From: Griffiths, Phil < Phil.Griffiths@telford.gov.uk>

Sent: 09 May 2022 17:38 **To:** Rutherford, Tom

Cc: reviews

Subject: Council Submission - Borough Warding

Attachments: LGBCE_Draft13_12_21_TelfordProposal.cpg; LGBCE_Draft13_12_21

_TelfordProposal.dbf; LGBCE_Draft13_12_21_TelfordProposal.prj; LGBCE_Draft13_12_21_TelfordProposal.sbn; LGBCE_Draft13_12_21_TelfordProposal.sbx; LGBCE_Draft13_

12_21_TelfordProposal.shp; LGBCE_Draft13_12_21_TelfordProposal.shp.xml; LGBCE_Draft13_12_21_TelfordProposal.shx; Telford & Wrekin Final Submission

Borough Warding 090522.pdf

Categories: Submissions,

Please find attached the Council's submission and shape files in response to draft recommendations Please contact me if you require any further information

Regards,

Phil Griffiths
Elections Team Leader
Legal & Democracy
Telford & Wrekin Council



www.telford.gov.uk



This e-mail and files transmitted with it may contain information which is personal/private and confidential and must be handled accordingly. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message and any attachments without further viewing.

Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Telford & Wrekin Council unless explicit stated otherwise.

Telford & Wrekin Council may monitor the contents of e-mails send and received via its network, for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies, procedures and any legal obligations. Please note if we receive a request to access information e.g under the Freedom of Information Act or data protection legislation, the contents of e-mails may have to be disclosed to third parties. If you would like to learn more about how the council uses information please refer to the council's privacy notice' on its website.

Email Security

We use Transport Layer Security (TLS) to encrypt and protect email traffic. If your mail server does not support TLS, you should be aware that any emails you send to, or receive from us, may not be protected in transit.

RESPONSE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (LGBCE) DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL - WARDING PATTERN SUBMISSION BOROUGH ELECTORAL REVIEW **9 MAY 2022**

1. SUMMARY OF MAIN PROPOSALS

- The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) commenced an Electoral review of the Borough in May 2021. The Commission intends that the outcome of the review will be in place for local elections which are scheduled for May 2023. Initial consultation took place on an appropriate council size, LGBCE opted for a Council size remaining at 54. They then sought initial submissions on warding patterns and published draft recommendations in November 2021. Electorate projections produced by LGBCE at the beginning of the review forecast a Borough electorate of 147,062 by 2027. The average number of electors per councilor being 2,723 for a 54 member Council. 7:
- within the Council. The overall warding pattern proposals contained in this submission have been supported by a majority Boundary Review Committee, is a politically-balanced committee comprising 7 Members from across the political groups Committee has now recommended a further submission in response to those recommendations. The Council delegates Members of the council's Boundary Review Committee have met regularly to work towards the submission of a warding pattern for the Borough. An initial warding pattern was submitted before draft recommendations were published and the authority to the Boundary Review Committee to make responses to Electoral Reviews on behalf of the Council. The of the cross-party Committee.

1<u>.</u>2

The Committee has considered the initial proposals of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and felt that, on the whole, the majority of those proposals were reasonable and represented community identities well. However, there were a small number of wards where it was felt that the proposals were not in the interests of community identity and did not recognise how our communities identify with each other and to ensure efficient and effective local government.

within one ward in a manner that did not recognise the day to day routines of residents living within the ward nor recognising It was felt that the proposals made by the LGBCE would result in fragmented communities with some being placed together the facilities and centres that residents within those areas used

Of the 32 wards, 16 are single member wards, 10 are two member wards and six are three member wards. Details of each proposed ward map have been provided to the Committee, with the submission proposals being approved at the meeting The council's proposals are for 32 Borough wards, an increase from the current 30 wards, represented by 54 councillors. on 25 April.

1.3

- Proposals include adjustments to a number of proposed wards to allow better community identity and provide effective local government for those wards <u>4</u>
- Apley Castle ward should be retained as a single member ward, separate from Hadley & Leegomery to better reflect the differing community identities between these areas and provide more effective local government for residents of these 1.5
- dentity for these areas would be better served by a single member Apley Castle ward and a larger Hadley & Leegomery Hadley & Leegomery. Proposals move parts of Hadley & Leegomery into a 2 member Apley Castle ward. Community 1.6
- or connection with Dawley & Aqueduct. Our growth estimates show our proposed 3 member Lawley ward being close to Lawley and Dawley & Aqueduct wards. The Council opposes the proposal to include part of Horsehay into the Dawley & Aqueduct ward. Under the wider proposals this area can only be placed in the Lawley ward, the area has no obvious affinity 17

proposed Lawley ward would best serve community interests, even if it is estimated to have above the average number of electoral equality for a 3 member ward. However LGBCE estimates for this area differ significantly, placing it at 14% above the average. The difference appears to be significant for the area in the north of the Lawley area. The Council believes that electors based on LGBCE calculations. We would ask that the proposals for this area be reconsidered as moving part of the estimated growth in electors for this area is significantly higher than it should be. The area around the Horsehay Steam Frust should not be in a Dawley & Aqueduct ward, this does not serve the interests of community identity and effective and convenient local government for this area. Despite the questions regarding numbers for this area we believe that our Horsehay into Dawley divides the existing community and does not provide effective local government.

