



Telford & Wrekin  
C O U N C I L

Addenbrooke House Ironmasters Way Telford TF3 4NT

## BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Date **Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2019** Time **6:00pm**  
Venue **Meeting Room G3/G4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford, TF3 4NT**

### Enquiries Regarding this Agenda:

Democratic Services	Maria Farley	01952 388356
Media Enquiries	Corporate Communications	01952 382403
Lead Officer	Jonathan Eatough, Assistant Director: Governance, Procurement & Commissioning	01952 383200

Committee Membership: Councillors A D McClements (**Chairman**), R A Overton (**Vice Chairman**), K T Blundell, N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, G C W Reynolds and R J Sloan

## AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Declarations of Interest**
3. **Minutes** Appendix A  
To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018
4. **Community Governance Review – Newport Town Council – Final Recommendations** Appendix B  
To seek Members approval of final recommendations following a second period of consultation and to agree a final decision for this review.

## **BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018 at 6:00pm in meeting rooms G3/4, Addenbrooke House, Telford**

**Present:** Councillors A D McClements (Chairman), R A Overton (Vice Chairman), K T Blundell, N A Dugmore, A J Eade, I T W Fletcher, G C W Reynolds and R J Sloan

**In Attendance:** D Bowen (Elections Team Leader), S Dodd (Service Delivery Manager - Governance & Legal Services), A Coburn (Legal Assistant) M Farley (Democratic & Scrutiny Services Officer)

#### **BRC-01 Apologies for Absence**

Jonathan Eatough, Assistant Director: Governance, Procurement & Commissioning

#### **BRC-02 Declarations of Interest**

None.

#### **BRC-03 Minutes**

**Resolved** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2018 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman subject to an amendment to minute number BRC-16 to include that concerns were expressed regarding the proposed boundary review of Newport.

#### **BRC-04 Community Governance Review – Newport Town Council – draft proposals**

The Service Delivery Manager, Governance & Legal Services presented members with Community Governance Review from Newport Town Council which sought Members approval of the draft recommendations following the initial consultation, and to agree recommendations for further consultation before a final decision was made in the new-year. The draft recommendation was that the boundary of the South Ward of the parish of Newport was changed to match that of the borough ward of Newport South & East. In order for the boundary to be changed, council had to ensure the area under review reflected the identities and interests of the community in that area, and was effective and convenient.

During the ensuing debate Members expressed concerns regarding a lack of consultation with the existing residents of Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote and that therefore this may not necessarily reflect their opinions; other areas within Telford and Wrekin had different parish boundaries to borough boundaries and they continued to remain unchanged; school catchment areas had not been considered within the report and residents may not necessarily be able to attend a Newport school despite paying for the facilities if the boundary was changed; existing residents of Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote would have to pay £82.15 more in council tax due to the proposed boundary move for which they had not been

consulted; houses had not yet been built on the site yet so this decision was premature.

Upon being put to the vote it was unanimously decided not to support the recommendation in the report.

**Resolved – that:**

- a) **There will be further statutory period of consultation and notices will be published on the council’s website**
- b) **The consultation responses received from consultees will be sent to all committee members by 5pm on Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> October in order for members to make their own comments on these. Members will then have until 5pm on Monday 29<sup>th</sup> October to return their comments on the responses.**
- c) **The boundary review will be bought back to committee following the further consultation period.**

The meeting ended at 6:46pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....

**TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL****BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE – 7 FEBRUARY 2019****COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – NEWPORT TOWN COUNCIL –  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS****REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: GOVERNANCE, PROCUREMENT  
& COMMISSIONING****1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To seek Members approval of final recommendations following a second period of consultation and to agree a final decision for this review.

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That BRC recommend that that no change should be made to the Newport Town Council/Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Boundary.

