards in the existing parish – eg: council tax income. However, the CGR was unlikely to be formally widened to cover the other Wards unless a valid petition was received for a separate Muxton or Donnington parish council. The Committee were mindful of the strong views that had been expressed on either side of the debate in Lilleshall, and there was a discussion on the merits of holding some form of non-binding referendum that would gauge the views of local residents. The cost of such an exercise was an issue, and it was suggested that a ballot based on a single straightforward question would be effective. Numbered ballot papers could be delivered to all local residents on the electoral register, with ballot boxes placed in a couple of locations in the ward. It was recognised that care would need to be taken on the wording of the question to be asked, and that interested parties should be consulted on that.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the Terms of Reference document, as appended to the report, be adopted and published, subject to the inclusion of a provision for a direct consultation exercise - with the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection being authorised, in consultation with**

**the Chair of the Boundary Review Committee, to finalise the details of the consultation following further discussions with the appropriate community representatives;**

- (b) that the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection be appointed as the 'Proper Officer' for the purposes of the Review.**

The meeting ended at 6.19 p.m.

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....

**TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL****BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE – 3 FEBRUARY 2014****FURTHER ELECTORAL REVIEW OF THE BOROUGH:  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS****REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR : LAW, DEMOCRACY AND PEOPLE  
SERVICES****PART A) – SUMMARY REPORT****1.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT**

- 1.1 This report draws to a conclusion the Further Electoral Review of the Borough with the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) final recommendations. Details of the proposed electoral arrangements are set out in Table A1 at pages 25-27 of the attached report and illustrated on the large map accompanying that report.

LGBCE have now completed their review of electoral arrangements for Telford & Wrekin. An Order – the legal document which brings into force the recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Telford & Wrekin Council, in 2015.

Telford & Wrekin Council currently has 54 councillors elected from 16 single-member, 13 two-member and four three-member wards. The final recommendations for Telford & Wrekin are that the Council should have 54 members, with 12 single-member wards, 12 two-member wards and six three-member wards. No ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2018. In making the final recommendations LGBCE have taken account of submissions received during consultation on their draft recommendations. As a result, they have proposed boundary amendments to draft recommendations for the Dothill, Edgmond & Ercall Magna, Hadley & Leegomery, Haygate, Park, Priorslee, Shawbirch and St Georges wards.

The full report is attached and is also available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the committee note the LGBCE final recommendations which will come into force at the next council elections in May 2015.

## **SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>COMMUNITY IMPACT</b>	Do these proposals contribute to specific Co-Operative Council priority objective(s)?	
	No	
	Will the proposals impact on specific groups of people?	
	No	Borough Wide
<b>DELIVERY DATE</b>	7 May 2015 local elections	
<b>FINANCIAL/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPACT</b>	No	Costs associated with the electoral review are in the form of officer time and will be met from within existing budgets.  MLB 17.01.12
<b>LEGAL ISSUES</b>	No	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has a statutory duty to keep under review electoral arrangements at local authority level
<b>OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS &amp; OPPORTUNITIES</b>	Yes	The outcome of any review may change the size of the council, number and boundaries of wards, names of wards and allocation of councillors to wards.
<b>IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS</b>	Yes	Borough-wide impact

## **PART B) – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**TABLE A1**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Councillors (2012)</b>	<b>Electors 2012</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Admaston & Bratton	1	2284	2284	0%	2270	2270	-4%
2	Apley Castle	1	2417	2417	5%	2427	2427	2%
3	Arleston	1	2308	2308	1%	2425	2425	2%
4	Brookside	2	4628	2314	1%	4698	2349	-1%
5	Church Aston & Lilleshall	1	2391	2391	4%	2355	2355	-1%
6	College	1	2393	2393	4%	2407	2407	1%
7	Dawley & Aqueduct	3	7266	2422	6%	7196	2399	1%
8	Donnington	2	4931	2466	8%	4928	2464	4%
9	Dothill	1	2262	2262	-1%	2236	2236	-6%
10	Edgmond & Ercall Magna	2	4657	2329	2%	4635	2318	-2%
11	Ercall	1	2395	2395	4%	2408	2408	1%
12	Hadley & Leegomery	3	6717	2239	-2%	7081	2360	-1%
13	Haygate	1	2170	2170	-5%	2347	2347	-1%

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Councillors (2012)</b>	<b>Electors 2012</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
14	Horsehay & Lightmoor	2	3337	1669	-27%	4931	2466	4%
15	Ironbridge Gorge	1	2556	2556	11%	2486	2486	5%
16	Ketley & Overdale	3	6401	2134	-7%	7083	2361	-1%
17	Madeley & Sutton Hill	3	7881	2627	15%	7767	2589	9%
18	Malinslee & Dawley Bank	2	4487	2244	-2%	4606	2303	-3%
19	Muxton	2	4828	2414	5%	4944	2472	4%
20	Newport North & West	2	4457	2229	-3%	4744	2372	0%
21	Newport South & East	2	4024	2012	-12%	4961	2481	4%
22	Oakengates & Ketley Bank	3	6243	2081	-9%	6828	2276	-4%
23	Park	1	2398	2398	5%	2441	2441	3%
24	Priorslee	2	4369	2185	-5%	4306	2153	-9%
25	Shawbirch	1	2425	2425	6%	2485	2485	5%
26	St Georges	2	4811	2406	5%	4763	2382	0%
27	The Nedge	3	7122	2374	4%	7113	2371	0%
28	Woodside	2	4474	2237	-2%	4322	2161	-9%
29	Wrockwardine	1	2309	2309	1%	2363	2363	-1%

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Councillors (2012)</b>	<b>Electors 2012</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
30	Wrockwardine Wood & Trench	2	4849	2425	6%	4711	2356	-1%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>123,790</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>128,249</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,292</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,375</b>	<b>–</b>

## **4.0 THE REVIEW**

4.1 In June 2013 LGBCE published draft recommendations for a 54 member council comprising a pattern of 10 single-member wards, 13 two-member wards and six three-member wards. The final recommendations for Telford & Wrekin are that the Council should have 54 members, with 12 single-member wards, 12 two-member wards and six three-member wards.

4.2 To recap, some of the key statutory criteria that the review had to follow included:

- electoral fairness: ensuring every councillor represents about the same number of electors within a 10%+/- variance from the electoral quota;
- the need to work within existing parish boundaries, but with a capacity to alter parish ward boundaries so that they are co-terminous with borough ward boundaries;
- using clear and identifiable physical barriers for boundaries: boundaries in the no-man's land between communities of identity;
- respecting and avoiding partitioning our communities of identity;
- taking into account the electorate in six years time.

### **4.3 Borough Final Recommendations**

#### **Newport**

The final recommendations for Newport are for a two-member Newport North & West ward having a similar number of electors to the average number of electors for the borough by 2018 and a two-member Newport South & East ward having 4% more than the average for the borough by 2018.

#### **Church Aston & Lilleshall, Edgmond and Ercall Magna**

The final recommendation is to include the parishes of Eyton-upon-the-Weald-Moors Moors and Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors in a two-member Edgmond & Ercall Magna ward. Final recommendations are for a two-member Edgmond & Ercall Magna ward and a single-member Church Aston & Lilleshall ward having 2% fewer and 1% fewer electors than the average for the borough by 2018, respectively.

#### **Wrockwardine and Shawbirch**

The final recommendations is for single-member Admaston & Bratton, Shawbirch and Wrockwardine wards with 4% fewer, 5% more and 1% fewer electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

#### **Wellington**

Final recommendations for Wellington, with the exception of Shawbirch, are for single-member Arleston, College, Dothill, Ercall, Haygate and Park wards which would contain 2% more, 1% more, 6% fewer, 1% more, 1% fewer and 3% more than the average number of electors for the borough by 2018, respectively.

### **North Telford**

In North Telford, final recommendations are for a three-member Hadley & Leegomery ward, three two-member Donnington, Muxton and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench wards and a single-member Apley Castle ward. These wards will contain 1% fewer, 4% more, 4% more, 1% fewer and 2% more electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

### **Lawley, Ketley, Overdale, Oakengates and Ketley Bank**

In Lawley, Ketley, Overdale, Oakengates and Ketley Bank final recommendations are for three-member Ketley & Overdale and Oakengates & Ketley Bank wards having 1% fewer and 4% fewer electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

### **St Georges and Priorslee**

Final recommendations are for two-member St Georges and Priorslee wards. These wards will a similar number to, and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

### **South Telford and Ironbridge Gorge**

In South Telford and Ironbridge Gorge final recommendations are for three-member Dawley & Aqueduct, Madeley & Sutton Hill and The Nedge wards, two-member Brookside, Horsehay & Lightmoor, Malinslee & Dawley Bank and Woodside wards and a single-member Ironbridge Gorge ward. These will contain 1% more, 9% more, a number similar to, 1% fewer, 4% more, 3% fewer, 9% fewer and 5% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

### **Final recommendations**

	<b>2012</b>	<b>2018</b>
Number of councillors	54	54
Number of wards	30	30
Average number of electors per councillor	2,292	2,375
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	4	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

### **Final recommendation for Borough**

Telford & Wrekin Council should comprise 54 councillors serving 30 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying the LGBCE report.

#### **4.4 Parish Electoral Arrangements**

As part of an electoral review, LGBCE are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review. Under the 2009 Act, and notwithstanding representations made to them which would suggest that they do otherwise, they only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of their recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Telford & Wrekin Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

To meet their obligations under the 2009 Act, LGBCE propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote, The Gorge, Hadley & Leegomery, Ketley, Lawley & Overdale, Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton, Madeley, Oakengates, St Georges & Priorslee, Stirchley & Brookside, Wellington, Wrockwardine and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench.

##### **Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote**

Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chetwynd Aston (returning four members) and Station Road (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1. They should, however, not come into effect until the ordinary election day in 2019.