- The current proposals merge Ketley with Ketley Bank and provide a single member Oakengates ward. The Ketley/Oakengates & Ketley Bank area would be better served by a distinct Ketley ward and a larger Oakengates & Ketley Bank ward, similar to the current ward. Thereby reflecting the differing identities of Ketley and Ketley Bank and also retaining the long standing community links between Oakengates and Ketley Bank. <u>_</u> &
- The Wrockwardine Wood & Trench ward should be retained in its current form. <u>6</u>
- Madeley and Sutton Hill should be retained as a 3 member ward rather than splitting these 2 areas into separate wards. 1.10
- to The Nedge ward. It should be noted, however, that registration levels have been historically significantly lower in this The Brookside ward should retain the Lake End Drive area as part of a single member ward rather than transfer this area area than other parts of the Borough due to the transient nature of the population in this Ward. 1.1

Naming proposals

Dawley Bank to provide a better reflection of local identity for the area which sits largely within the Great Dawley Town It was proposed in our initial submission that the current Malinslee & Dawley Bank ward be renamed to Great Dawley &

council area. However, in the light of the draft recommendations whereby this ward remains a 2 member ward and is not as fully aligned with the Great Dawley town council area, we propose that the name of the ward should now remain as Malinslee and Dawley Bank.

2 INFORMATION

Average estimated electorate per councillor 2027 based on LGBCE projections

2723 electors per councillor for 1 member ward

5446 electors per councillor for 2 seat ward

8169 electors per councillor for 3 seat ward

Proposed Warding Pattern for 54 member Council

		2027	
Name	Seats	electors	Variance
 Admaston & Bratton 	1	2574	9-
2. Apley Castle	1	2764	7
Arleston & College	2	5366	۱-
4. Brookside	1	3084	13
5. Church Aston & Lilleshall	1	2750	1
Dawley & Aqueduct	3	7388	6-
7. Donnington	2	5916	6
8. Edgmond	1	2514	8-
9. Ercall Magna	1	3021	11
10.Ercall	1	2501	8-
11.Had l ey & Leegomery	3	8028	۱-

0	9	£ - 3	4	0	7	5	-3	4-	-2	-3	5	3	7	2	L-	2	7	4-		-7		-7	
5473	2897	2652	2826	8163	8060	5713	5128	2621	2667	2628	2866	8361	2918	2698	4977	5692	8737	5226		2533		5064	146021
2	1	-	_	3	3	2	2	1	1	_	-	3	1	2	2	2	3	2		-		2	72
12. Haygate & Park	13. Horsehay & Lightmoor	14. Ironbridge Gorge	15. Ketley	16. Lawley	17. Madeley & Sutton Hill	18 Malinslee & Dawley Bank	19. Muxton	20. Newport East	21. Newport North	22. Newport South	23. Newport West	24. Oakengates & Ketley Bank	25. Overdale & The Rock	26. Priorslee	27. Shawbirch & Dothill	28. St Georges	29. The Nedge	30.Woodside	31. Little Wenlock &	Wrockwardine	32. Wrockwardine Wood &	Trench	

Rationale for proposed warding arrangements

1 Admaston & Bratton

2027	ts Seats electors Variance %	1 2574 -5
	Current Polling distric	WAA
		Admaston & Bratton

Admaston & Bratton borders on to the Shawbirch ward. The proposals move Leeses Close, Brook Meadow, Allerton's Meadow and Spafield Close, containing approximately 150 electors from the western boundary of the Shawbirch ward into Admaston & Bratton ward. Those properties that it is proposed to move from Shawbirch to Admaston & Bratton are geographically located so as to be more aligned with properties that currently sit within Admaston & Bratton.

The Council supports this proposal

2 Apley Castle

			2027	
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	electors	Variance %
Apley Castle	WAC	1	2876	9

Leegomery/Hadley into a two member ward. The current Apley Castle ward has a strong community identity. The development of Apley Castle is currently significantly above variance. However, the Council strongly opposes merging Apley Castle with parts of proposed that these electors be included in a single member Apley Castle ward and that electors from the Berberis Drive/Cactus the old Maxell factory site on the north western boundary of the current ward is scheduled to provide a further 300 electors. It is Drive area be moved into a larger Hadley & Leegomery ward in order to provide better electoral equality for this ward and to recognise differing community identities

The Council would make the following points to support a single member Apley Castle ward, separated from Leegomery and