**3. SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<b>COMMUNITY IMPACT</b>	Do these proposals contribute to specific Priority Plan objective(s)?	
	Yes/No	
	Will the proposals impact on specific groups of people?	
	Yes/No	Electors in the parishes of Newport and Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote.
<b>TARGET COMPLETION/ DELIVERY DATE</b>	March 2019- recommendations will be published	
<b>FINANCIAL/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPACT</b>	Yes/No	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/No	<p>Authority is delegated to Boundary Review Committee to deal with all matters relating to Community Governance Reviews.</p> <p>There is a need to appoint an officer of the Council to act as “Proper Officer” within the Regulations issued under the Act. The Proper Officer is needed to make decisions in respect of the apportionment of the property, rights and liabilities of parish councils where applicable. The Regulations set out criteria to be used by the Proper Officer in making such calculations.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS &amp; OPPORTUNITIES</b>	Yes/No	<p>The opportunities and risks associated with any 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.</p>
<b>IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS</b>	Yes/No	<p>Newport South and East (South), Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote, Church Aston and Lilleshall</p>

#### 4. **BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 The Council received a valid petition from Newport Town Council to undertake a community governance review pursuant to Part 4, Chapter 3 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the 2007 Act). An initial period of consultation period was undertaken between June 2018 and August 2018. The Boundary Review Committee (“the Committee”) gave due consideration to the consultee responses received and these were reviewed against the relevant statutory criteria as set out in the 2007 Act. The Committee met on 23 October 2018 and resolved that the Draft Recommendation would be that no change is made to the Parish/Town Council boundary.
- 4.2 This recommendation was subject to a second period of consultation commencing 1 November 2018 and closing on 6 January 2019.

## 5. **SUMMARY**

- 5.1 The Council have come to this recommendation following due consideration of all consultee responses in line with the criteria set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (“the Act”).
- 5.2 Four consultee responses were received during the initial consultation period; three in favour of the proposal and one against.
- 5.3 Twelve consultee responses were received during the second consultation period; six in favour of the draft recommendations, and six against.
- 5.4 Section 93 of The Act sets out the Council’s duties when undertaking a review. In particular, the Council must have regard to the need to secure that community governance within the area under review—
- (a) reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and
  - (b) is effective and convenient. (following the Government’s guidance on community reviews, the review committee have considered all responses received against the above duties which we have divided into the subcategories of Community Cohesion, Size, Population, Boundaries, Effective Governance and Identities as discussed below)
- 5.5 The council have also given full consideration to all consultee responses received during both consultation periods and can comment as follows:
- In order to give full consideration to these factors we have divided the above duties into the subcategories of Community Cohesion, Size, Population, Boundaries, Effective Governance and Identities:
- 5.6 **Community Cohesion**
- It is submitted that there is a strong, cohesive community within Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote (“CA&W”) that has an ancient and historical boundary. All consultees in support agree with the Draft Recommendations in this regard and there are no additional comments or evidence provided from those against the proposal that would support a change in the boundary.
- 5.7 **Size**
- Those consultees against the Draft Recommendations submit that the potentially large number of new residents will look to Newport for their schools and facilities. However there is nothing to support this and mere opinion as to where new residents will go is not conclusive enough to support a change in the boundary.

There is a strong case in support of the argument that the potential increase in the number of electors within the Review Area will greatly benefit a small rural community like CA&W whereas NTC may see little benefit given its current size.

## 5.8 Population

CA&W are able and willing to welcome a potentially large number of new residents into their community and with the additional precept charges that it will receive it will be able to provide for and tailor residents' requirements at a local level. Those against the proposal have provided no persuasive arguments that this will not be the case.

## 5.9 Boundaries and Effective Governance

Those against the Draft Recommendations have again argued that the boundaries should be aligned as this "makes logical sense" however it is worth reiterating that there are many examples within the Borough of situations where Ward boundaries differ to the Parish boundaries with no evidence that this has an adverse effect on effective governance. Aligning the Parish boundary with the Ward boundary is not sufficient justification for change.

## 5.10 Identities

The argument again has been raised by those against the Draft Recommendations that those living in the Review Area will identify with Newport and use its high street and its schools etc. However this does not mean that all residents who shop in Newport and all children who attend school in Newport necessarily identify themselves as Newport residents.

CA&W can be seen as having a distinctive community identity to that of Newport as it is situated in a more rural environment, it can be reasonably argued that it has its own physical identity because of this and that any new residents will want to identify with this community and not that of Newport.

## 6. FINAL RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 It is recommended that The Boundary Review Committee's Final Recommendation therefore is that no change should be made to the Newport Town Council/Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Boundary.