##### **The Gorge**

Parish Council should return eight parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Coalport & Jackfield (returning two members), Ironbridge Gorge (returning three members) and Lightmoor (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

##### **Hadley & Leegomery**

Parish Council should return 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Apley Castle (returning four members), Hadley Castle (returning three members), Hadley Manor (returning three members), Leegomery (returning four members) and Trench Lock (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

##### **Ketley**

Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Beveley (returning two members) and Ketley (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Lawley & Overdale**

Parish Council should return eight parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Central (returning four members), Dawley Bank (returning one member), Lawley (returning two members) and West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton**

Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Donnington East (returning one member), Donnington West (returning five members), Lilleshall (returning two members), Muxton (returning five members) and The Humbers (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Madeley**

Parish Council should return 17 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Cuckoo Oak (returning five members), Hill Top (returning one member), Madeley (returning five members) and Woodside (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Oakengates**

Town Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Hollyhurst (returning one member), North (returning three members) and Oakengates (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **St Georges & Priorslee**

Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Snedshill (returning one member), St Georges East (returning one member), St Georges West (returning four members) and Priorslee (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Stirchley & Brookside**

Parish Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Brookside (returning seven members), Holmer Lake (returning one member) and Stirchley (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Wellington**

Town Council should return 21 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Arleston (returning three members), College (returning three members), Dothill (returning three members), Ercall (returning three members), Haygate (returning three members), Park (returning three members) and Shawbirch (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Wrockwardine**

Parish Council should return 10 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Admaston & Bratton (returning seven members) and Wrockwardine (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### **Wrockwardine Wood & Trench**

Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: East (returning one member), Trench (returning eight members), Wrockwardine Wood East (returning one member) and Wrockwardine Wood West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

Documents and information used in the preparation of this report can be found on the website of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). Of particular relevance is the Commission's guidance: *Electoral reviews: technical guidance* (May 2011). Ward maps and electorates can be found at our elections website at [www.telford.gov.uk/elections](http://www.telford.gov.uk/elections)

The agendas for the Committee's meetings can be found on the council's website at

<http://apps.telford.gov.uk/demservice/CommitteesDetails.asp?theCommittee=Boundary>

**Report prepared by Phil Griffiths, Democratic Services Manager,  
telephone 01952 383210**

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	8
Rural North and West	9
Wellington	11
North Telford	12
Central Telford	13
South Telford and Ironbridge Gorge	16
Conclusions	17
Parish electoral arrangements	17
3 What happens next?	21
4 Mapping	23
<b>Appendices</b>	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Telford & Wrekin Council	26
B Glossary and abbreviations	29



## Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We have conducted an electoral review of Telford & Wrekin Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. We commenced the review in October 2012.

This review was conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
23 October 2012	Consultation on council size
29 January 2013	Submission of proposals of ward patterns to the LGBCE
9 April 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
18 June 2013	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
10 September 2013	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 54 members, comprising a pattern of 10 single-member wards, 13 two-member wards and six three-member wards. The recommendations were broadly based on the Council's proposals, amended to reflect our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government. All submissions can be viewed on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Submissions received

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 31 submissions, including comments covering the whole of the borough from Telford & Wrekin Council and the Chairman of the Telford & Wrekin Branch of UKIP. We also received submissions from Mark Pritchard MP, the Conservative Group on the Council, five borough councillors, five town and parish councillors, eight town and parish councils, the Chairman of Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish meeting and eight members of the public. In addition, we received a petition signed by 101 residents of Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish.

All submissions can be viewed on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

Telford & Wrekin Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2018. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of 3.6% over the six-year period from 2012–18. The increase in the electorate is forecast to be concentrated in areas of substantial housing developments expected to occur in Lawley, Hadley, Lightmoor and Newport.

We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

### General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. In making our final recommendations we have taken account of submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations. As a result, we have proposed boundary amendments to the draft recommendations for the Dothill, Edgmond & Ercall Magna, Hadley & Leegomery, Haygate, Park, Priorslee, Shawbirch and St Georges wards.

Our final recommendations for Telford & Wrekin are that the Council should have 54 members, with 12 single-member wards, 12 two-member wards and six three-member wards. No ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2018.

### What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Telford & Wrekin. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Telford & Wrekin Council, in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**You can also view our final recommendations for Telford & Wrekin Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

# 1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review was conducted following our decision to review Telford & Wrekin's electoral arrangements, to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submission received from Telford & Wrekin Council during the initial stage of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Telford & Wrekin Borough Council*, which were published on 18 June 2013. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 9 September.

## What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. A description of our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Telford & Wrekin?

5 Based on the December 2011 electorate data, 39% of the borough's wards currently have an electoral variance of more than 10% from the average for the borough. Of these, Horsehay & Lightmoor ward has an electoral variance of 28%.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. In addition, your ward name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Telford & Wrekin Council.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Telford & Wrekin is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

10 Legislation also requires that our recommendations are not based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but reflect estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the end of the review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward.

11 The achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. In all our reviews we therefore recommend strongly that, in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

12 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote; The Gorge; Hadley & Leegomery; Ketley; Lawley & Overdale; Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton; Madeley; Oakengates; St Georges & Priorslee; Stirchley & Brookside; Wellington; Wrockwardine, and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench.

13 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Telford & Wrekin Council or the external boundaries or names of parish or town councils, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Submissions received

14 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Telford & Wrekin Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

15 We received six submissions during the consultation on warding patterns including a borough-wide scheme from the Council. All of the submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

16 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 3.6% to 2018. The forecasts provided by the Council took into account planned developments across the borough, as well as population forecasts made by the Office for National Statistics.

## Council size

17 Telford & Wrekin Council currently has 54 councillors elected from 16 single-member, 13 two-member and four three-member wards. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders and Full Council. The Council subsequently made a proposal for the retention of the current council size of 54. In support of its proposal, the Council emphasised its Co-operative Council ethos and members' representational role.

18 The Conservative Group on the Council made an initial submission in favour of a council size of 44, proposing a return to the committee system.

19 We decided to consult publicly on council sizes of both 44 and 54, considering that we had insufficient evidence to recommend either number. This consultation ended on 3 December 2012.

20 During the consultation on council size, we received 108 submissions. A majority of respondents supported retention of the current council size. We received individual submissions from 31 borough councillors, of whom only one supported a reduction in council size, although Conservative Group members had made a collective response in favour of a reduction. The majority of town and parish councils were in favour of retaining the current council size. Of 64 local residents who made representations, 40 supported a reduction in council size.

21 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. Those supporting the retention of the current council size of 54 cited an increase in member workload as the principal reason for that view. They described the effects of a growing population, evidence of deprivation and health and welfare reforms as contributory to this workload increase. However, a number of councillors, residents and

parish councils said that the 'Co-operative Council' approach to community engagement and leadership necessitated the retention of current council size because of the implications of this approach for representational activities. In opposing a reduction in council size, fears were expressed about the impact of workload on ability of the Council to attract a broad spectrum of candidates for election and the ability of councillors to exercise effective scrutiny of council decision-making.

22 These views were not shared by all, however. The Council's Conservative Group put forward the view that the Co-operative Council approach was not leading to an increase in workload and that a reduction to 44 members would be consistent with the Council's decision-making and scrutiny structures whilst providing for cost-savings. This was a view shared by some residents making representations and by two parish councils. Whilst most of those in favour of a reduction in council size felt that 44 would be the appropriate number, a small number of residents proposed smaller council sizes, ranging from 27 to 40.

23 We concluded that, taken together, the submissions of those in favour of the retention of a council size of 54 had provided evidence to support the argument that the current council size should be retained in order to operate under current governance model. Whilst we did consider the submissions of those in favour of a reduction in council size, we felt that they did not provide us with a comparable volume or weight of evidence. We were therefore unable to assure ourselves that the Council's governance structure could operate effectively should council size be reduced.

24 We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 54 elected members as the basis of this electoral review. A consultation on warding arrangements began on 29 January 2013 and ended on 8 April 2013

25 During the consultation on warding arrangements we received only one representation relating to council size. The Council presented a warding pattern based on a council size of 55. It argued that this would provide for a better warding pattern than would its initial proposal for 54 members, but provided limited evidence to justify our moving away from the council size of 54 which we had adopted following consultation. We therefore did not move away from a council size of 54 when agreeing our draft recommendations.

26 We received a few very general comments on council size and the role of councillors in response to the draft recommendations and none of these submissions provided any additional evidence that would persuade us to move away from a council size of 54. We have therefore decided to base our final recommendations on this number of elected members.

## Electoral fairness

27 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

28 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. This is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (123,790 in 2012 and 128,249 by 2018) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 54 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,292 in 2012 and 2,375 in 2018.

29 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed 30 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for Telford & Wrekin.

## General analysis

30 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 31 submissions, including those from the Council, and the Chairman of the Telford & Wrekin Branch of UKIP who commented on all of the wards outlined in the draft recommendations, supporting some individual recommendations and opposing others.

31 Two respondents advocated that we should seek, to create single-member wards on principle. We have no policy, unless specifically requested by a principal council to conduct a single-member warding review, either to favour or disfavour single-member or multi-member wards. Instead, we seek, in making recommendations, only to balance the statutory criteria of electoral equality, reflecting community identity and providing for effective and convenient local government. Accordingly, we have recommended a combination of single- and multi-member wards.

32 Most responses to the draft recommendations addressed proposed warding of particular parts of the borough. Of the 29 wards proposed in the draft recommendations, seven attracted expressions of support and no opposition.

33 We have considered these responses, together with those made at earlier stages of the review, and have concluded that we should move away from our draft recommendations in respect of the following wards: Dothill; Edgmond & Ercall Magna; Hadley & Leegomery; Haygate; Park; Priorslee; Shawbirch; and St Georges.

34 Our final recommendations would result in 12 single-member, 12 two-member and six three-member wards. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in Telford & Wrekin.

## Electoral arrangements

35 This section of the report describes the submissions received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Telford & Wrekin. The following areas, defined only for the purposes of guiding readers of these recommendations, are considered in turn:

- Rural North and West (pages 9–11)
- Wellington (page 11)

- North Telford (pages 12–13)
- Central Telford (pages 13–15)
- South Telford and Ironbridge Gorge (pages 16-17)

36 Details of the proposed electoral arrangements are set out in Table A1 at pages 25-27 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Rural North and West

### **Newport**

37 The town of Newport lies in the north-eastern part of the borough. It is currently divided into four single-member wards. Significant housing development is expected to take place across the town.

38 In our draft recommendations, we proposed that the existing Newport East and South wards, together with the development at Station Road, be combined to form a two-member ward. We also proposed a two-member Newport North & West ward combining the existing Newport West and Newport North single-member wards. The Council supported these recommendations.

39 The representations which expressed general preference for single-member wards opposed our recommendations for Newport but presented no persuasive argument in favour of their preference for single-member wards. Two-member wards for Newport offer better electoral equality in the immediate term and by 2018 than do the present single-member wards. We therefore confirm the draft recommendations for Newport as final.

40 While we are content to include the Station Road development as part of the projected 2018 electorate figures, we understand that no electors are expected to be living in the area until 2015–16 onwards. We therefore confirm our draft recommendation that altered parish warding arrangements for the Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote parish should not come into effect until 2019.

41 Our final recommendations for Newport are, therefore, for a two-member Newport North & West ward having a similar number of electors to the average number of electors for the borough by 2018 and a two-member Newport South & East ward having 4% more than the average for the borough by 2018.