- Apley and Hadley & Leegomery are formed from different demographics;
- Apley has its own identity, evidenced by an active Friends of Apley Woods Group, looking after the local conservation area and the fact that there is a representative of Apley Preservation Association on the Parish Council;
- It is understood that the Parish Council is opposed to the proposal to be subsumed by Leegomery;
- The majority of residents within Apley send their children to Apley Wood Primary School in Apley whilst the majority of esidents in Leegomery send their children to school at Millbrook Primary School in Leegomery;
- Leegomery has more common linkages with Hadley and, together, former a long-established and identifiable community with its own shopping centre and community buildings such as the Leegate Centre;
- Conversely, Apley residents look to Shawbirch and Dothill as well as Wellington for their shopping and community hub;
- As the name suggests, Leegate Avenue forms the main road through the original Leegomery estate;
- The boundary leading off the A442 roundabout provides a more logical boundary with Apley Castle on the West and Leegomery/Hadley on the East;
- Properties around Okehampton Road are accessed from Hadley Park Road which, as the name suggests, is definitively Hadley and not Apley;
- Apley's identity is formed around the hospital, Apley Woods and the Apley Woods School whilst Leegomery's identity is formed around the original Telford Development Corporation estate development and the Millbrook School area;
- Notwithstanding that the Parish opposes the proposed changes, the resultant parish warding arrangements create a large Joining these areas creates a community imbalance and a consequential effect on the Parish Council arrangements.

Apley Castle' parish ward which includes parts of Leegomery and Hadley and significantly reduces representation for the Hadley parish ward areas. This would not appear to be conducive to effective and convenient local government - joining together two such different communities to enable electoral parity; and

- understand that these representations have been made to LGBCE, demonstrating the wishes of the Apley community to It is understood that there is significant opposition from local residents to the proposal to merge with Leegomery and we retain their individual identity.
- The proposed ward puts a distinct Apley community together with parts of quite different neighbouring communities. The proposed ward would have no clear community identity

3 Arleston & College

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Arleston & College	WAR WCO	2	5366	-1

and local policing teams - the local policing team is known as Arleston & College Community Policing team. Residents share use College wards share strong community links with similar demographics and residents using common schools, community centres cohesion/affinity that the two wards would provide effective and convenient local government, good electoral equality and clear The Council supports the proposals to merge Arleston and College wards to form a 2 member ward. The existing Arleston and of the Community Centre situated in the existing Arleston ward. It is considered that because of the strong community identifiable boundaries by creating a 2 seat Arleston & College ward.

4 Brookside

			2027	
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	electors	Variance
Brookside	TBR and part TBZ	1	3084	13

from all other residential areas within The Nedge and elected Members report that those living in that area are more likely to look to Brookside, broadly following the ring road around the Brookside estate. This proposal would transfer electors from north of the ring the facilities in Brookside (shops and community centre) than elsewhere, particularly given the infrastructure network around that member Brookside ward. Whilst it is recognised that it sits outside the ring road, it is also significantly geographically detached road and from the Lake End Drive area to The Nedge. The Council accepts moving electors from north of the ring road to The Nedge but opposes moving Lake End Drive electors. The Council proposes retaining the Lake End Drive area within a single The LGBCE proposed that the properties around Lake End Drive be taken out of Brookside and placed into The Nedge with area and the distances to be driven or walked to reach any facilities contained within The Nedge. Residents from Lake End Drive are engaged with the Brookside Community Centre which is located within a well-served parade of pedestrian linkages with the remainder of the Council's proposed Brookside ward and, furthermore, the two main highways leading to the rest of the Holmer Lake area would bypass natural routes leading to community facilities before reaching any facilities in the For road users, all entry points into Brookside lead from Brookside Avenue. Therefore, road users travelling from Lake End Drive from the Lake End Drive area exit onto the ring road, the name of this road is Brookside Avenue – to suggest that the properties serviced by the two roads that are only accessible from Brookside Avenue falls into anything but Brookside is flawed reasoning. shops, close to the local primary school and the toddler's group which operates from the Community Centre. There are also ward as proposed by the Commission.

Farm Road being on the outermost reaches of the catchment area. Conversely, Grange Park Primary School, located to the north The school located near Lake End Drive, although it is Holmer Lake Primary School, is attended by a high proportion of children from Brookside. The catchment area for this school covers approximately 80% of Brookside with the properties north of Holmer of Holmer Farm Road serves all of the Holmer Lake area and Stirchley with Lake End Drive properties being on the absolute periphery of the catchment area for that school. These residents form part of the Brookside community and should be retained within the Borough ward. It is acknowledged that this places the ward slightly above the expected variance but would emphasise that joining these electors with The Nedge ward would not be in the interests of community identity or effective and convenient local government. It is also pertinent to note that representation for Brookside has been reduced from 2 seats to 1 under current proposals.