## 7. What happens next?

7.1 The timetable for this Review is as follows:

Action	Timetable	Outline of action
Compiling Terms of Reference	10 May 2018	seek Members approval for draft Terms of Reference
Publication of Terms of Reference	1 June 2018	Publishes Council publishes TOR and notifies stakeholders, clearly defining extent of the review.
Consultations – invite initial submissions	1 June 2018  10 August 2018  10 Weeks	Council undertakes a full consultation requesting comments as to the proposals made and/or alternative proposals
Consider and prepare Draft Recommendations	10 August – 31 October 2018	
Publication of Draft Recommendations	31 October 2018	
Consultation on Draft Recommendations	1 November 2018 – 6 January 2019  9 Weeks	
Consider submissions following publication of draft recommendations	January 2019	Council considers the results of consultation and prepares Final recommendations
Final Recommendations are published and the Boundary Review Committee resolve to (a) either make no changes or (b) make a Reorganisation Order.	January/ February 2019	
Final Proposals are considered by Council at Full Council meeting on 28 February 2019	28 February 2019	Council adopts Final Proposals
Council publishes the Reorganisation Order, if required.	March 2019	Council publishes an order concerning Parish matters should this be the outcome of the review
Next election held under any new electoral arrangements	May 2023	

7.2 Final recommendations will be considered at a full council meeting on 28 February 2019. Because no change to the boundary is to be made then there is no requirement for a Reorganisation Order.

8. **INFORMATION ATTACHED**

8.1 Map of the review area highlighting the local facilities and amenities.

8.2 Appendix 1: List of responses to the second consultation

9. **PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Boundary Review Committee – 2 November 2017 (Minute No. BRC-05)

Boundary Review Committee – 8 March 2018 (Minute No. BRC-10)

Boundary Review Committee – 10 May 2018 (Minute No. BRC-16)

Boundary Review Committee – 23 October 2018 (Minute No. BRC-04)

10. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

(<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2007/28/contents>)

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

([https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/8312/1527635.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/8312/1527635.pdf))

**Report prepared by:**

- Alison Coburn, Solicitor Tel: 01952 380276  
- Dave Bowen Elections Team Leader Tel: 01952 383210.

# APPENDIX 1

## List of responses to the second consultation;

1. Lyn Fowler received 24 November 2018 against the recommendation.
2. Peter Scott 4 December 2018 against the recommendation
3. 18 December 2018 Newport – Corporate statement submitted by Chairman Peter Scott
4. Graham Foster, received 18 December 2018 against recommendation
5. Cllr Thomas Janke received 19 December 2018 against recommendation.
6. Cllr Phil Norton received 28 December 2018- Deputy Mayor against the recommendation.
7. Church Aston Parish Council received 5 January 2019 in favour of the recommendation.
8. Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Council 6 January 2019 in favour of the recommendation
9. Bill Harper 6 January 2019 in favour of the recommendation.
10. Ann Kinnish received on 6 January 2019 in favour of the recommendation.
11. Amanda Mattison received on 6 January 2019 in favour of the recommendation
12. Bridget Page received on 7 January 2019 in favour of the recommendation

## **Responses received to the 2<sup>nd</sup> period of consultation**

### **Additional information to support Appendix 1: Responses received**

Below are the 12 responses that were received during the second period of public consultation:

#### **Response 1:**

I write to support the application for Newport's Town boundary to be reviewed.

The town is naturally bordered by the A518 and A41. The previous boundary review changed the National voting boundary to be the A518 between the corner of Station Road and the A41. For some unknown reason the town boundary was not brought inline, which leaves us with an issue as to where people will vote for Telford and Wrekin Councillors from the Newport wards when actually they live in Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote, which seems to be completely nonsensical.

We have a high number of people moving into new houses which appear to be in Newport, again because of the natural boundary, but are again in Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote. They will contact their local councillors for help, who undoubtedly will be Newport Town Councillors and will not turn them away, when they actually should be contacting their councillors in Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote.

New residents will have children in Newport schools and will themselves use the facilities in Newport, they will identify with the town, not with Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote.

I hope you can see that this request is perfectly logical and will permit the request for a review. 700 Newport people signed a petition requesting this change it's not just NTC who are requesting it.

