



# New electoral arrangements for Shropshire Council Draft Recommendations

May 2023

### **Translations and other formats:**

To get this report in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England at:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

### **Licensing:**

The mapping in this report is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2023

### **A note on our mapping:**

The maps shown in this report are for illustrative purposes only. Whilst best efforts have been made by our staff to ensure that the maps included in this report are representative of the boundaries described by the text, there may be slight variations between these maps and the large PDF map that accompanies this report, or the digital mapping supplied on our consultation portal. This is due to the way in which the final mapped products are produced. The reader should therefore refer to either the large PDF supplied with this report or the digital mapping for the true likeness of the boundaries intended. The boundaries as shown on either the large PDF map or the digital mapping should always appear identical.

## Contents

Introduction	1
Who we are and what we do	1
What is an electoral review?	1
Why Shropshire?	2
Our proposals for Shropshire	2
How will the recommendations affect you?	2
Have your say	3
Review timetable	3
Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Number of councillors	6
Division boundaries consultation	6
Draft recommendations	7
North-Eastern Shropshire	8
North-Western Shropshire	12
Oswestry	15
Western & Central Shropshire	17
Shrewsbury	22
Southern Shropshire	28
Eastern Shropshire	33
Conclusions	39
Summary of electoral arrangements	39
Parish electoral arrangements	39
Have your say	45
Equalities	49
Appendices	51
Appendix A	51
Draft recommendations for Shropshire	51
Appendix B	57
Outline map	57
Outline map – Shrewsbury inset	58
Appendix C	61

Submissions received	61
Appendix D	63
Glossary and abbreviations	63



## Introduction

### Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament.<sup>1</sup> We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

2 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Andrew Scallan CBE (Deputy Chair)
- Susan Johnson OBE
- Amanda Nobbs OBE
- Steve Robinson
- Liz Treacy
- Jolyon Jackson CBE (Chief Executive)

### What is an electoral review?

3 An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed.
- How many wards or electoral divisions there should be, where their boundaries are and what they should be called.
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division.

4 When carrying out an electoral review the Commission has three main considerations:

- Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.
- Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.
- Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.

5 Our task is to strike the best balance between these three considerations when making our recommendations.

---

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

6 More detail regarding the powers that we have, as well as further guidance and information about electoral reviews and the review process in general, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why Shropshire?

7 We are conducting a review of Shropshire Council ('the Council') as its last review was completed in 2008, and we are required to review the electoral arrangements of every council in England 'from time to time'.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, some councillors currently represent many more or fewer electors than others. We describe this as 'electoral inequality'. Our aim is to create 'electoral equality', where the number of electors per councillor is as even as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

8 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The divisions in Shropshire are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of electors represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

## Our proposals for Shropshire

9 Shropshire should be represented by 74 councillors, the same number as there are now.

10 Shropshire should have 72 divisions, nine more than there are now. There should be two two-member divisions and the rest should be single-member.

11 The boundaries of most divisions should change; 13 will stay the same.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

12 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division, and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your division name may also change.

13 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the county or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to consider any representations which are based on these issues.

---

<sup>2</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development & Construction Act 2009 paragraph 56(1).

## Have your say

14 We will consult on the draft recommendations for a 10-week period, from 2 May 2023 to 10 July 2023. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to comment on these proposed divisions as the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be in making our final recommendations.

15 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new divisions to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

16 You have until 10 July 2023 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 45 for how to send us your response.

## Review timetable

17 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Shropshire. We then held a period of consultation with the public on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

18 The review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
15 November 2022	Number of councillors decided
22 November 2022	Start of consultation seeking views on new divisions
30 January 2023	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations
2 May 2023	Publication of draft recommendations; start of second consultation
10 July 2023	End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
3 October 2023	Publication of final recommendations





## Analysis and draft recommendations

19 Legislation<sup>3</sup> states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors<sup>4</sup> there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our divisions.

20 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create divisions with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

21 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

	2022	2028
Electorate of Shropshire	249,308	265,998
Number of councillors	74	74
Average number of electors per councillor	3,369	3,594

22 When the number of electors per councillor in a division is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the division as having 'good electoral equality'. 69 of our proposed 72 divisions for Shropshire are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2028.

## Submissions received

23 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed on our website at [www.lqbce.org.uk](http://www.lqbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

24 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2028, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2023. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 7% by 2028.

25 We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

<sup>3</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Number of councillors

26 Shropshire Council currently has 74 councillors. We have looked at evidence provided by the Council and have concluded that keeping this number the same will ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively. The Council passed a resolution to request the Commission conduct a single-member review. This means that we will seek, where possible, to recommend a uniform pattern of single-member divisions.

27 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of divisions that would be represented by 74 councillors representing 74 single-councillor divisions.

28 We received one submission about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on division patterns. The submission did not offer any specific alternative total number of councillors, or any evidence. We therefore based our draft recommendations on 74 councillors.

## Division boundaries consultation

29 We received 103 submissions in response to our consultation on division boundaries. These included two county-wide proposals from the Council, whose scheme included a number of sub-options, and a local resident. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county.

30 The two county-wide schemes provided uniform patterns of one-councillor divisions for Shropshire. We carefully considered the proposals received, but considered that they each had significant issues. The Council's scheme provided poor levels of electoral equality across several divisions, and split several parishes in ways which would require the creation of very small parish wards.

31 The resident's scheme provided little evidence of community identity, concentrating on offering good electoral equality by assembling divisions based mainly on polling districts. Particularly in urban areas we do not consider that polling districts, which exist for the sole purpose of administering elections, will necessarily offer a good reflection of community identity.

32 Our draft recommendations are based on differing proposals in different areas of the county. As well as the county-wide proposals we have taken into account local evidence that we received, which provided further evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas we considered that the proposals we received did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and so we identified alternative boundaries.

33 We undertook a detailed virtual tour of Shropshire. This tour of Shropshire helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

## Draft recommendations

34 Our draft recommendations are for two two-councillor divisions and 70 one-councillor divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

35 The tables and maps on pages 8–37 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Shropshire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>5</sup> criteria of:

- Equality of representation.
- Reflecting community interests and identities.
- Providing for effective and convenient local government.


36 A summary of our proposed new divisions is set out in the table starting on page 51 and on the large map accompanying this report.

37 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the division boundaries, and the names of our proposed divisions.

---

<sup>5</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## North-Eastern Shropshire



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2028
Cheswardine	1	-1%
Hodnet	1	-7%
Market Drayton East & Rural	1	9%
Market Drayton North	1	10%
Market Drayton South	1	7%
Prees	1	6%
Shawbury	1	-9%
Wem Rural & Whixall	1	-10%
Wem Town	1	10%
Whitchurch North	1	9%
Whitchurch South & Rural	1	-6%
Whitchurch West	1	4%

*Cheswardine, Hodnet and Shawbury*

38 The county-wide schemes we received proposed very similar divisions in this area. The only difference was the small portion of Sutton upon Tern parish to the west of the A41. The Council proposed placing this area in Hodnet division, rather than with the rest of the parish. As this would require the creation of a very small parish ward, in a way that we do not consider would promote effective and convenient local government, we have not adopted it, instead preferring the proposal from the resident, which accords with much of the other evidence received from parish councils and residents in this area.

39 Sutton upon Tern Parish Council supported remaining in a rural-based division, rather than being joined to Market Drayton or any other town, citing the existing links and the shared rural nature of the parishes in the existing Cheswardine division.

40 Stoke upon Tern Parish Council proposed remaining within Hodnet division, but eliminating the parish wards within the parish. As we are not proposing revised electoral arrangements for this parish, the parish warding is a matter for a Community Governance Review.