identity. This proposal enables Brookside electors to strengthen their community identity with the ward being re-defined to relate to ideal but this appears to provide the best solution for representation. The Brookside area is characterised by its strong community representation has been reduced by 1 seat. Furthermore, this ward is facing minimal development over the next 10 years and, as The Council's proposal would create a single member ward and 13% above the optimum electorate. This variance is higher than time passes beyond 2027, the variances will be brought closer to the optimum given that other wards will continue to grow. the Brookside estate and, whilst above the optimum variance, is considered to be the best solution, bearing in mind that

5 Church Aston & Lilleshall

2027	g districts Seats electors Variance	CJ 1 2750 1
	Name Current Polling districts	Church Aston & Lilleshall WCA WCC WCJ

The Council accepts the proposals

6 Dawley & Aqueduct

			7202		
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	electors	Variance	
Dawley & Aqueduct	TDA TDM TDY TDZ TDP	8	7388	6-	

The Council strongly opposes the proposal to add the area around the Horsehay Steam Trust into the Dawley & Aqueduct ward and believes that this proposal does not provide good community identity for this area. This area should be retained within the Council's proposed 3 member Lawley ward which maintains far better community identity than the proposal.

identifies as Horsehay and looks more towards Lawley which is particularly demonstrated by the fact that the railway runs The area around the Horsehay Steam Trust is quite distinct and most definitely not associated with Dawley - this area from Horsehay to Lawley, not Dawley.

- Horsehay and Lawley have very different identities to Dawley in so much as the majority of housing within Horsehay and Lawley is new-build modern development whereas the Dawley area is predominantly made up of older housing.
- been said about projections). Placing it in Dawley & Aqueduct would not provide appropriate community identity, nor would it In terms of community identity it is considered that the area around the Horsehay Steam Trust would be best served within a -awley ward because of its clear identity, even if this provides a ward with an electoral imbalance (notwithstanding what has provide effective and convenient local government as residents have no obvious connection with Dawley
- demonstrates the crossover between the Horsehay and Lawley and, perhaps more pertinently, demonstrates the complete Furthermore, as can be seen from a map, Horsehay Golf Club is almost symbiotic with Lawley Common which further ack of linkages with Dawley and Aqueduct.
- Families within the Spring Village area look to schools in Lawley rather than Dawley for meeting educational needs.
- Whilst it is recognised that the Lawley and Horsehay areas present challenges due to the significant growth in the area, the proposals put forward by the LGBCE do nothing but split another community in an attempt to remedy electoral equality that does not seem to be a justifiable position to take given the strength of community identity within the Horsehay and _awley areas.
- The train line closed in 1962 and the Steam Trust was originally formed in 1976 to ensure that the area's rail history was not forgotten. Notably, this trust was initially called the Telford Horsehay Steam Trust. The route runs from Horsehay at the south of the line to Lawley Village at the north end of the line.
- traced back as far as the early 1700s. In the 1820s, an ironmaster built some workers cottages which became known as Foster's Row. These houses are still in existence although now form part of the residential dwellings on Aqueduct Road. The majority of housing within Dawley & Aqueduct comprises older housing, with the origins of Aqueduct Village being
- The Committee also understands that the Commission may want to further explore options to place the area they have currently proposed to be moved in to Dawley & Aqueduct as part of an amended Horsehay & Lightmoor ward.

7 Donnington

ariance	- 6
rs V	5916
2027 electors	3
Seats	2
Current Polling districts	WDE WDG WDO and part of TPW from Priorslee
Name	Donnington

The Council accepts the proposals for Donnington ward

8 Edgmond

2027	Seats electors Variance	1 2514 -8
	Current Polling districts	WED WEE WEG
	Name	Edgmond

The Council supports the proposal for a single member Edgmond ward, providing good community identity for the area.

9 Ercall Magna

			2027	
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	electors	Variance
Ercall Magna	WEM WEP WER WEW WEY WEZ	_	3021	11

The Council supports the proposal for a single member Ercall Magna ward providing good community identity for the area.

10 Ercall

	ors Variance	2501 -8
2027	Seats electors	1
	Current Polling districts	WGE
	Name	Ercall

The Council supports the proposals for a revised Ercall ward

11 Hadley & Leegomery

	rs Variance	8014 -2
2027	Seats electc	3
	Current Polling districts	WHC WHL WHM
	Name	Had l ey & Leegomery

Castle & Leegomery ward and linked with proposals for Ketley and Oakengates. Each area is discussed within this submission but The Council opposes proposals for a Hadley & Trench Lock ward. These proposals are in tandem with proposals for an Apley the Council is opposed to all of these proposals.

In terms of the Hadley and Leegomery areas, the Council believes that these areas should stay together.