#### **Response 2:**

Sir,

I believe that the committee had got this very wrong and probably has not even visited the area to see for themselves.

I feel the boundary needs to be altered because,

It is the will of over 850 Newport residents and more since.

CA&W exists as a separate community on the far side of the A518.

Many in the new Wright Avenue houses already believe they live in Newport.

When we applied for the change there were only 5 CA&W residents in that ward that would be affected.

NTC can use the extra council tax for the benefit of all area residents to improve services.

Those in CA&W do not benefit from greatly reduced service costs such as burials and allotments which are supplied by NTC.

CA&W would only benefit by around £16000 which won't provide a lot of services. Will they supply a new cemetery for all the new residents? NTC can and will.

NTC provides,

**Direct services**

CCTV

Public toilet

Cemetery

Amenity areas

Allotments

Street clean

CAB

Guildhall Admin (Planning+SNT)

Xmas Lights and Switch on event

Footway lights

Civil weddings (Review, discounted or even free weddings for Newport residents?)

Youth Hub

**Indirect services**

NIB

PCSO

Library Book fund

SNCT

Events (Chinese new Year, St Georges, Old Tyme market, Carnival, Civic Sunday, Remembrance) Litter pick

3A.

CA&W provide nothing of note and will continue to provide nothing.

The residents will feel they live in Newport. They will use Newport services. They will complain to the NTC Guildhall as they don't know where to contact CA&W.

NTC meet 12 times a year, have 12 parish councillors and have committees that cover off local services. CA&W meet less frequently and are generally unknown to the residents.

It makes no sense to have a different parish and borough boundary.

The T & W officers recommended it.

I have heard Wright Avenue residents say they live in Newport.

I believe the new houses when built will be filled with people who also feel they live in Newport.

The A518 is a natural boundary point.

I would recommend that all committee members walk the area before any final decision.

Please listen to the will of the people. As more services are devolved to the parishes NTC are in a far stronger position to deliver better services to the majority.

### **Response 3:**

18<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

#### Newport Town Council Corporate Statement on the Southern Boundary

Newport Town Council firmly believes that the parish and borough boundaries of Newport South should be equalised. We began over 2 years ago, before any houses were built on Wright Avenue, because at that time the parish of CA & W only had four properties therefore few would be affected. We obtained the necessary 850 plus signatures and applied as per the regulations.

This has never been about “land grabbing” as some might think or council tax although extra income for any parish is welcome. The officers at Telford and Wrekin Council recommended that the parish and borough boundary amalgamate. Why? Because it makes logical sense! The committee then went against the recommendation for a number of reasons which we challenge. We would hope that before any final decision is made that all members of the committee make a site visit as that will confirm the logic of our boundary proposal.

If you look at the boundary maps you will see that some of that land (in H13) is already in the Newport Parish already. As it currently stands the vast majority of houses yet to be built will, in our view, feel they live in Newport and use our facilities ,as do some of the Wright Avenue residents, with the bypass on the A518 being the natural boundary line. A hard boundary for sustainable transport.

Newport Town Council offers its residents,

- Public CCTV
- Public toilets
- A cemetery
- Amenity areas
- Allotments
- Regular street cleaning
- Citizens Advice Bureau
- Guildhall administration staff with daily availability
- Christmas lights and a switch on event
- Footway lighting currently being upgraded to LED
- Civil weddings and a public hire room

- Youth Hub
- Substantial grant funding
- The Newport Library Book Fund
- An Integrated Management PCSO
- Litter picking
- Smartwater

Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote offer very little. Their recent Smartwater initiative was paid for from a grant. Newport Town Council are able to properly budget for it and could easily have included any houses in Wright Avenue. Whilst giving out Smartwater we have had Wright Avenue residents insisting that they are Newport residents!

NTC run a professional service for the residents which includes The Guildhall with a full time CILCA qualified Town Clerk and six staff with full availability including social media and a website. We meet 12 times a year and have 4 sub committees that deal with Planning and Economical Development, Leisure and Environmental Services, Community Safety and Resources and Finance. All meetings are open to and accessible to the public.