41 In Shawbury, we received very strong evidence from Clive Parish Council, supported by Councillor L. Bardsley, detailing the links this community shares with the neighbouring parish of Grinshill. Grinshill Parish Council also expressed their desire to remain in a rural division, and not be placed in a division with market towns. We have adopted this proposal, and retained the existing Shawbury division with the exception of Hadnall parish, which is placed into Tern division as proposed by the resident's scheme. The Council proposed splitting Hadnall parish between three separate divisions, in a way which we do not consider is compatible with effective and convenient local government.

*Market Drayton East & Rural, Market Drayton North and Market Drayton South*

42 This area, comprising the town of Market Drayton and the parishes of Norton-in-Hales and Woore were allocated three councillors by both the Council and the local resident in their respective proposals. The area has slightly more electors than ideal for three divisions, meaning that each of the divisions has to have more electors than the county-wide average.

43 Market Drayton Town Council proposed expanding the range of the divisions based on the town to include the parishes of Adderley and Moreton Say, arguing that residents of these parishes looked to Market Drayton for leisure and transport services. A resident of Adderley parish supported this proposal. However, including these parishes in a grouping with Market Drayton, Norton-in-Hales and Woore would result in this area being entitled to 3.55 councillors with good electoral equality. If three councillors were allocated to this area, they would each represent around 19% more electors than the average and if four councillors were allocated to the area,

they would each represent 11% fewer electors than the average. We do not consider that these would provide for an acceptable level of electoral equality in light of alternative schemes with better electoral equality, which we are satisfied would reflect the statutory criteria.

44 We have therefore not been persuaded to adopt this proposal, although we are persuaded to add the Western Way employment site and neighbouring development in Adderley Parish into Market Drayton East & Rural division, based on evidence provided by the Town Council that the employment site is closely linked to the town.

45 We based our draft recommendations for boundaries within the town of Market Drayton on the proposals from the resident's scheme, as the Council's proposals had 11% more electors than average in both Market Drayton Central and Market Drayton East divisions, even before the addition of any areas from Adderley parish. Our proposed boundaries follow major roads where possible, using Adderley Road as a boundary between the North and East divisions, and Shrewsbury Road, Shropshire Street and Frogmore Road as boundaries of Market Drayton South, but we welcome any further suggestions for improvements that would allow us to better reflect the statutory criteria.

46 Our proposed Market Drayton East & Rural division includes the parishes of Norton-in-Hales and Woore, as well as the eastern portion of the town itself. The full schemes received from the Council and the resident both proposed this arrangement, and we have adopted it as part of our draft recommendations.

*Prees, Whitchurch North, Whitchurch South & Rural and Whitchurch West*

47 We have based our draft recommendations for these divisions on the proposal of the local resident with modifications within the town of Whitchurch to use stronger and clearer boundaries where possible, and to improve electoral equality. The Council's proposal offered poorer electoral equality than that of the resident, and the larger Whitchurch South division proposed by the Council did not allow for the addition of Ightfield parish which we were persuaded we should include (see below at paragraph 49).

48 Both county-wide proposals retained much of the existing boundary between the existing Whitchurch North and Whitchurch South divisions, especially outside of the town itself. Within the town, we have modified the resident's proposals in order to ensure that The Brambles was not isolated within Whitchurch West division, and have moved Wayland Road into Whitchurch South & Rural, in order to improve the electoral equality of both this and the Whitchurch North division.

49 The Council's proposal placed Ightfield parish within Prees division, mirroring the existing arrangements in this area. In contrast, Councillor R. Thompson provided evidence of some links between the Ash areas of Whitchurch Rural parish and

Ightfield. We note that placing Ightfield parish in a Whitchurch-based division also allows Prees division to achieve good electoral equality without splitting any parishes other than Adderley parish as discussed above (paragraph 44). We have therefore placed Ightfield parish within Whitchurch South & Rural division.

#### *Wem Rural & Whixall and Wem Town*

50 The existing arrangements are a two-councillor division covering the parishes of Wem Urban, Wem Rural and Whixall. We do not consider that the proposals we received for these parishes would satisfactorily reflect our statutory criteria. The Council proposed dividing Wem Rural parish into three segments, with a boundary running along the B5476 and the town divided on an East-West axis broadly following the boundary of the existing parish wards. The Council accepted that this division of the town was 'not ideal'. The resident's proposal was for a North-South split of both the town and Wem Rural parish, based on polling district boundaries which do not reflect community identities or provide for clear and identifiable boundaries.


51 Although the existing two-councillor division is forecast to retain excellent electoral equality, the majority of this electorate is concentrated within Wem Urban parish. A single-member division containing only this parish would have 41% more electors than average – well beyond the bounds of good electoral equality. A split of Wem Urban parish is therefore required if we are to propose single-councillor divisions in this area.

52 We considered both retaining the existing two-member division, or identifying our own roughly equal split of the town of Wem. However, we have identified an alternative, namely creating a division based solely on the majority of Wem Town, including all of the High Street, and another rural-based division which contains all of Wem Rural and Whixall parishes and includes the portion of Wem Urban parish east of the railway line and south of the River Roden.

53 We are aware that this Wem Rural & Whixall rural division does not have complete access between the southern and northern sections without going through the town of Wem, but we consider this the best available proposal given the evidence received and the constraints of geography. We remain open to the possibility of retaining a two-member division in this area, or to an alternative split of the town of Wem if an alternative which reflects community identity and the other statutory criteria is offered during consultation.



## North-Western Shropshire



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2028
Ellesmere Urban	1	0%
Llanymynech	1	5%
Ruyton & Baschurch	1	9%
Selattyn & Gobowen	1	0%
St Martin's	2	-2%
St Oswald	1	5%
The Meres	1	2%
Whittington	1	6%

### *Ellesmere Urban, Selattyn & Gobowen, St Martin's and The Meres*

54 The resident's proposal for Ellesmere was for a single division comprising the entirety of Ellesmere Urban parish, matching the existing division, while the Council proposed a division focused narrowly on the settlement of Ellesmere with outlying sections of the parish placed in neighbouring divisions. As these outlying sections

would have required the creation of a number of very small parish wards, we have not adopted the Council's proposal, and are instead adopting the resident's proposal and retaining the existing division.

55 We received significant evidence from residents, the Shropshire Council Labour Group, Councillor N. Rowley and Councillor S. Hughes-Saunier, arguing that St Martin's parish should remain undivided and within a single division. Given the forecast electorate numbers, and the position of St Martin's and Weston Rhyn parishes on the edge of the county, this is not straightforward to accomplish. Councillor R. Macey argued for the existing division arrangement in this area to continue – as these are for a two-member division and a single-member division, neither of which would have good electoral equality, we have not adopted this proposal.

56 Neither the Council's nor the resident's county-wide schemes retained St Martin's parish within a single division. The Council's scheme placed the southern section of the parish, including the settlements of Moors Bank and St Martin's Moor in a division with Gobowen. This division would not have good electoral equality, with 14% fewer electors than average, as well as not reflecting the evidence of community identity in St Martin's. We have therefore not adopted it.

57 The resident's scheme included a division named Weston Rhyn & Chirk Bank, combining Weston Rhyn parish with the western half of St Martin's and the settlement of Rhewl, which was separated from the neighbouring Gobowen. While offering good electoral equality for this division, we do not consider that this proposal offers an acceptable balance of our criteria, as it appears to divide a number of communities, as well as relying on the remainder of Selattyn & Gobowen parish having a variance of -12%. It also relies on polling district boundaries which do not provide for clear or strong boundaries in St Martin's village.