### **Church Aston & Lilleshall, Edmond and Ercall Magna**

42 These wards comprise predominantly rural parishes. In our draft recommendations, we proposed that the parish of Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors be excluded from the Church Aston & Lilleshall ward, linking it instead with parts of Hadley & Leegomery parish. We also proposed to combine the current wards of Edmond and Ercall Magna into a two-member ward, with the exception of Eyton-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish, which we proposed be included with more built-up parts of Wellington and Wrockwardine parishes.

43 Our proposed Church Aston & Lilleshall ward was opposed by the Council and by Mark Pritchard MP. The Chairman of Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors Parish Meeting also opposed the draft recommendation, enclosing with his own submission a petition signed by 101 residents of Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors. Objectors cited the lack of

common community identity and character of the parish with the major part of our proposed Hadley & Leegomery ward, rather than providing evidence of community interaction between Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish and the remainder of the Church Aston and Lilleshall area.

44 We were persuaded by the arguments that the parish should not be included with the more urban area of Hadley & Leegomery but were not persuaded that the only ward it could be included in is Church Aston & Lilleshall. Accordingly, we have decided not to amend our Church Aston & Lilleshall ward but do propose transferring Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish into the proposed Edgmond & Ercall ward. We consider that this is a better alternative as the road links are more direct through the parish of Kynnersley and it would provide for a better level of electoral equality.

45 Similarly, the Council and the Telford & Wrekin Branch of UKIP considered that Eyton-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish has little in common with Shawbirch and objected to the inclusion of the rural parish with the built-up areas of Wellington, Admaston and Bratton.

46 We note that there are only 66 electors in the parish of Eyton-upon-the-Weald-Moors and transferring them into the proposed Edgmond & Ercall ward would have a minimal impact on electoral equality, improving the electoral variance in the ward from 4% to 2%. We were persuaded by the argument that this parish should be included with other more rural parishes. Accordingly, our final recommendation is to include the parishes of Eyton-upon-the-Weald-Moors and Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors in a two-member Edgmond & Ercall Magna ward.

47 Our final recommendations are therefore for a two-member Edgmond & Ercall Magna ward and a single-member Church Aston & Lilleshall ward having 2% fewer and 1% fewer electors than the average for the borough by 2018, respectively.

### **Wrockwardine and Shawbirch**

48 The current two-member Wrockwardine ward occupies a large rural area forming the western part of the borough, as well as some more urban built-up areas in Admaston, Bratton and Lawley.

49 We developed our own proposals for the Admaston and Bratton areas of Wrockwardine parish and the adjacent Shawbirch area of Wellington parish. A two-member ward which combined Admaston, Bratton and Shawbirch with Eyton-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish would have 3% fewer electors than the average by 2018, whilst the remainder of the current Wrockwardine ward would form a single-member ward with 1% fewer electors than the borough average in 2018.

50 We received a number of expressions of opposition to our draft recommendations, commenting that Admaston and Bratton form a community which is distinct from that of Shawbirch, citing the Beanhill Brook as a distinct and natural boundary between communities, with Admaston and Bratton looking towards the rural areas to the west. They add that combining the two areas in a single ward would weaken community ties between Shawbirch and the rest of Wellington.

51 Having considered the representations together with those regarding Eyton-upon-the-Weald-Moors, we are persuaded by these expressions of community identity, and recommend a single-member Admaston & Bratton ward comprising areas of the same

name. This will have 4% fewer electors than the borough average in 2018. We have made another amendment to the southern boundary of the proposed Shawbirch ward, which is detailed in paragraph 56, below.

52 Our final recommendations are therefore for single-member Admaston & Bratton, Shawbirch and Wrockwardine wards with 4% fewer, 5% more and 1% fewer electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

## Wellington

53 The historic market town of Wellington lies on the western side of Telford's built-up area and is bounded to its south by the M54. We based our draft recommendations on the Council's scheme.

54 Wellington Town Council objected to our draft recommendations for the Park and Haygate wards, arguing that the boundary between the Haygate and Park wards should be moved to follow the railway line. In making its representation, the Town Council believed that the nature of the railway line as a barrier should override considerations of electoral equality. We accept, in part, the comment that the railway line would form a clear and distinct boundary between the Haygate and Park wards and recommend that it does so between the town's western boundary and Orleton Lane. The impact on electoral equality in the Haygate ward is marginal, improving the variance from the average for the borough from 2% to 1%. However, we also believe that in order to reflect the mixed commercial and residential land uses north of the railway and to maintain electoral equality, that the current ward boundary between Orleton Lane and Church Street be retained.

55 We also received opposition to our proposal to include the area around McCormick Drive in our modified Dothill ward. Objectors commented that residents of this area find their local shopping and community facilities in Shawbirch, whilst McCormick Drive is separated from Dothill by a large copse and open ground, crossed by a rough, unsurfaced footpath. Vehicular access to the local minor road network in Dothill from McCormick Drive would be via the two roundabouts on Whitchurch Drive at the northern and southern extremity of the ward.

56 We have considered the representations made and accept the evidence of community identity presented in relation to McCormick Drive. We therefore propose transferring approximately 120 electors from our proposed Dothill ward into our proposed Shawbirch ward. This ward would have 5% more electors than the average for the borough in 2018.

57 Having received support for our recommendations for our Arleston, College and Ercall wards and no opposition, we confirm as final our draft recommendations.

58 Our final recommendations for Wellington, with the exception of Shawbirch, are therefore single-member Arleston, College, Dothill, Ercall, Haygate and Park wards which would contain 2% more, 1% more, 6% fewer, 1% more, 1% fewer and 3% more than the average number of electors for the borough by 2018, respectively.

## North Telford

59 Telford New Town encompasses a number of communities and stands astride the M54. The north of Telford is covered by the parishes of Hadley & Leegomery, Wrockwardine Wood & Trench and the communities of Donnington and Muxton within the parish of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton.

60 We proposed in our draft recommendations to accept the Council's proposal for a single-member Apley Castle ward, which forms part of Hadley & Leegomery parish, and two-member wards for Donnington and Muxton. Having received no objection to these proposals, we confirm as final our draft recommendations for these areas.

61 We received a submission from Oakengates Town Council with alternative proposals for the majority of this area. The Town Council provided an analysis of the historical development of communities in the area and detailed proposals for alterations to the draft recommendations, both within and around the periphery of the parish. Whilst we appreciate the extent to which the Town Council sought to reflect our statutory criteria in its suggestions, the proposals which they made did not, in our view, provide sufficient justification for the poor electoral equality that would result.

62 In our draft recommendations, we proposed that a three-member Hadley & Leegomery ward be formed by combining the majority of the parish of that name with Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish. As described in paragraph 43 above, the Chairman of Preston-upon-the-Weald-Moors parish meeting and others opposed this draft recommendation and we have made a final recommendation which addresses that opposition.

63 Oakengates Town Council further advocated that the Hadley & Leegomery ward should include the south-east part of the Hadley & Leegomery parish which our draft recommendations proposed be included in the Oakengates & Ketley Bank ward. Were we to accept the proposal made by Oakengates Town Council, electoral inequality in Hadley & Leegomery would have 13% more electors per councillor than the average by 2018.

64 We are unwilling to recommend such a degree of electoral inequality in this area in light of alternatives that we consider satisfactorily reflect the statutory criteria. Our final recommendation is therefore a three-member Hadley & Leegomery ward, consisting of those parts of the parish of that name which do not form the Apley Castle ward or part of the Oakengates & Ketley Bank ward.

65 In our draft recommendations, we accepted the Council's proposal for a two-member Wrockwardine Wood & Trench ward consisting of the northern part of the parish of that name and the northern part of Oakengates parish. The Borough Council and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council agree with our draft recommendations.

66 Oakengates Town Council objected to the proposal on two counts. Our draft recommendation proposed the inclusion of the whole of that part of the parish which lies to the north of Wrockwardine Wood Way in the proposed Wrockwardine Wood & Trench ward. The Town Council would prefer instead to include a southern portion of that area in the Oakengates and Ketley Bank ward. We believe, however, that

Wrockwardine Wood Way forms an appropriate boundary and we are not persuaded that the area which the Town Council would include in the Oakengates & Ketley Bank ward is more strongly connected to those parts of the parish which lie to the south of Wrockwardine Wood Way than it is to those parts lying adjacently to the north.

67 Oakengates Town Council also proposed that part of the Trench Lock area be included in the proposed Wrockwardine Wood & Trench ward. We believe that in this instance, Queensway forms an appropriate boundary between wards and are not persuaded that the part of Trench Lock referred to by the Town Council shares a stronger community with the area to the east of Queensway than it does with areas of similar housing accessed from Sommerfeld Road. The Town Council also advocated that parts of Trench Lock lying to the west of Sommerfeld Road should be included in the Hadley & Leegomery ward. Such a proposal would, however, lead to an electoral variance of 13% in Hadley and Leegomery and consequentially result in 23% fewer electors per councillor in Oakengates & Ketley Bank than the average. Accordingly, we confirm as final our draft recommendation for Wrockwardine Wood & Trench ward.

68 We received suggestions from Oakengates Town Council, one borough councillor and one local resident that the ward for this area be simply called Trench. Three reasons for this were given: the local area of Wrockwardine Wood is perceived by some to lie to the south of our proposed ward's southern boundary; the Wrockwardine Wood area constitutes parts of four wards proposed in the draft recommendations; and confusion between the names Wrockwardine Wood and Wrockwardine ward results in practical errors and misunderstandings in the Council's dealings. However, we note that the majority of Wrockwardine Wood & Trench parish lies within our proposed ward, and the presence of community and social facilities bearing the name Wrockwardine Wood in the ward.

69 In North Telford, our final recommendations are therefore a three-member Hadley & Leegomery ward, three two-member Donnington, Muxton and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench wards and a single-member Apley Castle ward. These wards will contain 1% fewer, 4% more, 4% more, 1% fewer and 2% more electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

## Central Telford

70 Central Telford is covered by the parishes of Ketley, Lawley & Overdale, Oakengates, and St. Georges & Priorslee.

### **Lawley, Ketley, Overdale, Oakengates and Ketley Bank**

71 Lawley is an area of substantial residential and associated development on the western side of Telford's built-up area. Recent, current and planned developments are expected to amount to a total of 3,500 homes. The Council proposed a single-member Lawley ward, centred on the current Lawley community and covering most of the area of current and future developments, taking in parts of the parishes of Lawley & Overdale and Dawley Hamlets. David Wright MP also advocated a separate ward for this area.

72 It was evident to us that a single-member ward for the area covered by the envisaged Lawley village development would be very significantly under-represented.