As a result of the proposal to retain a single member Apley Castle ward, the current Hadley & Leegomery ward should retain its taking on the Berberis Drive area from Apley Castle, resulting in acceptable electoral equality for a 3 existing footprint, whilst

proposed that this recommendation is reversed and the two areas are recombined with the addition of the areas mentioned above under the Apley Castle heading. It is felt that this better reflects community identities and preserves the existing relationships between these areas, with residents within both Hadley and Leegomery using the same facilities and community assets. The The LGBCE had proposed joining Leegomery to Apley Castle and creating a separate Hadley and Trench Lock Ward. It is rationale for this approach is largely set out above but, also includes:-

The name of the Parish Council reflects the close and long lasting association between Hadley and Leegomery;

- Apley's community was as a result of later development than Hadley and Leegomery;
- Leegomery and Hadley residents use Hadley and Leegomery centres;
- Apley residents have a more direct road access to Wellington or Shawbirch than Leegomery or Hadley;
- The Council's proposed changes to provide a single member Apley Castle ward moves properties into the adjoining Hadley & Leegomery ward from the Berberis/Cactus Drive area, providing acceptable electoral equality and retains the strongly developed and long lasting community identities.

12 Haygate & Park

2027	Seats electors Variance	2 5473 0
	Current Polling districts	WHY WHZ WPA and part of WGE from Ercall
	Name	Haygate & Park *

The Council supports the proposal for a two member Haygate & Park ward. The 2 wards have been combined, in the past, as part of County election arrangements. The proposed 2 member ward has good electoral equality.

13 Horsehay & Lightmoor

			2027	
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	electors	Variance
Horsehay & Lightmoor	THC	1	2897	9

The Council supports the proposal for a single member Horsehay & Lightmoor ward.

14 Ironbridge Gorge

	ce	
	Variance	-3
2027	electors	2652
	Seats	1
	Current Polling districts	TIB TIG TIH TIO TIR TIS gives to Woodside
	Name	Ironbridge Gorge

Geographically, being located within the Gorge provides a physical identity to the area of Ironbridge. The proposal is that this ward Those properties that it is proposed to be transferred to Woodside are actually set apart from the remainder of Ironbridge and are The Council supports the proposal for a revised single member Ironbridge Gorge ward. Ironbridge Gorge is defined by its World gives electors away to Woodside from Roberts Road/Beech Road area in order to improve electoral variance for both wards. Heritage status which covers a large part of the Ward. There is a thriving retail and hospitality community within Ironbridge. located adjacent to the Woodside perimeter road. The Council supports the proposal

15 Ketlev

	:		2027	. ;
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	electors	Variance
	TKY gives millennium village area to Oakengates &			
Ketley	Ketley Bank	1	2822	4

The Council opposes the proposal to combine Ketley with Ketley Bank and further proposals affecting Oakengates and Wrockwardine Wood, The proposals from the LGBCE has joined Ketley and Ketley Bank into a 2 member Ketley ward. The committee was clear that this these communities. It is clear that Ketley Bank is aligned to Oakengates, with Oakengates town providing the main retail centre for Oakengates and Ketley Bank sharing outdoor green spaces. The only thing in common between Ketley and Ketley Bank is the erroneously assumed some connection between these two distinct areas within the Borough, with little to no synergy between Ketley Bank, pedestrian footways leading from Ketley Bank away from Ketley and towards Oakengates and residents within

The Council's alternative proposals result in Oakengates and Ketley Bank being joined, once again, into one ward with part of the relatively modern Millennium community development which differs in nature and demographic from the rest of the current Ketley ward. It is also proposed that Hollyhurst area of Wrockwardine Wood be retained within Oakengates and Ketley Bank given that WOB polling district around Ketley Park Road being moved into Ketley in order to maintain electoral equality. This is part of the the communities within Wrockwardine Wood look to Oakengates as its main centre.

The Council carried out an engagement exercise in April to assess views on the draft proposals and the Council's alternative proposal. The engagement consisted of a small sample size but gave an indication of local views on the proposals

- The engagement event showed clear support for the proposals to retain an Oakengates and Ketley Bank ward from those living within the current ward with 60% of respondents either in favour or strongly in favour and 13% against or strongly against (the remaining 26% provided a neutral response);
- The Chair of Committee, through his previous role as MP for Telford for a number of years recognises the strong link between Oakengates and Ketley Bank and considers that Ketley is a distinct community in its own right;

16 Lawley

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Lawley	TLL THL THZ WWL	3	8163	0

LGBCE estimates that the Council's proposal for this ward would be 14% above the optimum electorate. The Council believes that The Council opposes the proposal for Lawley ward which transfers electors around the Horsehay Steam Trust area into Dawley & Aqueduct. This proposal fails to recognise the distinct community identities of these areas and would not provide effective and convenient local government. The estimated electorate figures for this ward differ between LGBCE and the Council, whereby the proposal would be close to the optimum for a 3 member ward.