58 We recognise the challenges of recommending single-member divisions that reflect the statutory criteria in this area. We could not identify single-member divisions in this area that would not result in us dividing the parish of St Martin's. For our draft recommendations, we propose to depart from the principle of single-member divisions, and propose a two-member division covering Weston Rhyn, St Martin's and Ellesmere Rural parishes. It would be possible to divide this into two single-member divisions, and we considered this, but any such division would inevitably split both the parish and village of St Martin's in a way which we do not consider would reflect the community identity of this area, as well as not offering a particularly strong or clear boundary. However, we retain an open mind, and would particularly welcome consultation responses that provides evidence for single-member divisions that reflects communities.

59 We received relatively little evidence regarding The Meres division specifically, as opposed to the consequential effects of decisions regarding neighbouring divisions. We have preferred the resident's scheme to that of the Council, as the latter involved placing small sections of Wem Rural and Myddle, Broughton & Harmer Hill parishes in this division, as opposed to keeping the parishes within single divisions. We consider that, other things being equal, retaining parishes within single divisions promotes effective and convenient local government.

60 Our decision regarding St Martin's allows Selattyn & Gobowen parish to stand as a single-member division with excellent electoral equality. Both county-wide proposals split this parish in order to try to find an acceptable solution for neighbouring divisions.

*Llanymynech, Ruyton & Baschurch, St Oswald and Whittington*


61 We received very similar proposals for these divisions from the Council and the resident. The Council proposed a very small extension to the existing Ruyton & Baschurch division, to allow the entirety of Walford Heath, which is split between Pimhill and Baschurch parishes, to be united within a single division. This was supported by Ruyton-XI-Towns Parish Council, which otherwise supported the link between Ruyton and Baschurch being maintained, citing shopping and medical facilities used by residents of both villages. We consider that this proposal has merit, but we have extended the Council's proposed addition to also include Old Woods in Ruyton & Baschurch division, in order to use the railway line as a stronger boundary and ensure that all parish wards have a viable number of electors.

62 Apart from this change, we have adopted the proposals from both the county-wide schemes, which retain the existing Whittington and Llanymynech divisions. Because of the impact on other divisions, the Council proposed retaining the existing St Oswald division, while the resident proposed expanding the division to cover all of Oswestry Rural parish. We have adopted this latter proposal as this offers good electoral equality and does not require Oswestry Rural parish to be divided between divisions.

63 Llanymynech & Pant Parish Council expressed a desire for the parish to be extended to take in the settlement of Crickheath in Oswestry Rural parish. Any change in parish boundaries is a matter for a Community Governance Review, led by Shropshire Council, who can subsequently request the Commission to amend division boundaries to match altered parish boundaries.

64 A resident suggested that villages such as Treflach, Llanymynech and Llynclys had traditional ties to Wales, and could be moved out of England and into Wales. We do not have the power to alter the external boundaries of Shropshire as part of this review, and do not have the power to alter the borders between the nations of the United Kingdom – this can be done only by Parliament.

## Oswestry



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2028
Oswestry North East	1	-9%
Oswestry South	1	0%
Oswestry South East	1	2%
Oswestry West	1	-2%

### *Oswestry North East, Oswestry South, Oswestry South East and Oswestry West*

65 The Council, and the resident's scheme, proposed very similar divisions in Oswestry West and Oswestry South. We have adopted the resident's proposal as the Council proposed placing the Oldport employment area in the north of Oswestry into a Gobowen division which would require the creation of a very small parish ward. Our proposed Oswestry South division is unchanged from the existing division.


66 The Council proposed a boundary between Oswestry North East and South East divisions running along Unicorn Road and Middleton Road. As this would result

in very high variances (-16% and 12% respectively), we have not adopted it, preferring instead the resident's proposal with a boundary running East-West along Cabin Lane.

67 Oswestry Town Council provided evidence that the Morda area, to the south of Oswestry, was becoming increasingly integrated into the town and suggested that this could be included within Oswestry Town. On our virtual tour of Shropshire, we considered that there is something of a division between the area north of the River Morda. We would welcome further evidence from residents of this area as to whether they consider that their community identity lies towards Oswestry, or towards the rural areas in the remainder of Oswestry Rural parish, and therefore whether this area should be included within an Oswestry division.

68 Our proposed names for the divisions in Oswestry mirror as far as possible the names of the existing divisions – we would welcome further evidence as to whether these remain appropriate, or whether alternative names better reflect the areas in question.

## Western & Central Shropshire



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2028
Bishop's Castle	1	0%
Burnell & Bayston Hill	2	7%
Chirbury & Worthen	1	-9%
Longden	1	-3%
Loton	1	-1%
Rea Valley	1	6%
Strettondale	1	11%
Tern	1	-1%

*Bishop's Castle, Burnell & Bayston Hill and Strettondale*

69 The Council's proposal for these divisions involved small areas of Wistanstow and Church Stretton parishes being transferred between Bishop's Castle, Strettondale and Craven Arms divisions, requiring a number of very small parish wards to be created. The resident's proposal allowed more parishes to be kept together, but divided Bayston Hill with roughly 500 electors from this parish being placed in a Shrewsbury-based ward.

70 Councillor T. Clarke and Councillor T. Parsons, together with the Shropshire Council Labour Group and a number of residents, argued for a single-member division comprising Bayston Hill parish alone. Such a division would have 22% more electors than the average across the county, a level of electoral inequality which we would consider in only the most exceptional circumstances. The evidence of community identity provided was strong, with details of the social, leisure and retail facilities that allow Bayston Hill to be a community which neighbours, but is not part of, Shrewsbury. Councillor Parsons in particular described the links between Bayston Hill and the other sections of the existing Bayston Hill, Column & Sutton division as 'tenuous at best'. Shrewsbury Town Council also suggested that Bayston Hill should be in a separate division from the larger town, while Bayston Hill Parish Council considered that it did not have enough information to comment.

71 We considered recommending a single-member Bayston Hill division with a 22% variance. We also considered the Council's proposal of a boundary running along the A49 and the Lyth Hill and Little Lyth areas further divided from Bayston Hill and placed into a Longden division. This latter option would still not offer good electoral equality, with the bulk of Bayston Hill in a division with 13% more electors than average. We note that, to achieve good electoral equality for a single-member division based on Bayston Hill, the boundary would have to run along Lyth Hill Road, with electors to the east of this road being included in an alternative division, either within Shrewsbury or in a rural area. We looked at this road on our virtual tour of Shropshire, but do not consider that it offers a particularly strong boundary, and we received no evidence that there is a distinction of community identity.

72 We are instead proposing as part of our draft recommendations a two-member division, linking Bayston Hill to a number of rural parishes to the south. The broad principle, although not the precise boundaries we propose, were suggested by a local resident. We consider that it is likely to be more reflective of community identity to place communities without obvious links together in a larger division, where the alternative is to impose arbitrary splits of natural communities. We note that our proposed Burnell & Bayston Hill division is linked by the A49 trunk road. We encourage consultation responses with alternative proposals, but note that the options available for Bayston Hill involve either exceptionally poor electoral equality, a split of Bayston Hill, or a two-member division linking Bayston Hill to a neighbouring area, either in Shrewsbury or outside.

73 Edgton Parish Council argued for the retention of the existing Bishop's Castle division, noting that it brought together a number of parishes which share common rural interests, and that any significant geographic expansion might make it hard to represent the division effectively. We note that the existing division is projected to have 16% fewer electors than average, which we do not consider provides a good level of electoral equality. The proposal we have adopted keeps the division at a comparable geographic size, by placing Mainstone parish in Clun division, but adding Church Pulverbatch parish to the north of this division, together with the grouped parishes of Smethcott, Woolstaston and All Stretton. This allows this division to have excellent electoral equality while not significantly increasing the length of the longest journey within the division.