However, alternative approaches to create a multi-member ward for Lawley would result in electoral inequalities in the surrounding areas.

73 We proposed in our draft recommendations to follow the present ward boundaries in the Lawley area, with parts of the Lawley development area being included in Wrockwardine, Ketley & Overdale and Horsehay & Lightmoor wards.

74 Some respondents to the consultation on the draft recommendations were opposed to the continued inclusion of the Lawley and Overdale West parish ward in the Wrockwardine ward. Having considered these objections and others relating to Lawley, we believe that the exclusion of Lawley and Overdale West parish ward would result in unacceptable levels of electoral inequality with 24% fewer electors in the Wrockwardine ward than the average for the borough.

75 The Council maintained its fundamental disagreement with the draft recommendations' omission of a single-member ward for Lawley village, but acknowledged that our draft recommendations provided good levels of electoral equality in the locality. Two local residents also expressed their opposition to our draft recommendations but provided no further evidence which would persuade us to alter our recommendations.

76 The Council proposed three-member Ketley & Overdale and Oakengates & Ketley Bank wards covering this part of central Telford which we adopted in our draft recommendations with one modification. This was opposed by the Lawley & Overdale Parish Council.

77 One local resident suggested that our proposed Ketley & Overdale ward should exclude Lawley Bank, Old Park and the town centre area, which should instead be added to the Malinslee & Dawley Bank ward proposed in our draft recommendations. However, this would result in 14% and 18% variances from the average electoral ratio for the borough in Ketley & Overdale and in Malinslee & Dawley Bank, respectively.

78 Lawley & Overdale Parish Council commented that the cumulative effect of our draft recommendations would be to increase the number of borough councillors representing their parish from four to eight, and that this would be detrimental. In fact, the increase would be from six to eight. In any case, we are not persuaded that an increase in borough councillors would hinder community identity or provide for poorer effective and convenient local government, or provide for poorer levels of electoral equality. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendation for our Ketley & Overdale ward.

79 Oakengates Town Council's substantial response to our draft recommendations provided alternative proposals and an assessment of their impact on electoral equality in the Oakengates & Ketley Bank, and surrounding wards. We have checked the Town Council's numerical analysis and find that it does not accord with the current and forecast electorate agreed with Telford & Wrekin Council. We have therefore considered the Town Council's proposals in terms of the numbers which we have agreed with Telford & Wrekin Council. Our consideration of the Town Council's proposals which relate to the Hadley & Leegomery and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench areas is described in paragraphs 63 and 67 above, respectively. Whilst the Town Council agrees with our proposal to include part of the Wrockwardine Wood area in the Oakengates & Ketley Bank ward, it proposed including the eastern part of St Georges

& Priorslee parish in the vicinity of Station Hill. We are not persuaded, however, that the Station Hill area shares no communality with the remainder of the parish in which it lies. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendation for Oakengates & Ketley Bank.

80 In Lawley, Ketley, Overdale, Oakengates and Ketley Bank our final recommendations are therefore three-member Ketley & Overdale and Oakengates & Ketley Bank wards having 1% fewer and 4% fewer electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

### **St Georges and Priorslee**

81 Our draft recommendations for this area were based on the Council's initial proposal, but with some modifications. Firstly, the south of the Council's proposed St Georges ward follows the existing ward boundary along Church Road and Snedshill Way. We proposed to include the whole of Priorslee Road in St Georges ward. Secondly, we proposed to include Park Close in Priorslee ward in order to secure a clear and easily identifiable divide of the area north of St Georges Bypass.

82 We received a number of objections to each of these. The first was supported by the Council and by one councillor who asserted that residents of Church Road and Priorslee Road identify their local community as that of St Georges. The Parish Council, two councillors and residents argued that the current boundary in this part of the ward should be retained in order that St Peter's church remain in the Priorslee ward. We believe, however, that St Georges By-Pass forms a distinct boundary between residential areas but we are not convinced that its identification as a borough ward boundary creates a barrier to the service which the church gives to its parishioners either in Priorslee or St Georges. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendation in this part of the ward.

83 Whilst one councillor agreed with our proposal to include Park Close and the St Georges Sports Ground in the Priorslee ward, the borough Council, Parish Council and three councillors disagreed, citing the role of the sports club in the community life of the St Georges area and the Park Close residents' identification with the St Georges community. Whilst this improves electoral equality in St Georges ward to parity with the average for the borough, it increases the variance from 5% in Priorslee to 9% fewer electors than the borough average. However, we are prepared to accept these representations about community identity and amend our draft recommendations accordingly.

84 Oakengates Town Council proposed that our draft recommendation for the boundary between those parts of St Georges and Priorslee wards which lie in Wrockwardine & Trench parish be amended in order that all properties on Coppice Drive, St Georges Road and Moss Road be included in St Georges ward. Such a change, which is not proposed in any other representation, would have significant impact on electoral equality, particularly in the Priorslee ward and we do not therefore propose to move away from our draft recommendation for this area.

85 Our final recommendations are therefore, for two-member St Georges and Priorslee wards. These wards will a similar number to, and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

## South Telford and Ironbridge Gorge

86 South Telford and Ironbridge Gorge are covered by the parishes of The Gorge, Madeley, Stirchley & Brookside, Hollinswood & Randlay, Great Dawley and the remainder of Dawley Hamlets.

87 In our draft recommendations, we proposed three-member Dawley & Aqueduct, Madeley and The Nedge wards, two-member Brookside, Horsehay & Lightmoor, Malinslee & Dawley Bank and Woodside wards and a single-member Ironbridge Gorge ward.

88 We received support and no objection to our proposed Brookside, Dawley & Aqueduct, Ironbridge Gorge and Woodside wards, and therefore confirm them as our final recommendations for those areas.

89 The Council and Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council supported our proposal for a three-member ward for The Nedge. One Borough Councillor proposed that we should subdivide this area to create a single-member ward for Stirchley and a two-member ward for Hollinswood & Randlay. However, we did not receive clear evidence of community identity or proposals for clear and strong ward boundaries which would address all of our statutory criteria. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendation for The Nedge.

90 We received a proposal for parish warding in Brookside from a member of that parish council. However, his proposal involved parish boundary and warding changes which are outside of the scope of this electoral review and we were therefore unable to recommend the changes he sought.

91 The Council expressed opposition to our proposal for a three-member Madeley ward, preferring instead, a single-member Cuckoo Oak ward and two-member Madeley ward. However, the Council's proposal would lead to unsatisfactorily levels of electoral equality of 17% and 13% respectively. We see no justification for this level of electoral inequality. The Council did suggest that should we be minded to adhere to our proposal for a three-member ward, then we should recommend that the ward be named Madeley & Sutton Hill in order to reflect the communities in the south eastern part of the borough. We accept this proposal and propose as our final recommendation a three-member Madeley & Sutton Hill Ward, having the boundaries shown in the draft recommendations.

92 The Council supported our proposal for a two-member Malinslee & Dawley Bank ward. Councillor Blackburn and Lawley & Overdale Parish Council were opposed to our proposal's inclusion of part of Dawley Bank in the Malinslee & Dawley Bank ward. However, the draft recommendation provides good electoral equality, accessibility and reflects communities whilst the alternative approach would result in the electoral variances of 14% in Ketley & Overdale and 18% in Malinslee & Dawley Bank described in paragraph 77, above.

93 Objections to our proposed Horsehay & Lightmoor ward all centered on the way in which the major and expanding Lawley development would be treated in our draft recommendations. These, and our response to them have been described in paragraphs 71-75 above. The Council did suggest that the name of the Horsehay and

Lightmoor ward include “Lawley”. Some respondents felt that our exclusion of Lawley from ward naming had the effect of making Lawley “disappear from the map”. However, we feel that the community continues to be identified in the parish name. Furthermore, the extent of recent and anticipated development is such that no single ward could embrace the whole of the area which is being developed as Lawley Village. We therefore confirm as final, our draft recommendation for Horsehay & Lightmoor

94 In South Telford and Ironbridge Gorge our final recommendations are, therefore, three-member Dawley & Aqueduct, Madeley & Sutton Hill and The Nedge wards, two-member Brookside, Horsehay & Lightmoor, Malinslee & Dawley Bank and Woodside wards and a single-member Ironbridge Gorge ward. These will contain 1% more, 9% more, a number similar to, 1% fewer, 4% more, 3% fewer, 9% fewer and 5% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

## Conclusions

95 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2018 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2012	2018
Number of councillors	54	54
Number of wards	30	30
Average number of electors per councillor	2,292	2,375
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	4	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

### **Final recommendation**

Telford & Wrekin Council should comprise 54 councillors serving 30 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

96 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

97 Under the 2009 Act, and notwithstanding representations made to us which would suggest that we do otherwise, we only have the power to make changes to

parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Telford & Wrekin Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

98 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote, The Gorge, Hadley & Leegomery, Ketley, Lawley & Overdale, Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton, Madeley, Oakengates, St Georges & Priorslee, Stirchley & Brookside, Wellington, Wrockwardine and Wrockwardine Wood & Trench.

99 As a result of our proposed district ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote parish.

**Final recommendations**

Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chetwynd Aston (returning four members) and Station Road (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1. They should, however, not come into effect until the ordinary election day in 2019.

100 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for The Gorge parish.

**Final recommendations**

The Gorge Parish Council should return eight parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Coalport & Jackfield (returning two members), Ironbridge Gorge (returning three members) and Lightmoor (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

101 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Hadley & Leegomery parish.

**Final recommendations**

Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council should return 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Apley Castle (returning four members), Hadley Castle (returning three members), Hadley Manor (returning three members), Leegomery (returning four members) and Trench Lock (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

102 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Ketley parish.

**Final recommendations**

Ketley Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing

two wards: Beveley (returning two members) and Ketley (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

103 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Lawley & Overdale parish.

**Final recommendations**

Lawley & Overdale Parish Council should return eight parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Central (returning four members), Dawley Bank (returning one member), Lawley (returning two members) and West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

104 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton parish.

**Final recommendations**

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Donnington East (returning one member), Donnington West (returning five members), Lilleshall (returning two members), Muxton (returning five members) and The Humbers (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

105 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Madeley parish.

**Final recommendations**

Madeley Parish Council should return 17 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Cuckoo Oak (returning five members), Hill Top (returning one member), Madeley (returning five members) and Woodside (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

106 As a result of our proposed district ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Oakengates Town.

**Final recommendations**

Oakengates Town Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Hollyhurst (returning one member), North (returning three members) and Oakengates (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

107 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for St Georges & Priorslee parish.