CA &W meet less frequently and do not appear to have the same high level of connectivity with their residents. They have approximately 172 households the vast majority of which are on the far side of the borough boundary. Their precept is an annual £6000. NTC has an annual precept of around £400000 and can therefore do far more for the residents within their boundaries.

The residents that will come to the Land Off Station Road and H!3 etc will almost certainly look to Newport for their children's education, indeed the Burton Borough School catchment area has been altered by Telford and Wrekin Council to exclude those outside of the town in preference for local children. These newcomers will see themselves as Newport residents for this purpose.

Our High Street will serve the wider community. It is logical that everyone both sides of the A518 will use the local services as their own town centre.

The boundary line of the A518 is the logical boundary. On the CA & W side it is relatively rural with just 2 pubs and no other services. On the Newport side it is an urban built up community with a thriving High Street and many services. They are 2 distinctly separate communities.

If this is an argument around Council Tax then NTC can offer so much more than CA & W. In fact due to their low precept either now or in the future they are extremely limited with the services they can offer. Please bear in mind that when we first brought forward our request for a boundary change that none of the new houses were built. It simply makes sense for the parish and borough boundaries to be the same. Less confusing for the residents and we have seen there is much confusion as to who lives where. We get many people who do not live in the Newport parish boundaries assuming they are our residents when they are not. Wright Avenue is

the perfect example of residents thinking they are in Newport when they are not. We have had requests for Smartwater and Speed Indicator Devices recently.

The interests of the future residents will best be met by a large Town Council that has the qualified staff and the ability to provide a wide range of services. If CA & W inherit the new houses it may triple their precept but the amount will still be too small for any discernible benefits yet the new residents can access all of the current and future benefits of Newport as listed above.

Many of those still to come from other areas will be coming to live in Newport. As with many now they not have heard of CA & W or where that starts or finishes. The feeling of belonging will be to Newport. They will expect to use our facilities, our shops, car parks etc all paid for by Newport residents. The A518 is a natural boundary assumed already as the Newport boundary. Telford and Wrekin Council have created much confusion with the previous boundary changes. We have some voting in CA & W for the borough but not for the parish. If the fields had not been given planning permission for so many houses we would still have asked for the changes as we believe they should be the same. If you are inclined to reject our application then the sensible thing would be to bring the borough boundary back to its original position but that would not be in the interests of the vast majority.

We politely request that the committee walk that boundary and see it for themselves. A decision as important as this for future generations cannot and must not be made on assumptions. We believe our application is just, correct and in the best interests of the majority.

#### **Response 4:**

It is my opinion that the A518 and the A41 to the East are the natural boundaries for the town of Newport.

The idea of Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish being on the Newport side of the A518 is in my eyes rather lacking in reason.

I feel that if you ask the residents on the new estate off Station Road their initial response is that will say that they live in Newport: so why not have the ward boundaries and town boundary as one - it seems like common sense to me.

Yes they pay less precept but what do they get for their money!

The residents concerned will use the schools, shops, health and community facilities of Newport - What has Chetwynd and Woodcote parish to offer these residents.

Please consider people's perceptions in your decision.

#### **Response 5:**

Chairman and Members of BRC,

Having already achieved this review based on 850 signatories.

I write this email to respectfully ask that more consideration is taken when making the final decision on this boundary review. The officers at Telford and Wrekin Council

recommended that the parish and borough boundary amalgamate as it makes logical sense to do so. Geographically speaking at the very least, I believe this should be aligned with the borough boundary.

Newport Town Council offers a great, professional services to its Town's people. New residents moving in areas like Wright Ave already believe that they're Newport residents. They expect to be privy to all the professional services NTC offers to its residents, unbeknown to them, won't help by contributing to them.

Services already highlighted in the corporate response from NTC.

With regards to the Parish of Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote, offer little to no services for their residents.

I hope that this situation can be resolved through the lens of common sense that is required here.

### **Response 6:**

Dear Mr Chairman

I would like the committee to reconsider your decision in not allowing the boundary change

I believe that it's in the best interest to allow the appeal please see below.

I firmly believes that the parish and borough boundaries of Newport South should be equalised. We began over 2 years ago, before any houses were built on Wright Avenue, because at that time the parish of CA & W only had four properties therefore few would be affected. We obtained the necessary 850 plus signatures and applied as per the regulations.