74 We propose a Strettondale division comprising just Church Stretton parish with 11% more electors than average. We considered dividing this parish, placing electors in Minton and Little Stretton into a neighbouring division, but considered that the benefits of retaining the parish within a single division outweighed the poorer electoral equality. Church Stretton Town Council provided evidence that the geography and social nature of the Church Stretton community is different from neighbouring areas, and that a single-member division covering only the parish would reflect this identity. We would welcome further evidence as to whether this is an accurate reflection of the community identity of this parish, and where any outlying area could be placed if we were persuaded to alter our draft recommendations to provide for better electoral equality.

75 The Council's proposal placed both Cardington and Church Pulverbatch parishes within a Burnell division. As discussed above (paragraph 73), we have adopted the resident's proposal to place Church Pulverbatch in Bishop's Castle division which ensures good electoral equality. We received no specific evidence regarding the community identity of Church Pulverbatch, and would welcome this evidence during consultation on these draft recommendations. We propose to place Cardington parish in Corvedale division, based on evidence from Rushbury Parish Council, who provided evidence of social and community links such as walking groups, parish magazines and sports and social facilities that are shared between Rushbury and Cardington parishes.

#### *Chirbury & Worthen, Longden, Loton and Rea Valley*

76 The existing Chirbury & Worthen division, comprising the two parishes of Chirbury with Brompton and Worthen with Shelve, is projected to have 30% fewer electors than average by 2028. While we are aware of the constraints of this area being on the Welsh border, and the rural nature of these parishes, we do not consider that this level of electoral equality offers a good balance of our statutory criteria. The Council's primary proposal was to retain the existing division, but it also offered a secondary option.



77 Due to the poor electoral equality of the existing division, we have adopted the Council's secondary proposal for this area, which matched that of the local resident. This proposal adds the Westbury area and parish ward of Westbury parish to Chirbury & Worthen division, allowing the division to have good electoral equality at 9% fewer electors than average. This approach was supported by Chirbury with Brompton and Worthen with Shelve Parish Councils, who cited the shared rural nature of the areas in question, and expressed a reluctance to be linked to any market towns.


78 Councillor E. Norton argued against Westbury being placed in a Chirbury & Worthen division, arguing that Chirbury & Worthen should be disbanded as a division and electors placed in either Loton or Bishop's Castle divisions. Not only would this create very large divisions geographically, but it would also mean that both of the divisions proposed would have too many electors for good electoral equality. Councillor Norton argued that the Yockleton area of Westbury parish might be isolated under the Council's plan. However, we consider that the addition of Ford parish, which neighbours Yockleton, as proposed by the resident is likely to mitigate this. However, we note that it would be possible to add the Yockleton area to Chirbury & Worthen division, with Loton gaining a neighbouring parish such as Melverley or Knockin. We would be particularly interested in further evidence as to whether this alternative might offer a better reflection of community identity than our draft recommendations.

79 Pontesbury Parish Council expressed satisfaction with the existing split of the parish between Rea Valley and Longden divisions, and suggested that these divisions should be maintained. In contrast, a resident suggested that the existing Tern division, joining parishes to the east, north and west of Shrewsbury, could be shrunk to improve access across the division. We acknowledge that the existing Tern division is geographically large and places parishes on opposite sides of Shrewsbury in the same division, and we propose to improve this by placing the largest part of Bicton parish in Longden division. We have adopted the proposal of Pontesbury Parish Council to retain the existing boundary between Rea Valley and Longden divisions, running through Pontesbury parish. Great Hanwood Parish Council proposed an amendment to their parish boundaries, which we do not have the power to do as part of this electoral review.

80 The Council proposed a Tern West division, comprising the northern section of Bicton parish, the majority of Pimhill, and small sections of Hadnall and Myddle, Broughton & Harmer Hill parishes. In addition to requiring a number of very small parish wards, this proposed division would have 16% fewer electors than average – well beyond the bounds of good electoral equality. We have therefore not adopted it, preferring to adopt the resident's proposal for a Tern division smaller than the existing one. This proposal offers good electoral equality, and keeps the majority of parishes in single divisions. Our proposed division contains all of Hadnall, Astley,

Upton Magna and Withington parishes, and the majority of Pimhill and Uffington parishes.

## Shrewsbury



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2028
Abbey	1	10%
Bagley	1	9%
Battlefield	1	-7%
Bicton Heath	1	10%
Belle Vue	1	-2%
Castlefields & Ditherington	1	1%
Column & Sutton	1	4%
Cophorne	1	5%
Harlescott	1	-5%
Meole	1	4%
Monkmoor	1	-10%
Otley & Reabrook	1	-9%

Porthill	1	-5%
Quarry & Coton Hill	1	-3%
Radbrook	1	12%
Sundorne	1	-5%
Underdale	1	-7%

81 Both the Council and the resident based their proposals on the existing divisions, with changes proposed in order to improve electoral equality. While we remain open to the possibility of more significant changes, we have based our draft recommendations on those of the Council, which broadly follow the existing pattern of divisions.

82 Shrewsbury Town Council did not offer substantive comments on the boundary of divisions within the town. They commented on the external boundary of Shrewsbury parish, particularly in areas where past or future development spills over into neighbouring, more rural parishes. We have attempted, where possible, to place these electors and future developments into divisions based in Shrewsbury, but in some cases the legal requirements of parish warding makes this impractical if very small parish wards would be necessary. If the boundaries of Shrewsbury parish are extended as a result of a future Community Governance Review, we can make related alterations to division boundaries.

*Bagley, Battlefield, Castlefields & Ditherington, Harlescott, Quarry & Coton Hill and Sundorne*

83 All submissions discussing the town agreed on the use of the River Severn through Shrewsbury as a boundary. The Council, and resident, agreed on the retention of the existing Quarry & Coton Hill and Castlefields & Ditherington divisions, and we have adopted these proposals as part of our draft recommendations.

84 The Council also proposed retaining Bagley and Harlescott divisions unchanged, while the resident's scheme suggested a minor change moving Westbury Road and streets to the north into Harlescott in order to improve electoral equality. We considered this, and viewed the area on our virtual tour, but concluded that the existing boundary on Mount Pleasant Road is clear and relatively strong. We therefore propose to retain these divisions unchanged, as proposed by the Council.

85 A resident suggested that the Heath Farm area was currently split between Bagley and Harlescott divisions, but did not suggest where the boundary should be, or exactly which streets identify as Heath Farm. We would be particularly interested in further evidence as to the community identity, and perceived limits of this area, as we would look to unite this community within a single division if it can be done in a way compatible with our other statutory criteria.

86 The existing Sundorne division is forecast to have 17% fewer electors than average by 2028. This is only partly mitigated by expanding this division past the parish boundary to the A49, to bring in the development expected in this area, as proposed by the Council. In addition to this change, we propose to adjust the boundary between the existing Sundorne and Battlefield divisions to the A5112 Whitchurch Road, moving Albert Road and Albert Square into Sundorne division. This follows the suggestion of a resident, and allows both Sundorne and Battlefield divisions to have good electoral equality.

*Abbey, Column & Sutton, Monkmoor and Underdale*

87 Councillor P. Moseley provided evidence that the railway line between Monkmoor and Abbey divisions acted as a strong barrier between communities, and should remain as a division boundary, which the Council's proposal followed. The local resident's scheme proposed moving this boundary southwards to Belvidere Road. We viewed Belvidere Road on our virtual tour, but did not consider that this was a strong or clear boundary. We have therefore decided to retain this boundary, and most of the existing Monkmoor division, as proposed by the Council. We have made one adjustment in the north of the division to bring Corsten Drive into Monkmoor division order to improve electoral equality.