**Final recommendations**

St Georges & Priorslee Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at

present, representing four wards: Snedshill (returning one member), St Georges East (returning one member), St Georges West (returning four members) and Priorslee (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

108 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Stirchley & Brookside parish.

**Final recommendations**

Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Brookside (returning seven members), Holmer Lake (returning one member) and Stirchley (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

109 As a result of our proposed district ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Wellington town.

**Final recommendations**

Wellington Town Council should return 21 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Arleston (returning three members), College (returning three members), Dothill (returning three members), Ercall (returning three members), Haygate (returning three members), Park (returning three members) and Shawbirch (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

110 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Wrockwardine parish.

**Final recommendations**

Wrockwardine Parish Council should return 10 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Admaston & Bratton (returning seven members) and Wrockwardine (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

111 As a result of our proposed district ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose parish electoral arrangements for Wrockwardine Wood & Trench parish.

**Final recommendations**

Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: East (returning one member), Trench (returning eight members), Wrockwardine Wood East (returning one member) and Wrockwardine Wood West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

112 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Telford & Wrekin Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Telford & Wrekin Council in 2015.

#### Equalities

113 The matters presented in report have been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the public sector equalities duty as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.



## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for Telford & Wrekin

114 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Telford & Wrekin Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Telford & Wrekin Council.

You can also view our draft recommendations for Telford & Wrekin Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Telford and Wrekin**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Admaston & Bratton	1	2284	2284	0%	2270	2270	-4%
2	Apley Castle	1	2417	2417	5%	2427	2427	2%
3	Arleston	1	2308	2308	1%	2425	2425	2%
4	Brookside	2	4628	2314	1%	4698	2349	-1%
5	Church Aston & Lilleshall	1	2391	2391	4%	2355	2355	-1%
6	College	1	2393	2393	4%	2407	2407	1%
7	Dawley & Aqueduct	3	7266	2422	6%	7196	2399	1%
8	Donnington	2	4931	2466	8%	4928	2464	4%
9	Dothill	1	2262	2262	-1%	2236	2236	-6%
10	Edgmond & Ercall Magna	2	4657	2329	2%	4635	2318	-2%
11	Ercall	1	2395	2395	4%	2408	2408	1%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Telford and Wrekin**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
12	Hadley & Leegomery	3	6717	2239	-2%	7081	2360	-1%
13	Haygate	1	2170	2170	-5%	2347	2347	-1%
14	Horsehay & Lightmoor	2	3337	1669	-27%	4931	2466	4%
15	Ironbridge Gorge	1	2556	2556	11%	2486	2486	5%
16	Ketley & Overdale	3	6401	2134	-7%	7083	2361	-1%
17	Madeley & Sutton Hill	3	7881	2627	15%	7767	2589	9%
18	Malinslee & Dawley Bank	2	4487	2244	-2%	4606	2303	-3%
19	Muxton	2	4828	2414	5%	4944	2472	4%
20	Newport North & West	2	4457	2229	-3%	4744	2372	0%
21	Newport South & East	2	4024	2012	-12%	4961	2481	4%
22	Oakengates & Ketley Bank	3	6243	2081	-9%	6828	2276	-4%
23	Park	1	2398	2398	5%	2441	2441	3%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Telford and Wrekin**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
24	Priorslee	2	4369	2185	-5%	4306	2153	-9%
25	Shawbirch	1	2425	2425	6%	2485	2485	5%
26	St Georges	2	4811	2406	5%	4763	2382	0%
27	The Nedge	3	7122	2374	4%	7113	2371	0%
28	Woodside	2	4474	2237	-2%	4322	2161	-9%
29	Wrockwardine	1	2309	2309	1%	2363	2363	-1%
30	Wrockwardine Wood & Trench	2	4849	2425	6%	4711	2356	-1%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>123,790</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>128,249</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,292</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,375</b>	<b>–</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by the Telford & Wrekin Council.

Note: The ‘variance from average’ column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each ward varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

## Appendix B

### Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews.

Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council

PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

**TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL**

**BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE – 3 FEBRUARY 2014**

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – LILLESHALL, DONNINGTON & MUXTON PARISH COUNCIL – DRAFT PROPOSALS**

**REPORT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: LAW, DEMOCRACY & PEOPLE SERVICES**

**1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To seek Members comments on a draft Proposals document for the conduct of this Review. The document incorporates the draft recommendations that the Council now makes in this review, following the first consultation period when initial submissions were invited.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the Committee adopts and publishes the Draft Proposals
- 2.2 That the Committee notes that an all postal ballot (attached ballot paper design) will take place in February in order to gain the views of the wider Lilleshall electorate on formation of a separate Lilleshall Parish council .
- 2.3 That the Committee agree whether information for residents presenting both the case for change and case for no change should be included with the postal ballot paper

**3.SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>COMMUNITY IMPACT</b>	Do these proposals contribute to specific Priority Plan objective(s)?	
	No	
	Will the proposals impact on specific groups of people?	
	Yes	<i>Electors in Donnington, Muxton and Lilleshall</i>
<b>TARGET COMPLETION/ DELIVERY DATE</b>	September 2014	
<b>FINANCIAL/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPACT</b>	Yes	Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Local Authorities have the responsibility to undertake Community Governance Reviews, which includes arrangements in Parishes. The process to be followed is prescribed and will involve officer time and other associated costs, such as postages and printing. These costs will be

		met from within existing resources.
<b>LEGAL ISSUES</b>	Yes	Authority is delegated to Boundary Review Committee to deal with all matters relating to Community Governance Reviews.  There are no direct legal implications arising from this report at this stage. Further legal advice will be given as and when necessary during the consultation and order making process.
<b>OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS &amp; OPPORTUNITIES</b>	Yes	The opportunities and risks associated with any legislative change following on from this consultation have been identified and assessed. Arrangements would be put in place to manage the risks and maximise the opportunities that have been identified if community governance in the affected areas was to change.
<b>IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS</b>	No	Donnington, Muxton and Church Aston & Lilleshall Borough wards.

#### **4. SUMMARY**

- 4.1 Telford and Wrekin Council has received a Community Governance Petition signed by 340 local government electors of the Lilleshall Ward of the Parish of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton calling for a separate parish to be formed for their ward. The petition has been checked and found to be a valid petition in accordance with Section 80 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. In accordance with Section 83 of the Act, the Borough Council is required by law to conduct a Community Governance Review. A similar request for a separate Lilleshall parish was received in 2012/09. A Community Governance Review was undertaken and, following a counter petition, Licensing Committee concluded that existing parish arrangements should remain unchanged other than the name of the parish council being amended to include Muxton. Government guidance requires a 2 year moratorium before a further review of that parish area be requested, this period has elapsed and a further review can now be held.
- 4.2 The Council published a Terms of Reference document on 2 October 2013 and invited initial submissions from electors and other interested bodies. These submissions have been considered alongside the relevant legislation and the policies that the Council laid down in the Terms of Reference. Together, they have informed the Draft Proposals, which the Committee is asked to adopt and publish and which lead to the next and more substantive stage of consultation in this Review.
- 4.3 At the last meeting of the Boundary Review Committee it was agreed that a direct consultation be undertaken in order to get the views of the broader Lilleshall community. The Chairman of the Committee, in

consultation with the Assistant Director, has agreed that a postal ballot take place between 21 February and 7 March to gauge local opinion on the formation of a separate Lilleshall Parish council. In addition, supporters of a separate Parish and those opposed to any change have agreed a document that they would like to be sent with the ballot paper to inform voters on the relevant issues. The Committee is asked to decide whether this is appropriate. A copy of the proposed ballot paper and the information document are attached to this report

## **5. PREVIOUS MINUTES**

5.1 Boundary Review Committee 26 September 2013.

## **6. INFORMATION**

### **6.1 Background**

In the conduct of a Review, the Council has to be mindful of Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews that has been issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government and The Electoral Commission and the Council's Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference laid out how the Council proposed to consult the electors and other interested organisations and the consultation periods that would be allowed in the Review.

The publication of Draft Proposals is a significant stage in this Review; the Council has given due consideration to the petitions that were received and it has carefully considered the various submissions that have been received to date. It has weighed these against its legal duty in section 93 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to ensure that community governance within the Borough reflects the identities and interests of the community; is effective and convenient and takes into account any other arrangements for community representation and engagement in the area.

The Draft Proposals are that there is evidence that Lilleshall is a distinctive community of identity and that from a budgetary perspective it should be viable. However, the views of the wider Lilleshall community are paramount; the council has no wish to impose a change in community governance arrangements that is not in line with the wishes or interests of the Lilleshall community. Therefore the draft proposals at this stage are that further evidence now needs to be provided that evidences wider support from Lilleshall residents for a separate Parish council.

## **6.2 What happens next?**

Publication of this Draft Proposals document formally launches a three-month period lasting until 9 May 2014 in which comments and submissions are invited. We will then use the comments and submissions that are received together with the policies outlined in the Terms of Reference and the legislative framework to help us draw up Final Proposals for the future of community governance in the affected area.

### **A timetable for the Review**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Timetable</b>	<b>Relevant Date</b>
Draft Recommendations are published		February 7
Consultations	Three months	February 10 – May 9
Final Recommendations are prepared		June 2014
Final Recommendations are adopted by Boundary Review Committee and published		July 2014
Council publishes the Reorganisation Order		July/August 2014

## **7. WARD IMPLICATIONS**

Donnington Borough Ward  
Muxton Borough Ward  
Church Aston & Lilleshall Borough Ward (Lilleshall part)

## **8. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

Guidance on Community Governance Reviews (Department for Communities and Local Government and LGBCE, March 2010).

Community Governance Reviews And Related Matters – Local Government And Public Involvement In Health Act 2007 – A Guide To New Legislation And Practice

***Report prepared by Phil Griffiths, Democratic Services Manager - Tel: 01952 383210***



**Telford & Wrekin**

**C O U N C I L**

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
PARISH OF LILLESHALL DONNINGTON & MUXTON  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN  
HEALTH ACT 2007  
DRAFT PROPOSALS**

**THESE DRAFT PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED BY THE COUNCIL  
ON:**

7 FEBRUARY 2014.

**SUBMISSIONS AND COMMENTS ON THIS DRAFT PROPOSALS  
DOCUMENT SHOULD BE MADE BY:**

9 MAY 2014

## **1. Introduction**

1.1 Telford and Wrekin Council received a Community Governance Petition signed by 340 local government electors of the Lilleshall Ward of the Parish of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton, calling for a separate parish to be formed for their ward. The petition has been checked and found to be a valid petition in accordance with Section 80 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the Act). In accordance with Section 83 of the Act, the Borough Council is required by law to conduct a Community Governance Review. A similar request for a separate Lilleshall parish was received in 2009. A Community Governance Review was undertaken and it was at that time concluded that existing parish arrangements should remain unchanged other than the name of the parish council being amended to include Muxton. Government guidance requires a 2 year moratorium before a further review of that parish area be requested, this period has elapsed and a further review can now be held. The previous review attracted some criticism for being long and unnecessarily complex. This review has the aim of being straightforward and simpler to understand.