This has never been about "land grabbing" as some might think or council tax although extra income for any parish is welcome. The officers at Telford and Wrekin Council recommended that the parish and borough boundary amalgamate. Why? Because it makes logical sense! The committee then went against the recommendation for a number of reasons which we challenge. We would hope that before any final decision is made that all members of the committee make a site visit as that will confirm the logic of our boundary proposal.

If you look at the boundary maps you will see that some of that land (in H13) is already in the Newport Parish already. As it currently stands the vast majority of houses yet to be built will, in our view, feel they live in Newport and use our facilities ,as do some of the Wright Avenue residents, with the bypass on the A518 being the natural boundary line.

Newport Town Council offers its residents,

- Public CCTV
- Public toilets
- A cemetery
- Amenity areas
- Allotments
- Regular street cleaning
- Citizens Advice Bureau

- Guildhall administration staff with daily availability
- Christmas lights and a switch on event
- Footway lighting currently being upgraded to LED
- Civil weddings and a public hire room
- Youth Hub
- Substantial grant funding
- The Newport Library Book Fund
- An Integrated Management PCSO
- Litter picking
- Smartwater

Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote offer very little. Their recent Smartwater initiative was paid for from a grant. Newport Town Council are able to properly budget for it and could easily have included any houses in Wright Avenue. Whilst giving out Smartwater we have had Wright Avenue residents insisting that they are Newport residents!

NTC run a professional service for the residents which includes The Guildhall with a full time Town Clerk and six staff with full availability including social media and a website. We meet 12 times a year and have 4 sub committees that deal with Planning and Economical Development, Leisure and Environmental Services, Community Safety and Resources and Finance. All meetings are open to and accessible to the public.

CA & W meet less frequently and do not appear to have the same high level of connectivity with their residents. They have approximately 172 households the vast majority of which are on the far side of the borough boundary. Their precept is an annual £6000. NTC has an annual precept of around £400000 and can therefore do far more for the residents within their boundaries.

The residents that will come to the Land Off Station Road and H!3 etc will almost certainly look to Newport for their children's education, indeed the Burton Borough School catchment area has been altered by Telford and Wrekin Council to exclude those outside of the town in preference for local children. These newcomers will see themselves as Newport residents for this purpose.

Our High Street will serve the wider community. It is logical that everyone both sides of the A518 will use the local services as their own town centre.

The boundary line of the A518 is the logical boundary. On the CA & W side it is relatively rural with just 2 pubs and no other services. On the Newport side it is an urban built up community with a thriving High Street and many services. They are 2 distinctly separate communities.

If this is an argument around Council Tax then NTC can offer so much more than CA & W. In fact we cannot see what they can offer as they are extremely limited with services. Please bear in mind that when we first brought forward our request for a boundary change that none of the new houses were built. It simply makes sense for the parish and borough boundaries to be the same. Less confusing for the residents and we have seen there is much confusion as to who lives where.

The interests of the future residents will best be met by a large Town Council that has the qualified staff and the ability to provide a wide range of services. If CA & W inherit the new houses it may triple their precept but the amount will still be too small

for any discernible benefits yet the new residents can access all of the current and future benefits of Newport as listed above.

Many of those still to come from other areas will be coming to live in Newport. As with many now they not have heard of CA & W or where that starts or finishes. The feeling of belonging will be to Newport. They will expect to use our facilities, our shops, car parks etc all paid for by Newport residents. The A518 is a natural boundary assumed already as the Newport boundary. Telford and Wrekin Council have created much confusion with the previous boundary changes. We have some voting in CA & W for the borough but not for the parish. If the fields had not been given planning permission for so many houses we would still have asked for the changes as we believe they should be the same. If you are inclined to reject our application then the sensible thing would be to bring the borough boundary back to its original position but that would not be in the interests of the vast majority.

I request that the committee walk that boundary and see it for themselves. A decision as important as this for future generations cannot and must not be made on assumptions. We believe our application is just, correct and in the best interests of the majority.

### **Response 7:**

Dear Sir,

Please find attached a response provided on behalf of Church Aston Parish Council to the 2nd round of Consultation on draft recommendations made by the T&WC Boundary Review Committee into a review requested by Newport TC.