88 With the exception of Corsten Drive, we have adopted the Council's proposal for Underdale division, which adds Horsefair, Railway Lane, The Old Meadow and neighbouring streets to this ward. The resident's scheme was very similar, with the exception of the area around Abbey Foregate, which would have removed Shrewsbury Abbey from the division of this name. We have not adopted this proposal as we consider it would be counter-intuitive to have the source of the division's name in a different division.

89 The Council's primary proposal for Abbey division placed an area to the south of Preston Street into a Severn Valley division based outside of Shrewsbury. While we are aware of future developments around Weir Hill meaning that the shape of communities in this area by 2028 is uncertain, we do not consider that this proposal promotes effective and convenient local government, or reflects the community identity of the existing electors in this area and we have not been persuaded to adopt it. The Council's secondary proposal was for Abbey division to cross the railway line to the north, and extend southwards. As discussed below, we have adopted portions of this proposal, but consider that the railway line is a strong and clear boundary that we do not propose to cross.

90 The resident's proposal was to retain the existing southern boundary of Abbey division along Preston Street, but also to bring a number of streets to the south of Old Potts Way into Abbey ward. These electors would be separated by Rea Brook and some distance from the remainder of Abbey ward, and no evidence of community identity was provided. We have therefore not adopted this proposal.

91 We propose instead to extend the boundary of Abbey division to the south, with a boundary running along Wenlock Road and Ebnal Road. This broadly follows the Council's secondary proposal in this area, but we are recommending the boundary follow Wenlock Road rather than London Road in order to ensure good electoral equality for both Abbey and Column & Sutton divisions.

92 All the proposals we received agreed on the southern boundary of Column & Sutton division running along a disused railway line from Otley Road to Pritchard Way. The Council's proposal was for a division with 16% more electors than average – we have adjusted this by altering the proposed boundary with Abbey division as discussed above (paragraph 89) and also ensuring that the south-eastern boundary follows the parish boundary along Thieves Lane rather than the A5. Although following the A5 ring road would have attractions in terms of providing a strong and clear boundary, with the existing parish boundaries it would require creating a very small parish ward for Atcham parish, in a way which would not facilitate effective and convenient local government.

*Belle Vue, Meole and Otley & Reabrook*

93 We have broadly adopted the Council's proposal for these divisions. The resident's scheme placed a significant number of electors from Bayston Hill into divisions in the south of Shrewsbury, which we have not been persuaded to adopt (see paragraphs 69–72).

94 The Council's proposal for the southern boundary of Otley & Reabrook and Meole divisions ran along the A5 main road. While this has attractions as a strong and clear boundary, it does not follow the parish boundary, and the issues relating to parish warding discussed above (paragraph 82) we cannot adopt it in full. In the area of Hendrick Crescent, in Atcham parish, there are a sufficient number of electors to provide for a viable parish ward, and we propose to place these electors within Otley & Reabrook division in the same division as their neighbours. In other areas, such as Green Crescent or Bestune Way, the constraints of the existing parish boundaries mean that, while we acknowledge that the residents are likely to share a community identity with their near neighbours in Shrewsbury parish, we consider that proposing divisions placing them in Shrewsbury would not provide for effective & convenient local government due to very small parish wards being required. If the relevant parish boundaries change as a result of a Community Governance Review, we can then make related alterations to the division boundaries.

95 We propose one minor change to the Council's proposals for Belle Vue division, moving electors on Roman Way into Porthill division. This improves the electoral equality of the latter division, and also ensures that the electors of Roman Way are not isolated within Belle Vue division, where they would be separated by the cemetery from any other electors in this division.

*Bicton Heath, Copthorne, Porthill and Radbrook*

96 We have adopted the Council's proposals for these divisions in the main, which we note were very similar to those proposed by the resident's county-wide scheme. As with much of Shrewsbury, we received relatively little evidence regarding community identity, with the exception of that from Councillor C. Lemon.

97 Councillor Lemon argued for the existing Radbrook division to retain its existing areas, and merge with another neighbouring division to create a two-councillor division. We considered this carefully, but in light of the formal request from Shropshire Council, we are obliged to propose single-member divisions wherever possible. Councillor Lemon did not offer any suggestions for which areas of the existing division (which is forecast to have a 33% variance by 2028) could move into neighbouring divisions if we kept Radbrook as a single-councillor division.

98 The Council proposed a boundary running along Crowmeole Lane and Radbrook Road, before passing through developments due to be built north of the A488. We have adjusted this boundary to bring all of these proposed developments within Radbrook division. While the shape of communities based around future developments is inevitably uncertain, we consider that splitting single or neighbouring developments is unlikely to reflect the identity of the area following the completion and occupation of the developments.

99 This decision leaves Radbrook with 12% more electors than average by 2028 – just beyond the bounds of what we consider good electoral equality. We considered various options to improve this variance, of which the most plausible was that suggested by the local resident's scheme to place Six Acres into Meole division. However, this would merely transfer the poor electoral equality to Meole, which would have 11% more electors than average under this proposal. The rest of the resident's proposal was very similar to that of the Council, the only difference being that the resident proposed a boundary along the A5112 rather than the railway line, in order to accommodate electors from Bayston Hill into a Shrewsbury-based division. Given our decision regarding Bayston Hill (paragraphs 69–72), we have not adopted this proposal.


100 We have expanded the Council's proposals for Bicton Heath division to ensure that all of the development on both sides of the A458 is retained within a single division – there are an adequate number of electors to do this and provide a viable parish ward for Bicton parish. We note that the existing division in this area is named Bowbrook. A resident suggested that Bicton Heath was more appropriate, and this received some support from the Council's submission and we have adopted the name at this stage. However, we retain an open mind, and welcome views on both the name Bicton Heath and Bowbrook or a combination of the two if it is felt that this would best reflect the community identity of the area. The resident's proposal for

Bicton Heath/Bowbrook mirrored that of the Council, except for the expansion outside of the Shrewsbury parish boundary.

101 We have adopted the Council's proposals for Copthorne and Porthill divisions, which placed electors north of Crowmeole Lane and Radbrook Road in Copthorne division. As discussed above at paragraph 96 & 98, we have adopted the Council's proposal for Porthill, subject to the addition of Roman Way. The resident's scheme was broadly similar, but involved residents of Falcons Way being cut off from the remainder of Radbrook division.



## Southern Shropshire



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2028
Broseley	1	9%
Brown Clee	1	8%
Clee	1	-7%
Cleobury Mortimer	1	-2%
Clun	1	-8%
Corvedale	1	-4%
Craven Arms	1	3%
Highley	1	-9%
Ludlow East	1	-5%
Ludlow North	1	-8%
Ludlow South	1	-5%
Much Wenlock	1	7%
Severn Valley	1	-2%
Stottesdon	1	-9%

*Broseley, Much Wenlock and Severn Valley*

102 All respondents agreed that Broseley should be the basis of a division, differing only in the treatment of the Broseley Wood area on the western side of the town. Broseley Town Council argued for this area to be incorporated into the town division, noting that it caused confusion and inconvenience where some residents of Broseley were represented by a councillor for the wider Much Wenlock area. This view was echoed by a number of residents, Councillor D. Thomas and Councillor C. Bagnall.

103 The Council's primary proposal placed the Broseley Wood area in Broseley division, while their secondary proposal, and that of the resident, retained the existing boundary, with Broseley Wood remaining in Much Wenlock division.

104 We considered this area carefully. While we are sympathetic to the argument that the existing boundary divides the community of Broseley, we note that placing the entirety of Broseley parish within a single division would mean that the division would have 17% more electors than average – well beyond the bounds of good electoral equality. We also note that following the parish boundary would still mean that electors on Bridge Road, Spout Lane and neighbouring areas, who might reasonably consider themselves to live in Broseley, would not be included in a Broseley division.