The public meeting held in October was a useful indicator of the views of residents. It highlighted a range of views, both those supporting a separate parish and those opposing any change to arrangements. The review will consider the tests required by legislation in producing recommendations and at the same time be very mindful of the views of the residents of the area under review.

1.2 This Review commenced on 2 October 2013, when the Boundary Review Committee of the Council published a Terms of Reference document and invited initial submissions from individuals or organisations who had an interest in the Review. In the Terms of Reference, the Council published a timetable for the Review and it published a consultation strategy. A public meeting was held on 14 October 2013 at Lilleshall Memorial Hall to discuss issues and questions regarding the review. The period for initial submissions

closed on 30 November 2013. The Council now publishes these Draft Proposals in response to the Community Governance Petition.

**1.3 It will be seen that the Draft Proposals are that, in order to assist the council in making a final recommendation, there should be a ballot of Lilleshall electors to determine their views on the formation of a separate Lilleshall Parish. Reasons have been given to support the Draft Proposals. A summary of these reasons can be found in part 6 of this document.**

1.4 In preparing these Draft Proposals, the Council has been mindful of the request of the petitioners and the initial submissions that have been received. The Council also has the role of balancing these requests and submissions against the wider requirements and duties that are placed upon it in the 2007 Act. In particular, the Council has a duty to ensure that community governance within its area:

- reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area;
- is effective and convenient, and
- takes into account any other, non-parish, arrangements for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in the area.

1.5 In Part 2 of the Terms of Reference document consideration was given to the question of consultation with the electors and other interested persons or bodies in this Review. The timetable for this Review has attempted to balance the legal requirement that the review be completed within twelve months with another legal requirement that consultation take place with electors and other interested persons or bodies during the decision making stages of the Review. The publication of these Draft Proposals will now trigger the next, stage of consultation.

1.6 The Terms of Reference document was intended to inform and open the local debate by providing extensive information on present parish governance

in Lilleshall and Donnington, the legislative framework for a Review and other policies that the Council felt were of importance.

1.7 The previous review was completed in April 2010, resulting in recommendations for no change to existing Parish arrangements. That review was characterised by strongly held views from residents both in favour of a separate Parish and subsequent counter petitions from residents supporting maintaining current arrangements.

Submissions received in this review so far indicate that a similar situation remains with strong views being expressed, both in favour of a separate Parish and in favour of maintaining current arrangements.

In Annex 1 of this document, details are included of the submissions that have been received since the publication of the Terms of Reference. A variety of submissions have been received. They present divided views about the request in the original Community Governance Petition. 54 electors from Lilleshall have made individual or joint submissions by letter or by e-mail. Of these submissions, 37 support a separate Parish council and 17 oppose it. Mr P Hawkins outlines his case for a separate parish and outlines an indicative budget for a separate parish council. He makes the case for a viable parish serving a distinct community of identity. Mr J Hockin also believes there is a strong case for a separate parish, taking the view that a ballot should be held regarding the formation of a separate parish. Mr Ralph Morgan, clerk to the Parish council, submits a case for parish arrangements that currently work well. He argues that a strong, cohesive and socially inclusive community already exists and that there is no requirement for change. Mr F Graham Platt does not believe that Lilleshall is a separate, recognisable community of identity. He does not believe that there is any evidence for the benefits and advantages of a separate parish for Lilleshall. A number of submissions in favour of a separate parish are very concise and do not contain any specific reasons for their support. Mr Andrew Baker, Chairman of the Parish council, believes that current arrangements work well and that a separate parish would lose the benefits of economies of scale which are available to the current parish. Simon Collier believes Lilleshall is a distinct community with the required infrastructure and that there should be a separate parish council

for Lilleshall. A number of submissions opposing a separate parish cite their disappointment that a further review has been triggered following the 2009 review. In addition, a number of submissions opposing change see little significant financial or community benefits from the creation of a separate parish. During the last review in 2009 Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council made objections to the original petition, but has also taken the view that “if Lilleshall can prove that it can financially sustain itself, then it should become an independent parish of its own, should the majority of electors wish this. If so, two new parishes should be formed possibly called ‘Lilleshall Community Council’ and ‘Donnington and Muxton Parish Council’”. With these comments in mind and in the absence of definitive support it was agreed at the last meeting of the council’s Boundary Review Committee that a direct consultation take place. It is proposed that a postal ballot of Lilleshall electors should be held from 21 February to 7 March. The ballot would be a simple yes/no question and ask if electors were in favour of a Lilleshall Parish council.

## **2. The Parish of Lilleshall Donnington and Muxton**

2.1 In Parts 3-5 of the Terms of Reference and the accompanying annexes, considerable information was provided about the existing Parish of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton. (The full Terms of Reference document is available either in hard copy or on our website at the contact details provided in Section 8 below.)

2.2 The present parish of Lilleshall and Donnington comprises three wards: the Donnington ward with 4,970 electors and six councillors, the Lilleshall ward with 1,079 electors and three councillors, and the Muxton ward with 4,963 electors and six councillors. The Donnington ward comprises the modern area centre of Donnington together with commercial and industrial premises at its southern tip and in that half of the ward that lies to the north of the A518. At its very north, at Station Road and Humber Lane, the ward has further residential development at The Humbers which closely adjoins the

more rural Lilleshall ward. The Lilleshall ward is an extensive rural ward. Apart from some scattered farms and rural dwellings, the settlement is concentrated in the linear village of Lilleshall and at the estate type development at Body Road and Hill Road at The Humbers. The Muxton ward comprises three elements: the open agricultural and reclaimed land that comprises about two-thirds of the ward; the residential development at Donnington Wood to the west of Donnington Wood Way, and the residential development at Muxton, which is a mix of the older development of the original village of Muxton to the north and along the newer estate roads to its south.

2.3 In the Terms of Reference document, it was stated that the main considerations that the Council would need to be mindful of in coming to recommendations in this Review arise in Section 93 of the 2007 Act as outlined in paragraph 1.4 above. This identified three ‘tests’ which we would need to apply in the Review.<sup>1</sup> The first is what is described as the **‘community of identity’ test**: do the areas that constitute the present parish wards of Donnington, Lilleshall and Muxton represent distinctive communities of identity, deserving of separate parish status and individual parish representation? However, it was emphasised that this test cannot be considered in isolation from a second test: the **effective and convenient local government test**. To a large extent, this test may be thought of as a ‘viability’ test: do these parish wards have the viability to stand alone, not dependent one on the other, in the funding and provision of services that would compare with current service levels? However, viability is only a part – albeit a considerable part – of the effective and convenient local government test. The Council considers that it has a broad duty in law to promote effective and convenient local government across its Borough. Finally, the Council is required to take into account other organisations in the area that promote representation and engagement for its inhabitants and that thereby serve to reinforce the community of identity test.

2.4 It is the Council's duty to promote effective and convenient local government across the whole of our Borough. The area under Review was defined as comprising the existing Lilleshall ward of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish council. In effect, the review has the potential to create one new parish for Lilleshall and to consider arrangements for Donnington & Muxton. Effectively, the review is looking at the potential for a separate parish council for Lilleshall. The original petition was from Lilleshall residents and followed on from a previous petition received in 2009. There have been no letters or requests concerning separation for Donnington or Muxton and therefore the review will focus on arrangements for Lilleshall.

### **3. The Community of Identity test**

3.1 It was stated in the Terms of Reference document that parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity. In the submissions received, there is little comment on whether Lilleshall is a distinctive community of identity. There seems little doubt that Lilleshall, situated, in a rural environment, differs greatly from the more urban Donnington and Muxton and it can be reasonably argued that it has its own physical identity. It can also be argued that Lilleshall has a more rural identity than the rest of the Parish and that is served by separate schools, community halls, churches and voluntary groups.

3.2 The government's Guidance states "Parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity... the feeling of local community and the wishes of local inhabitants are the primary considerations.

3.3 It is straightforward to identify tangible and statistical differences between Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton in terms of housing quality, indices of deprivation, age structures etc. These differentials do not necessarily substantiate the community of identity test; in isolation they are not proof that a community of identity either exists or does not exist. Some of the more robust communities of identity within the Borough – Wellington, for instance – encompass a wide diversity of residents, housing, social backgrounds, qualifications, and so forth, and yet their diverse inhabitants identify closely with their single community.

3.4 The Council will not lightly make a recommendation to cut off one area from another area on which it has a traditional and long-standing dependence. The government has emphasised in its Guidance that the interests of community cohesion should be taken into account in a Review. The division of a parish on the basis of indices of deprivation and similar considerations would appear to be contrary to government's Guidance.

3.5 Question 2 in the Terms of Reference document asked consultees to comment on whether they felt that an adequate infrastructure of meeting points, community halls, local schools, neighbourhood stores, community organisations, voluntary groups and so forth existed to support a distinct community of identity. The initial submissions and information collected in the last review have identified such an infrastructure as existing. A school, village hall, youth centre, cricket club, tennis club and many other voluntary groups and organisations are present in Lilleshall. A key question relates to the usage and inter-dependence of these facilities. On the other hand, Lilleshall is served by separate schools, playgroups, community halls, police teams and churches.

3.6 Although sound arguments for separation have been put forward for a separate parish council a number of the initial submissions have shown little appetite for change in the present structure of community governance. A number of residents are satisfied with the status quo in the Lilleshall Ward.

3.7 In summary, there is a reasonable argument that technically Lilleshall parish ward forms a distinctive community of identity, deserving of separate parish status. However, there is a distinct split in submissions received with a number of respondents strongly opposed to changing current arrangements. At this point it is important to consider that this is the second review in a few years and that it would be sensible and informative to gain the views of a larger group of local residents. In order to further substantiate and support the case a postal ballot of residents will be held in February to assess the views of the wider Lilleshall community. This information will further support the review's final proposals.

#### **4. The present warding arrangement**

4.1 The council considers that the present warding arrangements has worked well to ensure the separate representation of the different parts of the parish.

Furthermore, consideration must be given to the relationship between the parish ward boundaries and the boundaries of the Borough wards. The parish wards have been used as the building blocks for the Borough wards across much of the Borough, and the Borough wards therefore share the same boundaries with the parish wards. The maintenance of this co-terminosity is in the best interests of effective and convenient local government for the residents in The Humbers and at Donnington Wood: for those residents to be in one parish ward but in a different borough ward may result in confusion. The present ward boundary, while it may not be entirely ideal, is easily identifiable, fairly clearly understood and represents an appropriate parting of local attachments within a parish that comprises different parts.