Church Aston PC retain the view that there was no basis for a valid review in the first instance and as such wholly endorse the draft recommendations made by the BRC.

### **Question**

	Yes	No
Do you agree there should be <b>NO CHANGES made</b> to the existing Parish / Town council boundary?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Community Cohesion</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Size</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Population</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Boundaries and Effective Governance</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Identities** section?

 YES

If you have ticked “No” to any of the above questions, please explain your reasons here. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to explain your reasons for disagreeing with the recommendations made.

---

Do you have any other comments to add or views you wish to be taken into account?

Please add these below. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to make your additional comments.

***Yes, Church Aston PC strongly supports recommendations of the T&WC BRC on the basis of arguments put forward in our original submission (dated 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018) i.e. that the request for a boundary review made by Newport Town Council was and remains politically motivated and is not consistent with the BRC’s terms of reference and related criteria for changes to a local authority boundary.***

**Response 8:**

Please find the response from Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council

**Question**

Yes

No

Do you agree there should be **NO CHANGES made** to the existing Parish / Town council boundary?

 YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Community Cohesion** section?

 YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Size** section?

 YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Population** section?

 YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Boundaries and Effective Governance** section?

 YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Identities** section?

If you have ticked “No” to any of the above questions, please explain your reasons here. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to explain your reasons for disagreeing with the recommendations made.

---

Do you have any other comments to add or views you wish to be taken into account?

Please add these below. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to make your additional comments.

***Yes, Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council strongly supports recommendations of the T&WC BRC on the basis of arguments put forward in our original submission (dated 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018) i.e. that the request for a boundary review made by Newport Town Council was and remains politically motivated and is not consistent with the BRC’s terms of reference and related criteria for changes to a local authority boundary.***

**Response 9:**

I submit this document for your consideration. The boundaries should not be moved.

**Question**

Yes

No

Do you agree there should be **NO CHANGES made** to the existing Parish / Town council boundary?

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Community Cohesion** section?

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Size** section?

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Population** section?

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Boundaries and Effective Governance** section?

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Identities** section?

If you have ticked “No” to any of the above questions, please explain your reasons here. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to explain your reasons for disagreeing with the recommendations made.

---

Do you have any other comments to add or views you wish to be taken into account?

Please add these below. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to make your additional comments.

***Yes, Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council strongly supports recommendations of the T&WC BRC on the basis of arguments put forward in our original submission (dated 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018) i.e. that the request for a boundary review made by Newport Town Council was and remains politically motivated and is not consistent with the BRC’s terms of reference and related criteria for changes to a local authority boundary.***

**Response 10:**

<b><u>Question</u></b>	Yes	No
Do you agree there should be <b>NO CHANGES</b> made to the existing Parish / Town council boundary?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Community Cohesion</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Size</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Population</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Boundaries and Effective Governance</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you agree with the recommendations under the <b>Identities</b> section?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have ticked “No” to any of the above questions, please explain your reasons here. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to explain your reasons for disagreeing with the recommendations made.

---

Do you have any other comments to add or views you wish to be taken into account?

Please add these below. You may continue on a separate sheet / submit a separate document to make your additional comments.

Yes, as a resident of Chetwynd Aston I strongly support the recommendations of the T&WC BRC on the basis of arguments put forward in our original submission (dated 18th July 2018) i.e. that the request for a boundary review made by Newport Town Council was and remains politically motivated and is not consistent with the BRC’s terms of reference and related criteria for changes to a local authority boundary.

**Response 11:**

Please see my response below - thank you

**Question**

Do you agree there should be **NO CHANGES made** to the existing Parish / Town council boundary? YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Community Cohesion** section? YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Size** section? YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Population** section? YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Boundaries and Effective Governance** section? YES

Do you agree with the recommendations under the **Identities** section? YES

***I as a member of Chetwynd Aston Parish strongly supports the recommendations of the T&WC BRC on the basis of arguments put forward in our original submission (dated 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018) i.e. that the request for a boundary review made by Newport Town Council was and remains***

***politically motivated and is not consistent with the BRC's terms of reference and related criteria for changes to a local authority boundary.***

**Response 12:**

I support Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council's comments and do not wish to see any boundary changes.