some other areas should properly fall into Horsehay. The difficulties with the Lawley area are that the number of electors projected development despite the fact that this is already mainly built out and leaves little room for additional development. The rationale to The counter proposals remedy this and ensure that the ward includes areas locally considered as Lawley whilst recognising that The LGBCE proposal creates a Lawley Ward which included some areas that would, ordinarily, be recognised as Dawley Bank. by the LGBCE are significantly higher than those projected by the Council based upon census and planned development data. This skews the figures with one part of the Lawley area being projected, by the LGBCE, to carry the vast majority of proposed support the Council's proposal is set out below:-

- identifies as Horsehay and looks more towards Lawley which is particularly demonstrated by the fact that the railway runs The area around the Horsehay Steam Trust is quite distinct and most definitely not associated with Dawley - this area from Horsehay to Lawley, not Dawley.
- Horsehay and Lawley have very different identities to Dawley in so much as the majority of housing within Horsehay and Lawley is new-build modern development whereas the Dawley area is predominantly made up of older housing.
- been said about projections). Placing it in Dawley & Aqueduct would not provide appropriate community identity, nor would it In terms of community identity it is considered that the area around the Horsehay Steam Trust would be best served within a -awley ward because of its clear identity, even if this provides a ward with an electoral imbalance (notwithstanding what has provide effective and convenient local government as residents have no obvious connection with Dawley
- demonstrates the crossover between the Horsehay and Lawley and, perhaps more pertinently, demonstrates the complete Furthermore, as can be seen from a map, Horsehay Golf Club is almost symbiotic with Lawley Common which further lack of linkages with Dawley and Aqueduct.
- Families within the Spring Village area look to schools in Lawley rather than Dawley for meeting educational needs.
- Whilst it is recognised that the Lawley and Horsehay areas present challenges due to the significant growth in the area, the proposals put forward by the LGBCE do nothing but split another community in an attempt to remedy electoral equality that does not seem to be a justifiable position to take given the strength of community identity within the Horsehay and Lawley areas.
- The Committee also understands that the Commission may want to further explore options to place the area they have currently proposed to be moved in to Dawley & Aqueduct as part of an amended Horsehay & Lightmoor ward.

- There are good bus routes between the area around Telford Steam Railway/Spring Village and the retail centre in Lawley. Conversely, bus routes to reach shops in Dawley still require around a 10 minute walk from the nearest bus stops.
- Further evidence of the links between Horsehay, Lawley and Lightmoor is the operation of the Bournville Village Trust. The Lawley and Horsehay & Lightmoor, not in Dawley. The Trust itself creates communities and provides funding to strengthen rrust was established in 1900 by George Cadbury to provide affordable homes for communities. The Trust operates in community ties and develop modern urban villages for families to live in. Again, this demonstrates that the differences between these areas and Dawley & Aqueduct.

community, using the same shops, hospitality venues and with good transport links. The boundary of the ward runs south as far as As set out elsewhere in this submission, the request or a review of electoral arrangements was driven, in part, by a desire to cater, and provide representation, for this community. The proposals are for a 3 member seat including electors currently within both the the Frame Lane area, with further development ongoing to the south in the new Horsehay ward. The Committee decided that the current Wrockwardine and Horsehay & Lightmoor wards. The area has seen high and ongoing development and the Committee considered that those areas known locally as Lawley Village as well as the new Lawley development was identifiable as one considered where an appropriate boundary should be drawn for the area covering Lawley and Horsehay. The Committee name of the new ward should be Lawley.

17 Madeley & Sutton Hill

2027	ts electors Variance	3 8060 -1
	Seats	
	Current Polling districts	TMA TMB TMC TMD
	Name	Madeley & Sutton Hill

The Council opposes the proposal to separate Madeley and Sutton Hill.

The LGBCE proposals split these two communities from each other which the Council feel strongly is not appropriate. There are a advocating for these communities. There is a strong historic connection between these two areas with many residents having deprivation and benefit from the multiplicity of representation both at Borough and parish level, having more than one voice number of synergies between these areas, with both represented by one parish council. These areas have high levels of

practical impact upon electoral equality or effective and efficient local government but has a vastly positive impact upon community family living across both communities. The proposal is that these two communities are reconnected into one ward. This has no between the two, with around 4 buses every hour during the week. There are also good transport links using private vehicles. identity. Whilst there are some amenities in Sutton Hill, the nearest larger supermarket is in Madeley with good transport links

The engagement event carried out in April indicated that:-

- 100% of respondents living in the Madeley & Sutton Hill areas were in favour of retaining a joint ward arrangement with the ollowing being some of the reasons given:-
- Better access to more councillors
- Madeley is the natural local centre for Sutton Hill
- Three councillors means stronger community ties, better opportunities for bringing money in, it makes more sense 0
- Why break up the community area? They work well together at the moment and that benefits the residents 0
- I think it is wrong to try and change a perfectly good system where three councillors fight for the residents and now it is proposed to change that. That seems daft. 0
- All of the respondents that used a Post Office used either the one in Madeley (75%) or the one in Sutton Hill (25%) whilst 80% used a pharmacist in Madeley or Sutton Hill with the remaining 20% using Woodside Pharmacy