4.2 Next, consideration is given to whether the numbers of councillors elected to the parish council by each ward continues to be appropriate. Section 95 of the 2007 Act requires consideration of any change in the number or distribution of the electors which is likely to occur in the period of five years beginning with the day when the Review starts. Table 3.2 of the Terms of Reference document presented electorate projections for the period 2013/14 – 2018/19. In the current financial and housing market conditions it is difficult to give a realistic assessment of the actual numbers of new dwellings that would be completed to occupation. Even so, if the projections were realised, there would be the following impact for levels of representation between the two wards.

**Table 1 – Projected electorates and councillor entitlements for Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council**

	<i><b>Electorate 2013/14</b></i>	<i><b>Resulting Councillor Entitlement</b></i>	<i><b>Projected Electorate 2018/19</b></i>	<i><b>Resulting Councillor Entitlement</b></i>
Donnington Ward	4970	6.77	4980	6.59
Lilleshall Ward	1079	1.47	1109	1.47
Muxton Ward	4963	6.76	5243	6.94
		15		15

4.3 Although there will be a continuing shift of councillor entitlement away from the Lilleshall ward where development will remain static, this is not considered to be sufficient to recommend any change in the allocation of councillors between the three wards at this time. With three councillors at present, the Lilleshall ward has an apparent over representation in current electoral arrangements for the parish and this is a consideration in this review. Even so, this seeming over-representation acknowledges the traditional scales of representation in the parish, the need to support the warding arrangement by providing a balance of representation between the wards, and the more rural character and sparsity of population within the Lilleshall ward with the challenges with regard to representation.

4.4 It should be noted that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) have recently completed an electoral review of the Borough. They are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. They cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review. They only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. Should this review make final proposals for a separate Lilleshall parish then consequential orders will need to be laid. Their recommendations will take effect from May 2015 local elections and are:

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Donnington East (returning one member), Donnington West (returning five members), Lilleshall (returning two members), Muxton (returning five members) and The Humbers (returning two members).

Should this review ultimately recommend a separate Parish council for Lilleshall then LGBCE would be informed and they would be required to lay

further consequential orders to reflect these arrangements.

## **5. Effective and Convenient Local Government**

5.1 Central to the debate on whether effective and convenient local government can result from the formation of a separate parish of Lilleshall is the question of whether a separate Lilleshall parish council could prove to be a viable entity.

5.2 The parish council provided a budget for 2013-14, which was presented in Annex 2 of the Terms of Reference document. The parish council's income can be broken down as follows:

**Table 2 – Income of Parish of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Precept	205,675.00
Bank Interest	620.00
Reclaimed VAT	8,000.00
Advertising (Parish Magazine)	50.00
Cordingley Hall	0
Turreff Hall	15000.00
Talbot Centre (Tennis Club)	600.00
Lilleshall Allotments	723.79
Donnington Allotments	704.46

5.3 In turn, a careful exercise was undertaken in Tables 6.2 and 6.3 and the accompanying annexes of the Terms of Reference document to disaggregate the council tax base and the parish precept between the three wards of the present parish of Lilleshall and Donnington. The parish council's precept for 2013-14 is £205,675.00 (including grant of £26,270.00 from the Borough council). Tables at section 6 of this report show disaggregation data.

5.4 The disaggregation of a parish council's budget between its constituent wards is a very difficult exercise, but there also needs to be an attempt to provide a disaggregation for the Parish of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton. The Parish Clerk has been asked to attempt to disaggregate the budget to show his expenditure as it relates to each of the three wards of the existing parish, and we have subjected this disaggregation to our own analysis. This is a very difficult exercise, but the Clerk's findings go some considerable way towards giving a balanced and realistic assessment of the situation that would confront three separate parish councils. This disaggregation is shown in Annex 2.

5.5 The existing parish council budget is compiled on the basis of four different headings. The first is the 'Parish Precept', which shows the parish's core income and its core expenditure: the clerks' salaries, employees' on-costs and the general administration costs. The total expenditure here is apportionable across the whole parish. The second heading is the 'Environment Budget'. In particular, this budget covers sixteen acres of open space at Muxton, closed churchyards in Lilleshall and Donnington, the Talbot Centre clubhouse and asphalt tennis courts at Lilleshall, Donnington toilets, the electricity, management, maintenance and renewal of 675 street lights and general maintenance. Elements of this budget, such as the general grounds maintenance allocation, and elements within the street lighting allocations, are apportionable across the whole parish. However, other elements, such as bus shelters and street lights, can be apportioned on the basis of the number of units in each ward, while other elements, such as Donnington Toilets or the Talbot Centre at Lilleshall are directly apportionable to a specific ward.

5.6 The spending from the parish council's environment budget in the Lilleshall ward is about 20 per cent of that overall budget. This could be an indicator that Lilleshall is "asset heavy" and dependent on the other two wards. However, the central administration costs revolving around the parish office may appear to favour Donnington, because that is where the office is located. Even so, it should be borne in mind that the Donnington ward does

generate most of the parish's other income. The present arrangement allows for a permanent parish office and permanent staffing.

5.7 The review has considered the most appropriate mechanism for apportioning those elements within the parish council's budget that are apportionable across its three wards. New parish councils would define new priorities and they would adjust their budgets accordingly, and it is therefore very difficult to forecast how the budget of a new parish council would evolve during the first year or two of its existence. For example, we understand that there is a potential cost for replacement of street lighting across the Parish which might make a significant dent in Parish council budgets. In effect, it is only possible to make an assessment based on the present budget of the existing parish council. There are only two mechanisms available for apportioning those elements within the budget of the existing parish council that are apportionable across its three wards; either by using the ratios provided by the council tax base or the ratios provided by the electorate, and these ratios are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3 – Bases for apportioning the budget for Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council**

	<b><i>Apportionment based on Council Tax Base (%)</i></b>	<b><i>Apportionment based on Electorate (%)</i></b>
Donnington	37.99	45.1
Lilleshall	12.3	9.83
Muxton	49.72	45.07

The resulting apportionments of the budget are shown in Annex 2 to this document. It is acknowledged that each of the bases for apportioning the budget is far from ideal, and they show widely differing outcomes across the headings in the council's expenditure. The outcomes are shown below. The conclusions follow.

**Table 4 – Disaggregation of the budget of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council – the basis for the disaggregation being the electorate**

	<i>Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Donnington Ward – by electorate</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Lilleshall Ward – by electorate</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Muxton Ward – by electorate</i>
Difference (Shortfall / Surplus)		9620.37	-199.55	22124.48

**Table 5 – Disaggregation of the budget of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council – the basis for the disaggregation being the council tax base**

	<i>Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Donnington Ward – by council tax base</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Lilleshall Ward – by council tax base</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Muxton Ward – by council tax base</i>
Difference (Shortfall / Surplus)		2150.52	2260.64	27637.28

5.8 It is considered that a separate Lilleshall parish council could prove viable. It is assumed that a separate parish council would wish to look at the current level of grant funding that the present ward receives as part of its precepting work. Street lighting and bus shelters, a closed churchyard and the Talbot Centre would need to be maintained. Once again it is assumed that a separate Parish would make appropriate budgetary decisions. .

5.9 A significant part of the budget of a separate Lilleshall parish council would need to be set aside for street lighting. This is a potential issue as the Parish will be required to replace street lighting across the Parish area in the foreseeable future. Significant expenditure might put some pressure on a small Parish budget but it is assumed that the Parish would make budget adjustments or alternatively raise precept if this was ultimately required. It would be for a new parish council to consider how best to manage the street lighting in its area

5.10 The Lilleshall ward has a number of assets to maintain, more than neighbouring rural parishes, and it is not considered that there would a great deal of scope for significant savings under the existing environment budget.

5.11 It should be noted that, in a number of areas of its budget, the present Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council commands economies of scale in the services that it provides. These serve to mask any real gains or losses that separate parish councils would obtain in their budgets. Some of the areas that currently command economies of scale include councillor expenses, office administration and staff on-costs, subscriptions and insurance, training, room hire, grants to community organisations, grounds maintenance and newsletters. A new parish council might be vulnerable to any additional burdens arising from these lost economies of scale. The assessment here does not provide for any further future expenditure that a separate parish council might wish to incur in due course within their area. However, this would be a matter for a new Parish to set a precept to provide the appropriate level of service.

5.12 Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council has provided details of their reserves as they stood at 31 December 2013, when they amounted to £72,810.98. A parish's balances would be transferred to any new parishes in an appropriate proportion based on population.

5.13 Overall, it is concluded that Lilleshall is able to fulfil the basic legal tests required in terms of being a community of identity and having the ability to be financially viable. However, submission responses are mixed to the prospect of a separate Lilleshall parish council. The main issue is the apparent absence of community consensus in the Lilleshall parish ward. The council has no wish to impose revised community governance arrangements on an area without further evidence that a separate Lilleshall Parish council commands wider support within the community. Therefore our draft recommendation is that further direct consultation should take place, in the form of a postal ballot, with the wider Lilleshall electorate, signposting them to the terms of reference documents. Those residents strongly in favour of or against a separate Parish would have the opportunity to provide material to residents before the postal votes were received. The result of such a ballot would help further inform this review and provide a better understanding of what the residents of Lilleshall feel about a separate Parish council. .

## **6. Summary of Draft Proposals**

6.1 The Draft Proposals are that, although Lilleshall appears to fulfil the technical/legal requirements to form a separate Parish, there is, from submissions made to this review, an absence of community consensus. Therefore further direct consultation should take place, in the form of a postal ballot, with Lilleshall electors. The result of such a ballot would help further inform this review and provide a better understanding of what the residents of Lilleshall feel about the formation of a separate Parish council for their area.

## 7. What happens next?

7.1 The timetable for this Review is as follows:

**Table 6 – Timetable for the Review**

Action	Timetable	Relevant Date
Terms of Reference are published		2 October 2013
Introductory stage – submissions are invited	Two months	2 October – 30 November 2013
Draft Proposals are prepared	Two months	December 2013 – January 2014
Draft Proposals are published		February 2014
Consultations	Three months	7 February – 9 May
Final Proposals are prepared	Six Weeks	May/June
Final Proposals are published by Boundary Review Committee		July
Licensing Committee publishes the Recommendations	Two weeks later	July
Council publishes the Reorganisation Order	thereafter	

7.2 These Draft Proposals give our initial proposals for the future of community governance in Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton. We now allow a period of three months, in accordance with our timetable at Table 6 above, for consultations on our proposals. Our Final Proposals will be made in response to the outcome of these consultations. They may wholly change our Draft Proposals, because we will endeavour again to encompass the broadly held views of the residents of the affected areas insofar as they are compatible with the legal tests and policies. There will then be a short period before the Council publishes its Recommendations in this Review, and this period allows time for any final submissions and arguments to be made covering matters which may not have arisen earlier in the Review.