105 On balance, we consider that retaining the existing division boundary for our draft recommendations offers the best balance of our statutory criteria. An alternative allowing Broseley Wood to be placed within the division with better electoral equality, would be for the settlement of Jackfield, together with electors from the rural eastern portion of Broseley parish to be placed in a neighbouring division. We would welcome further evidence during consultation on whether this might offer a better reflection of community identity.

106 A number of submissions from residents commented on the nature of the existing boundary, suggesting that it is unclear in places. It would be possible for the boundary to run along King Street, Woodlands Road and Ball's Lane, slightly increasing the size of the Broseley Wood parish ward, but providing a stronger and clearer boundary. While we have not been persuaded to make this change at this time, we would very much welcome further evidence on this possibility during consultation on these draft recommendations.

107 The Council proposed a Severn Valley East and a Severn Valley West division to the east and south of Shrewsbury. The proposed Severn Valley East division stretched from Hadnall parish to Buildwas parish, and would have had 16% fewer electors than average by 2028. Due to this poor electoral equality, we have not adopted this proposal, preferring to adopt the proposal of the local resident for a single Severn Valley ward, comprising seven complete parishes and offering good electoral equality.

108 A submission from Easthope, Shipton & Stanton Long Parish Council indicated that the parishes wished to remain in the same division as each other, with a preference for this to be the Much Wenlock division. As placing them in this division would result in Much Wenlock having a 17% variance we have not adopted this proposal, but we retain an open mind, particularly if corresponding changes to improve electoral equality to the relevant divisions are suggested. We have, however, included these parishes in the same Brown Clee division. Barrow Parish Council expressed a desire to remain in Much Wenlock division, which remains the case under our draft recommendations.

109 The resident's scheme placed the grouped parishes of Church Preen, Kenley, and Hughley in a Burnell division. In order to facilitate our proposals for one two-member Burnell & Bayston Hill division, discussed at paragraphs 69–72, we propose to place these parishes within Much Wenlock division as part of our draft recommendations.

*Brown Clee, Cleobury Mortimer, Highley and Stottesdon*

110 The Council's primary proposal for these divisions involved splitting the town of Cleobury Mortimer between divisions, and a Cleobury Mortimer West division with 12% fewer electors than average. The Council provided a secondary option in this area, which retained Cleobury Mortimer together, but had variances at the outer limits of good electoral equality for both Cleobury Mortimer and Clee divisions. We have therefore broadly adopted the resident's proposal in these areas, with the exception of placing Astley Abbots parish in Brown Clee division, where the resident suggested it should retain its existing link to Bridgnorth.

111 Both Hopton Wafers and Neen Savage parish councils argued for the retention of the existing two-member Cleobury Mortimer division, but suggested that if this were not possible priority should be given to retaining parishes as units rather than splitting them. Given the formal request from Shropshire Council for a single-member review, we seek to propose multi-member divisions only where we believe we cannot achieve an acceptable balance of our statutory criteria with single-member divisions. We do not currently believe that this is the case in this area of Shropshire, and are therefore retaining a single-member pattern as part of our draft recommendations.

112 The only parish we propose to split in this area is Bitterley parish, where we propose to place the existing parish ward of Cleeton St Mary into Stottesdon division. This is in line with all three full proposals in this area. This area is separated from the remainder of Bitterley parish by Titterston Clee Hill, and the road access from this area is to the rest of Stottesdon division. We would welcome further evidence as to whether the split of the parish offers a good reflection of community identity in this area.

113 The resident's proposal, which we have adopted, placed Chelmarsh parish in Brown Clee division, while the Council's proposal placed it in Highley division. Neither proposal gave substantial evidence as to the community identity of this area. We would welcome further evidence as to whether Chelmarsh, and the neighbouring parish of Eardington, look towards Highley, Bridgnorth, or the rural areas to the west for its community identity.

#### *Clee, Clun, Corvedale and Craven Arms*

114 Both county-wide schemes offered identical proposals for Clee division, and we have adopted these proposals as part of our draft recommendations. The Council's proposal for Corvedale division had 13% fewer electors than average, and we have instead adopted the resident's proposal. This concurs with the evidence from Rushbury Parish Council (discussed above at paragraph 75) regarding the links between this parish and Cardington.

115 The Council and resident proposed broadly similar Craven Arms divisions. However, the resident's proposal kept all parishes together within single divisions, while the Council's proposal involved splitting Wistanstow and Hopesay parishes in a way which would require very small parish wards to be created. We do not consider this promotes effective and convenient local government, and have therefore adopted the resident's proposal for this division.

116 Similar divisions for Clun were proposed, with the Council placing Mainstone parish in Bishop's Castle division (discussed at paragraph 73), and moving the bulk of the electors from Hopesay parish into Clun division. As discussed above, we prefer not to split parishes where a viable alternative is available, and have therefore adopted the resident's proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

#### *Ludlow East, Ludlow North and Ludlow South*

117 Both the Council's and the resident's schemes proposed broadly similar divisions for the Ludlow area, differing mostly in the expansion of the existing Ludlow East division necessary to achieve good electoral equality. The Council proposed including the Rockgreen area, in the neighbouring parish of Ludford within Ludlow East division, while the resident proposed an extension to the south, with Rockgreen remaining within Ludlow East. The Council's proposed Ludlow East division had poor electoral equality, with roughly 16% fewer electors than average, while the resident's proposal was for a division with 12% fewer electors.


118 We considered both proposals carefully. One local resident suggested that Ludford parish north of the River Teme should be merged into Ludlow, but provided limited evidence. On balance, we consider that the parish boundary running along the A49 is a particularly clear and strong boundary, and have therefore preferred to retain Rockgreen within Ludlow South division as proposed by the resident's county-

wide scheme. We would particularly welcome further information as to whether this area shares a community identity with any particular part of Ludlow town, and if so which part.

119 We have modified the resident's proposal slightly, adjusting the proposed boundary in order to place Baker Close, Ballard Close and Vashon Close in Ludlow East division. This helps to equalise the forecast electorate between Ludlow East and South divisions, and also ensure that residents on these streets are in the same division as their immediate neighbours.

120 Both the county-wide schemes received proposed identical divisions for Ludlow North, mirroring the existing division. Subject to the adjustments to the boundary with Ludlow East described above, both schemes proposed very similar Ludlow South divisions with the rural parishes to the south of the town added to the south-eastern portion of Ludlow. We have adopted these proposals for Ludlow North and Ludlow South divisions, subject to the discussion above regarding the boundary between Ludlow South and Ludlow East.

## Eastern Shropshire



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2028
Albrighton	1	11%
Bridgnorth Castle	1	0%
Bridgnorth East	1	-7%
Bridgnorth Rural	1	-10%
Bridgnorth West & Tasley	1	-3%
Claverley & Worfield	1	-4%
Shifnal North	1	2%
Shifnal Rural	1	-4%
Shifnal South	1	-6%

*Albrighton, Shifnal North, Shifnal Rural and Shifnal South*

121 The existing divisions in this area have very poor electoral equality, with both the existing Shifnal North and Shifnal South & Cosford divisions having forecast variances in excess of 30%.