Further rationale is as follows:-

- was exemplified during the height of the pandemic where the community hubs in Madeley, Sutton Hill and Woodside worked The Town Council for Madeley encourages collaborative working between the communities of Sutton Hill and Madeley. This single member ward could isolate the area when it can benefit from the wider support of a larger 3 member ward providing to assist residents of both areas. Sutton Hill faces some significant challenges in terms of deprivation and infrastructure, a more effective and convenient local government for residents. The two areas work effectively together, helping to attract significant investment for Sutton Hill such as the investment by the Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Safer, Stronger Communities across Madeley & Sutton Hill.
- Sutton Hill residents use wider services in Madeley with which it has strong vehicular connectivity both by private motor vehicle and by public transport routes.

registration would mean that the variance would be outside of the usual 10% tolerance allowed and this should be taken into Further, the variance in electoral equality is noted, with Sutton Hill currently being at +9% on the LGBCE's proposals. Whilst not strictly a LGBCE criteria, it is widely known that the area of Sutton Hill is one with under-registration and this remains the case despite concerted efforts to improve this. If the LGBCE were to look at resident numbers, the effect of this underaccount particularly when considering that the proposals already reduce representation for the area of South Telford

18 Malinslee & Dawley Bank

	ors Variance	5713 5
2027	seats ∣ electo	2
	Current Polling districts	TME TMG TMH TML TLE
	lame	Malinslee & Dawley Bank

The Council accepts the proposals for Malinslee & Dawley Bank

It was proposed in our initial submission that the current Malinslee & Dawley Bank ward be renamed to Great Dawley & Dawley Bank the light of the draft recommendations whereby this ward remains a 2 member ward and is not as fully aligned with the Great Dawley to provide a better reflection of local identity for the area which sits largely within the Great Dawley Town council area. However, in town council area, we propose that the name of the ward should now remain as Malinslee and Dawley Bank.

19 Muxton

	Variance	9-
2027	electors	5216
	Seats	2
	Current Polling districts	WMH WMM WMO
	ame	Muxton

The Council supports the proposals for Muxton.

20 Newport East

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 Seats electors	Variance
Newport East *	WNE and takes 415 from WNS	1	2621	4
21 Newport North				
			2027	
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	Seats electors	Variance
Newbort North *	ZZ	7	2667	-2

22 Newport South

ors Variance	2628 -3
2027 s electors	1
Seats	,
Current Polling districts	WNS WNV WSS Gives 415 from WNS to Newport East
Name	Newport South *

23 Newport West

			2027	
Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	electors	Variance
Newport West *	WNW	1	2866	5

electoral numbers and in order to provide broadly equal representation for 4 wards this area would need to receive electors from an adjoining ward. Newport East (WNE) could take 415 electors from Newport South (WNS) by drawing the ward boundary along The Council supports the proposals for the 4 Newport wards. 4 single seat wards, as has previously been the case, can provide better representation and community identity for Newport. The Committee recognised that the area of Newport East was low on

Meadow Road and Meadow View road, with the properties to the north going in to a single Newport East ward. This would provide 4 single wards all within 5% variance

24 Oakengates & Ketley Bank

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 Seats electors	Variance
Oakengates & Ketley Bank	TOE TOH TOO TOT TOW part TKY from Ketley WOB WOL	က	8361	2

The Council is opposed to the proposals to merge Ketley and Ketley Bank and to make Oakengates a single member ward

already contained with Oakengates & Ketley Bank, the proposals are that all of the Millennium community electors are moved from THY into Oakengates and Ketley Bank so that the whole community is included in one ward. This provides better electoral equality for both Ketley and Oakengates & Ketley Bank wards, less voter confusion and, most importantly, enables this contemporary and The Council's proposal is based around the current 3 seat ward. However, the proposals for Ketley & Overdale ward to cease to exist mean that the existing polling district containing Ketley is too large for a 1 seat ward. Part of the Millennium community is easily identifiable development to be joined together into one single community.

these communities. It is clear that Ketley Bank is aligned to Oakengates, with Oakengates town providing the main retail centre for this erroneously assumed some connection between these two distinct areas within the Borough, with little to no synergy between Oakengates and Ketley Bank sharing outdoor green spaces. Residents of Ketley Bank use Oakengates as their transport hub for The proposals from the LGBCE had joined Ketley and Ketley Bank into a 2 member Ketley ward. The committee was clear that bus and train services from the area. Oakengates also provides medical practices, pharmacies, shopping and leisure facilities serving residents from both Oakengates and Ketley Bank. The only thing in common between Ketley and Ketley Bank is the Ketley Bank, pedestrian footways leading from Ketley Bank away from Ketley and towards Oakengates and residents within

The Council's alternative proposals result in Oakengates and Ketley Bank being joined, once again, into one ward with part of the relatively modern Millennium community development which differs in nature and demographic from the rest of the current Ketley ward. It is also proposed that Hollyhurst area of Wrockwardine Wood be retained within Oakengates and Ketley Bank given that the communities within Wrockwardine Wood look to Oakengates as its main centre. Hollyhurst has very cleat pedestrian access WOB polling district around Ketley Park Road being moved into Ketley in order to maintain electoral equality. This is part of the linking to Oakengates with both a bridge across the Queensway and an underpass beneath it.