7.3 A period for comments on the Draft Proposals has now opened, and this lasts until 9 May.

## 8. How to contact us

8.1 Comments should be submitted to the Democratic Services team. They can be submitted either by letter or by e-mail.

8.2 You can contact us at:

Electoral Services  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Addenbrooke House  
Ironmasters Way  
Telford  
TF3 4NT

01952 383210

[reviews@telford.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@telford.gov.uk)

[http://www.telford.gov.uk/info/200169/elections/355/boundary\\_matters/2](http://www.telford.gov.uk/info/200169/elections/355/boundary_matters/2)

8.3 Details of our officer contacts are as follows:

Jonathan Eatough Assistant Director	Strategic management of the Review	
Phil Griffiths Democratic Services Manager	Project and resource management of the Review	<a href="mailto:phil.griffiths@telford.gov.uk">phil.griffiths@telford.gov.uk</a> 01952 383210
	Responding to consultation responses and preparing key consultation documents	<a href="mailto:melvin.humphreys@telford.gov.uk">melvin.humphreys@telford.gov.uk</a> 01952 383202

## **9. A List of Annexes**

Annex 1 – Submissions received in this Review

Annex 2 Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish council- a disaggregation of the budget between the 3 wards

**Submissions received in this review**

Petition signed by 340 local government electors of the Lilleshall ward of the parish of Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton, 12 October 2012

Philip Hawkins, by letters, 08 September 2013, 18 November 2013 , For (1)

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council, by email, 06 November 2013, Against

Mr J W Hockin, by email, Undated, For (1)

Ralph Morgan, by email, Undated, Against (1)

David Taylor, by email, 12 November 2013, Against (1)

Alistair & Marguerite Balderson, by email, 13 November 2013, For (2)

Shirley Harris, by email, 14 November 2013, Against (1)

Michael Harris, by email, 14 November 2013, Against (1)

Don Marshall, by email, 15 November 2013, For (3)

Paul Whorton, by email, 15 November 2013, Against (1)

Barry Round, by email, 17 November 2013, For (3)

Ann Whittingham, by letter, 18 November 2013, Against (1)

Colleen & John Lowe, by email, 21 November 2013, For (2)

Rosemary Sampson, by email, 21 November 2013, Against (1)

Neil Sampson, by email, 21 November 2013, Against (1)

Mr B Hughes, by letter, 22 November 2013, Against (1)

Phil Ward, by email, 22 November 2013, For (2)

Graham & Rhona Palmer, by email, 22 November 2013, For (2)

Mrs S Hughes, by letter, 23 November 2013, Against (1)

F Graham Platt, by email, 23 November 2013, Against (1)

Calpreta Parkinson, by email, 23 November 2013, For (3)

Simon Collier, by email, 24 November 2013, For, 6

Mrs Mary Ayres, by letter, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Mr Cedric Ayres, by letter, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

E Anne Platt, by email, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Ruth Taylor, by email, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Ian & Christine Robinson, by email, 27 November 2013, For (1)

Jillian & Howard Broadbent, by email, 27 November 2013, For (2)

Mr & Mrs P Cawthorne, by letter, 28 November 2013, For (2)

Keith & Pauline Coffey, by email, 28 November 2013, For (2)

Brian & Christine Leyden, by email, 28 November 2013, No view (2)

Andrew Baker, by email, 29 November 2013, Against (1)

Margaret Marshall, by email, 29 November 2013, For (1)

Carol Baker, by email, 30 November 2013, Against (1)

**Electoral Services**

Telford & Wrekin Council  
Addenbrooke House, 2nd floor,  
Ironmasters Way,  
Telford TF3 4NT

Tel: +44 (0)1952 383201  
Tel: +44 (0)1952 383202



**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

**PARISH OF LILLESHALL, DONNINGTON & MUXTON**

Telford & Wrekin council has received a Community Governance petition calling for a separate Parish to be formed for Lilleshall ward. As part of the Review the council has decided to ballot the electors of Lilleshall in order to determine your views on this matter. The council's draft recommendations and supporting information can be found on our website at [www.xxxxxxx.co.uk](http://www.xxxxxxx.co.uk)

**Are you in favour of a separate Lilleshall Parish council?**

Please complete your response below and detach and return your ballot paper in the envelope provided. \*Ballot papers must reach the council offices by 5pm on Friday 14 March

---

Counterfoil No.	Question	Answer	
		Yes	No
Number	Are you in favour of the formation of a separate Lilleshall Parish council?		

## **INFORMATION FOR LILLESHALL RESIDENTS**

### **THE CASE TO STAY AS WE ARE**

#### **POINTS TO CONSIDER - FROM THE PRESENT WARD COUNCILLORS :**

- 1. The** present Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Council (LDMPC) has been operating for approximately 70 years (Muxton was added in 2011) and may benefit from economies of scale. At present 6312 dwellings contribute towards the assets located in Lilleshall i.e. Churchyard, Bus Shelters and Tennis Courts provided free of charge to anyone local or otherwise. These costs would fall solely onto 572 Lilleshall dwellings.
- 2. Lilleshall** residents have contributed to all parish assets located in Muxton and Donnington i.e. buildings, fixtures and fittings such as office equipment and the present reserves of approx. £72,000.00 of which 12.3% would transfer to any new parish council. There would be some start-up costs for any new council which would fall to Lilleshall residents.
- 3. To** retain the current full-time, qualified, experienced Clerk and part-time Assistant Clerk the cost would be 2.5p per week per elector, covering 63 hours per week. Any new proposed new Clerk might work 7hrs per week and not necessarily be operating locally.
- 4. Nominations** for Councillors can be from up to 3 miles from the Parish boundary, as is the current case, and thus there is no guarantee of future Councillors being Lilleshall residents. The Councillors of any new council would decide how much money is required to run the Council and how it is spent. Up to 9 new Councillors are proposed for a new Lilleshall Parish Council. There are currently 3 LDMPC councillors who live in Lilleshall.
- 5. The** larger present Council has, in the past, played a major role in opposing unwelcome Planning Applications such as the former Open-Cast Mine and Vegetable Pack House application at the edge of the Village, providing substantial funds and officer time toward the cost. Would a new Council be able to support such effort and finance if required in the future?
- 6. There** are many activities and groups which are enjoyed by residents from Muxton and Donnington. The School draws only 18% of Lilleshall children. Small Parishes, of which Lilleshall would be one, are encouraged by Central Government to combine with a view to make them more financially viable and effective.
- 7. The** proposed introduction of a new Ward 'The Humbers' in 2015 (subject to Government decision) does not alter Lilleshall Ward but increases the representation for those residents. The Parish warding system, common to all larger Councils, normally works well with the Ward Councillors taking lead roles on their local issues.

#### **For further information please contact:**

**Clr. Andrew Baker - 07773752204 - Cllr. Pam Millard - 01952670437 - Cllr. Carol Baker - 01952 604262**

### **THE CASE FOR AN INDEPENDENT LILLESHALL PARISH COUNCIL**

#### **Current LILLESHALL, DONNINGTON and MUXTON PARISH COUNCIL representation:**

2014 15 COUNCILLORS - 3 from LILLESHALL

2015 15 COUNCILLORS - 2 from LILLESHALL (Subject to Government decision)

#### **AN INDEPENDENT LILLESHALL PARISH COUNCIL would:**

- BE POTENTIALLY FINANCIALLY VIABLE WITHIN THE PRESENT COUNCIL TAX & ABLE TO GENERATE RESERVES

- HAVE UP TO 9 COUNCILLORS MEETING IN THE VILLAGE - LOCALLY ACCOUNTABLE AND DEMOCRATIC
- FOCUS PRINCIPALLY ON VILLAGE CONCERNS, PROJECTS, EVENTS, ORGANISATIONS AND INITIATIVES
- LOOK AFTER THE VILLAGE, FOR THE VILLAGE , WITH THE VILLAGE

**For further information please contact:**

**John Hockin 01952 677652**

**Jilly Broadbent 01952 677050**

**David Parker 01952 606901**

**Submissions received in this review**

Petition signed by 340 local government electors of the Lilleshall ward of the parish of Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton, 12 October 2012

Philip Hawkins, by letters, 08 September 2013, 18 November 2013 and by email 20 November 2013, For (1)

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council, by email, 06 November 2013, Against

Mr J W Hockin, by email, Undated, For (1)

Ralph Morgan, by email, Undated, Against (1)

David Taylor, by email, 12 November 2013, Against (1)

Alistair & Marguerite Balderson, by email, 13 November 2013, For (2)

Shirley Harris, by email, 14 November 2013, Against (1)

Michael Harris, by email, 14 November 2013, Against (1)

Don Marshall, by email, 15 November 2013, For (3)

Paul Whorton, by email, 15 November 2013, Against (1)

Barry Round, by email, 17 November 2013, For (3)

Ann Whittingham, by letter, 18 November 2013, Against (1)

Colleen & John Lowe, by email, 21 November 2013, For (2)

Rosemary Sampson, by email, 21 November 2013, Against (1)

Neil Sampson, by email, 21 November 2013, Against (1)

Mr B Hughes, by letter, 22 November 2013, Against (1)

Phil Ward, by email, 22 November 2013, For (2)

Graham & Rhona Palmer, by email, 22 November 2013, For (2)

Mrs S Hughes, by letter, 23 November 2013, Against (1)

F Graham Platt, by email, 23 November 2013, Against (1)

Calpreta Parkinson, by email, 23 November 2013, For (3)

Simon Collier, by email, 24 November 2013, For, 6

Mrs Mary Ayres, by letter, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Mr Cedric Ayres, by letter, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

E Anne Platt, by email, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Ruth Taylor, by email, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Ian & Christine Robinson, by email, 27 November 2013, For (1)

Jillian & Howard Broadbent, by email, 27 November 2013, For (2)

Mr & Mrs P Cawthorne, by letter, 28 November 2013, For (2)

Keith & Pauline Coffey, by email, 28 November 2013, For (2)

Brian & Christine Leyden, by email, 28 November 2013, No view (2)

Andrew Baker, by email, 29 November 2013, Against (1)

Margaret Marshall, by email, 29 November 2013, For (1)

Carol Baker, by email, 30 November 2013, Against (1)