122 We do not consider that the proposals we received in this area were a good fit for our statutory criteria. The Council's scheme split the town of Shifnal into three divisions, each containing a significant rural area; as well as dividing the neighbouring village of Albrighton. The resident's scheme again proposed dividing Shifnal town between three divisions, with the southern one of these extending as far as Stockton parish. Stockton Parish Council provided evidence that they saw the parish as having a clearly rural identity, and would not wish it to be joined to any towns. We have not adopted either of the county-wide proposals in this area, preferring to take the suggestion of another resident for two divisions for Shifnal Town. We are adopting this principle to put forward our own proposal and test the response. Shifnal Town Council accepted the necessity for an additional division in this area, but did not offer any specific proposals.

123 We propose to divide Shifnal parish so that the built-up area of the town is divided into two divisions with the boundary between them running along the B4379, then south of Curriers Way, before re-joining the existing boundary at Greenfields Crescent. This allows both divisions to have good electoral equality, and also ensures that the commercial centre of Shifnal is within a single division. We propose to include the rural parts of Shifnal parish that surround the town in a Shifnal Rural division with other rural areas.

124 We propose one Albrighton division comprising the majority of Albrighton parish, and including Brooklands Road, Barclay Close, Woodland Close and neighbouring streets which appear to be part of the village of Albrighton, but fall into Donington parish. We also propose to include development to the north of Kingswood Road in Albrighton division – this means the division is forecast to have

11% more electors than average, slightly beyond the bounds of good electoral equality. We considered drawing the boundary more tightly around the village itself, with electors in the western portion placed into Shifnal Rural division, and would welcome any comments on this proposal as part of consultation on these draft recommendations.

125 The remainder of this area is covered by a Shifnal Rural division, including Sutton Maddock, Beckbury and all rural parishes to the north, including the rural part of Shifnal parish. We acknowledge that this rural division does not have convenient access to all areas without travelling through Shifnal, but consider that, as well as offering good electoral equality, the proposal facilitates an effective pattern of divisions for the whole area.

126 We considered expanding our two proposed Shifnal divisions to cover the entirety of Shifnal parish. This would leave the remainder of 'Shifnal Rural' division with 9% fewer electors than average, and would also mean that access between the southern and northern sections of the division would be even harder without leaving the division. We would welcome further evidence as to whether electors in the rural areas of Shifnal parish consider their community identity lies towards the town, or toward the neighbouring rural areas.

127 We propose naming the large rural division 'Shifnal Rural', but we retain an open mind on this name, and the boundaries proposed in this area.

*Bridgnorth Castle, Bridgnorth East, Bridgnorth Rural, Bridgnorth West & Tasley and Claverley & Worfield*

128 Our draft recommendations for Bridgnorth are based on proposals from both the Council and the local resident, who offered very similar ideas. The Town Council also made a proposal for these divisions, and we have incorporated aspects of this. All the schemes proposed very similar Bridgnorth West & Tasley divisions, bringing developments in Tasley parish into a Bridgnorth-based division, and reflecting the northern half of the existing two-member division of this name. The Town Council suggested that the proposed electorate figure for developments in Tasley was optimistic, but we consider the data provided by Shropshire Council to be the best available.

129 We have adjusted the proposed boundary of Bridgnorth Castle division slightly, to improve electoral equality and ensure that electors on Cricket Meadow have access to the remainder of their division. We have also adopted a proposal from the Town Council for Portman's Way, Three Ashes Road, Farmlands Road and Highfields Road to be placed in Bridgnorth Castle division, improving the electoral equality of both divisions and offering a stronger boundary.



130 The resident proposed a division covering both Central Bridgnorth and Astley Abbots parish to the north, while the Council proposed placing this parish in Brown Clee division. While the existing division links these areas, we received evidence from Bridgnorth Town Council that there are few community links between Astley Abbots and Bridgnorth. We are adopting the Council's proposal and placing Astley Abbots parish in the largely rural Brown Clee division as part of our draft recommendations.

131 While the River Severn would undoubtedly offer a strong and clear boundary in Bridgnorth, only the Town Council proposed sticking to this boundary, with the other schemes involving a division crossing the river. There are a total of 8,051 electors forecast for Tasley and the area of Bridgnorth west of the river, meaning it is impossible to propose two divisions with good electoral equality for this area – each councillor would, on average, represent 12% more electors than the county-wide average. We therefore propose to retain the principle of a cross-river division in Bridgnorth.

132 The Council proposed a boundary running along Friar's Street, with only relatively few electors on Riverside and surrounding streets in Bridgnorth East, while the resident proposed a boundary along the B4373. We have adopted this latter proposal, as it not only offers a stronger and clearer boundary, but also facilitates good electoral equality for our proposed Bridgnorth Rural division. Both the resident and Bridgnorth Town Council proposed retaining the existing boundary in the region of Stoneway Steps – we would be interested in further information as to whether this boundary is sufficiently clear, or could be improved.

133 The resident's scheme proposed a boundary along the A458 for the northern boundary of Bridgnorth Rural division, which stretched along the A443 to the edge of the county. This proposal relies on adding the Hobbins parish ward of Worfield parish in order to achieve acceptable equality. The Town Council offered some support for this, but this was based on the industrial estate being a major source of employment in Bridgnorth rather than on considerations of the community identity of the electors. On balance, we prefer to leave Worfield parish in a single division, and instead move the northern boundary of this division northwards from the resident's proposal, to run to the north of Goodwood Avenue and Kings Court.

134 Bridgnorth Town Council suggested that the division boundary south of the town should follow the River Severn, rather than the parish boundary which places an area on the western bank of the river in Bridgnorth parish rather than the neighbouring Eardington parish. We acknowledge the merits of this proposal but, as in other areas, we are unable to adopt this suggestion as the resulting parish ward would have no electors.

135 The Council proposed a division linking Alveley and Claverley, and a Worfield division stretching as far north as Kemberton parish. This proposal also split Claverley parish, with electors in Shipley and Upper Ludstone separated from the remainder of the parish. A resident provided evidence that there were few if any links between Alveley and Claverley, with Alveley's links being mostly towards Bridgnorth. We have therefore not adopted the Council's scheme in this area, preferring a modified version of the resident's scheme, with Romsley, Alveley and Quatt Malvern parishes linked to Bridgnorth along the A443 in a Bridgnorth Rural division.



## Conclusions

136 The table below provides a summary as to the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality in Shropshire, referencing the 2022 and 2028 electorate figures against the proposed number of councillors and divisions. A full list of divisions, names and their corresponding electoral variances can be found at Appendix A to the back of this report. An outline map of the divisions is provided at Appendix B.

### Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2022	2028
Number of councillors	74	74
Number of electoral divisions	72	72
Average number of electors per councillor	3,369	3,594
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	12	3
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

#### Draft recommendations

Shropshire Council should be made up of 74 councillors serving 72 divisions representing 70 single-councillor divisions and two two-councillor divisions. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

#### Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed divisions for Shropshire Council. You can also view our draft recommendations for Shropshire on our interactive maps at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

### Parish electoral arrangements

137 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 divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

138 Under the 2009 Act 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, Shropshire 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.

139 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Adderley, Albrighton, Atcham, Bicton, Bridgnorth, Donington and Boscobel, Great Hanwood, Ludlow, Market Drayton, Oswestry, Pimhill, Shifnal, Shrewsbury, Uffington, Wem Urban and Whitchurch Urban.

140 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Adderley parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Adderley Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Adderley Rural	5
Western Way	2

141 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Albrighton parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Albrighton Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Albrighton Rural	1
Albrighton Village	14

142 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Atcham parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Atcham Parish should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Atcham Rural	3
Hendrick Crescent	4

143 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Bicton parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Bicton Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Bicton Rural	6
Bicton Urban	3

144 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Bridgnorth parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Bridgnorth Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Bridgnorth Castle	6
Bridgnorth East	5
Bridgnorth Morfe	2
Bridgnorth West	3

145 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for the grouped parishes of Donington and Boscobel.