The rationale for these alternative proposals is summarised as follows:-

- The engagement event showed clear support for the proposals to retain an Oakengates and Ketley Bank ward from those living within the current ward with 60% of respondents either in favour or strongly in favour and 13% against or strongly against (the remaining 26% provided a neutral response);
- Some of these responses indicated that the areas had been together for so long and that family members all live in either Oakengates or Ketley Bank, there being no compelling reason to change, wanting to have more than one councillor to speak with and one respondent said "the bank always leads to Oakengates";
- Oakengates and another area (Telford Town Centre being common and the Wrekin Retail Park also being common); 65% of respondents from the Oakengates & Ketley Bank ward used Oakengates for their day to day shopping or
- Of those who use a Post Office, 65% use the one located in Oakengates whilst 46% of respondents use the pharmacist in Oakengates (with almost 20% stating they used a supermarket pharmacy);
- 71% spend their leisure time (pubs, restaurants, cafes, community centres) in Oakengates (or a combination of Oakengates and Telford Town Centre)
- The Chair of Committee, through his previous role as MP for Telford for a number of years recognises the strong link between Oakengates and Ketley Bank and considers that Ketley is a distinct community in its own right;
- Residents within the Hollyhurst area, look towards Oakengates it has already been identified by elected Members that the parish boundary, which divides that area, causes elector confusion due to the community split. Drawing the Borough boundary in the same location will simply compound this issue;

Feedback from Oakengates Town Council indicates that they would like to retain 3 members for the Oakengates area to include Wrockwardine Wood,

25 Overdale & The Rock

2027	ats electors Variance	1 2918 7
	Seats	
	Current Polling districts	TLN plus 120 from Old Park in TLE
	Name	Overdale & The Rock *

The Council supports the proposals

26 Priorslee

2027	rrent Polling districts Variance	TPP TPR TSS 5698 5
	Name	Priors l ee T

The Council supports the proposals

27 Shawbirch & Dothill

	Variance	6-
2027	electors	4977
	Seats	2
	Current Polling districts	WSH and WDT
	Name	Shawbirch & Dothill

The Council supports the proposal to merge Shawbirch and Dothill single member wards into a two member ward

28 St Georges

ome N	Current Dolling districts	Coate	2027	Variance
INGILIC	2	ocato	GICCIOIS	Valiation
St Georges	TSE TSG TSP TSW part TPW, TPG TPZ from Priorslee	2	5692	5

The Council accepts the proposals

29 The Nedge

2027	Seats electors Variance	3 8737 7
	Current Polling districts	TTH TTO TTR TTS and part TBZ from Brookside
	Name	The Nedge

The Council supports the proposal in relation to some Brookside electors being moved into The Nedge ward. However the Council opposes transferring electors from the Lake End Drive part of Brookside into The Nedge. The rationale for this is explained earlier in the report under the Brookside ward information

30 Woodside

27	ctors Variance	5226 -4
2027	Seats ∣ele	2
	Current Polling districts	TWO part TIH from Ironbridge part THC from Horsehay
	Name	Woodside

The Council supports the proposals

31 Little Wenlock & Wrockwardine

<i>L</i> :	2533 -	l	WWC WWD WWN WWR Gives WWL to new Lawley	Wrockwardine
/ariance	electors	Seats	Current Polling districts	Name
	2027			

The Council accepts the proposals.

32 Wrockwardine Wood & Trench

Variance	'-
2027 electors	5064
Seats	2
Current Polling districts	TWR TWT
Name	Wrockwardine Wood & Trench

The Council opposes the proposals for this ward. The Council's proposal recommends that Hollyhurst area of Wrockwardine Wood main centre. Residents within the Hollyhurst area, look towards Oakengates and have good pedestrian access to that area. There be retained within Oakengates and Ketley Bank given that the communities within Wrockwardine Wood look to Oakengates as its gravitate towards. Additionally, these residents have access to good travel links from Oakengates with the bus station and train is a thriving community hub operated at The Wakes in the centre of Oakengates which residents from Wrockwardine Wood station operating as a beginning/end point for residents from Hollyhurst.

It has already been identified by elected Members that the parish boundary, which divides that area, causes elector confusion due to the community split. Drawing the Borough boundary in the same location will simply compound this issue;

Feedback from Oakengates Town Council indicates that they would like to retain 3 members for the Oakengates area to include Wrockwardine Wood.