**Draft recommendations**

Donington with Boscobel Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Cosford & Boscobel	6
Windsor Road	3

146 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Great Hanwood parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Great Hanwood Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Hanwood Bank & Hanwood	8
Upper Edgebold	1

147 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ludlow parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Ludlow Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Bringewood	2
Clee View	2
Corve	2
Gallows Bank	3
Hayton	2
Rockspring	2
Whitcliffe	2

148 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Market Drayton parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Market Drayton Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Market Drayton East	2
Market Drayton North	5
Market Drayton South	5

149 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Oswestry parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Oswestry Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Cabin Lane	2
Cambrian	2
Carreg Llwyd	4
Castle	3
Gatacre	3
Maserfield	2
Victoria	2

150 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Pimhill parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Pimhill Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing five wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Bomere Heath	8
Fitz	2
Leaton	1
Preston Gubbals	1
Walford Heath	1

151 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Shifnal parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Shifnal Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Shifnal North	7
Shifnal Rural	1
Shifnal South	7

152 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Shrewsbury parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Shrewsbury Town Council should comprise 17 councillors, as at present, representing 17 wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Abbey	1
Bagley	1
Battlefield	1
Bicton Heath	1
Belle Vue	1
Castlefields & Ditherington	1
Column & Sutton	1
Copthorne	1
Harlescott	1
Meole	1
Monkmoor	1
Otley & Reabrook	1
Porthill	1



Quarry & Coton Hill	1
Radbrook	1
Sundorne	1
Underdale	1

153 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Uffington parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Uffington Parish Council should comprise five councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Pimley Manor	2
Uffington Rural	3

154 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Wem Urban parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Wem Urban Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Wem East	4
Wem West	10

155 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Whitchurch Urban parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Whitchurch Urban Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Whitchurch North	6
Whitchurch South	3
Whitchurch West	6

## Have your say

156 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of who it is from or whether it relates to the whole county or just a part of it.

157 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Shropshire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

158 Our website is the best way to keep up to date with progress on the review and to have your say [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

159 Each review has its own page with details of the timetable for the review, information about its different stages and interactive mapping.

160 Submissions can also be made by emailing [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk) or by writing to:

**Review Officer (Shropshire)**  
**The Local Government Boundary Commission for England**  
**PO Box 133**  
**Blyth**  
**NE24 9FE**

161 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for Shropshire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of electors.
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities.
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

162 A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of electors.
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links.
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries.
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.

163 Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of electors as elsewhere in the area?

164 Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

165 Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed divisions? Is there any form of public transport?

166 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk) A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

167 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers. This includes your name, postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

168 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

169 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft

Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the all-out elections for Shropshire in 2025.



## Equalities

170 The Commission has looked at how it carries out reviews under the guidelines set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It has made best endeavours to ensure that people with protected characteristics can participate in the review process and is sufficiently satisfied that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.



## Appendices

### Appendix A

Draft recommendations for Shropshire

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2028)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Abbey	1	3,751	3,751	11%	3,950	3,950	10%
2 Albrighton	1	3,594	3,594	7%	4,002	4,002	11%
3 Bagley	1	3,809	3,809	13%	3,901	3,901	9%
4 Battlefield	1	3,129	3,129	-7%	3,342	3,342	-7%
5 Belle Vue	1	3,428	3,428	2%	3,512	3,512	-2%
6 Bicton Heath	1	3,537	3,537	2%	3,972	3,972	10%
7 Bishop's Castle	1	3,493	3,493	4%	3,589	3,589	0%
8 Bridgnorth Castle	1	3,416	3,574	6%	3,588	3,588	0%
9 Bridgnorth East	1	3,300	3,300	-2%	3,360	3,360	-7%
10 Bridgnorth Rural	1	2,916	2,916	-13%	3,232	3,232	-10%
11 Bridgnorth West & Tasley	1	3,005	2,847	-15%	3,496	3,496	-3%
12 Broseley	1	3,792	3,792	13%	3,936	3,936	9%



Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2028)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13 Brown Clee	1	3,652	3,652	8%	3,874	3,874	8%
14 Burnell & Bayston Hill	2	7,140	3,570	6%	7,662	3,831	7%
15 Castlefields & Ditherington	1	3,404	3,404	1%	3,625	3,625	1%
16 Cheswardine	1	3,420	3,420	2%	3,572	3,572	-1%
17 Chirbury & Worthen	1	3,091	3,091	-8%	3,263	3,263	-9%
18 Claverley & Worfield	1	3,353	3,353	0%	3,449	3,449	-4%
19 Clee	1	3,163	3,163	-6%	3,332	3,332	-7%
20 Cleobury Mortimer	1	3,470	3,470	3%	3,533	3,533	-2%
21 Clun	1	3,230	3,230	-4%	3,289	3,289	-8%
22 Column & Sutton	1	3,180	3,180	-6%	3,729	3,729	4%
23 Copthorne	1	3,829	3,829	14%	3,792	3,792	5%
24 Corvedale	1	3,406	3,406	1%	3,467	3,467	-4%
25 Craven Arms	1	3,351	3,351	-1%	3,709	3,709	3%
26 Ellesmere Urban	1	3,375	3,375	0%	3,587	3,587	0%

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2028)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
27 Harlescott	1	3,336	3,336	-1%	3,412	3,412	-5%
28 Highley	1	3,024	3,024	-10%	3,259	3,259	-9%
29 Hodnet	1	3,021	3,021	-10%	3,341	3,341	-7%
30 Llanymynech	1	3,507	3,507	4%	3,775	3,775	5%
31 Longden	1	3,512	3,512	4%	3,503	3,503	-3%
32 Loton	1	3,310	3,310	-2%	3,569	3,569	-1%
33 Ludlow East	1	3,476	3,476	3%	3,403	3,403	-5%
34 Ludlow North	1	3,103	3,103	-8%	3,321	3,321	-8%
35 Ludlow South	1	2,757	2,757	-18%	3,407	3,407	-5%
36 Market Drayton East & Rural	1	3,541	3,541	5%	3,907	3,907	9%
37 Market Drayton North	1	3,546	3,546	5%	3,948	3,948	10%
38 Market Drayton South	1	3,728	3,728	11%	3,837	3,837	7%
39 Meole	1	3,375	3,375	0%	3,746	3,746	4%
40 Monkmoor	1	3,327	3,327	-1%	3,244	3,244	-10%

Commented [dM1]: 3% on p. 17

Commented [dM2]: See map p. 8

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2028)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
41 Much Wenlock	1	3,547	3,547	5%	3,836	3,836	7%
42 Oswestry North East	1	3,065	3,065	-9%	3,266	3,266	-9%
43 Oswestry South	1	3,356	3,356	0%	3,600	3,600	0%
44 Oswestry South East	1	3,295	3,295	-2%	3,665	3,665	2%
45 Oswestry West	1	3,498	3,498	4%	3,517	3,517	-2%
46 Otley & Reabrook	1	2,628	2,628	-22%	3,261	3,261	-9%
47 Porthill	1	3,540	3,540	5%	3,408	3,408	-5%
48 Prees	1	3,198	3,198	-5%	3,797	3,797	6%
49 Quarry & Coton Hill	1	3,271	3,271	-3%	3,488	3,488	-3%
50 Radbrook	1	3,641	3,641	8%	4,041	4,041	12%
51 Rea Valley	1	3,476	3,476	3%	3,819	3,819	6%
52 Ruyton & Baschurch	1	3,477	3,477	3%	3,900	3,900	9%
53 Selattyn & Gobowen	1	3,253	3,253	-3%	3,605	3,605	0%
54 Severn Valley	1	2,781	2,781	-17%	3,529	3,529	-2%

Commented [dM3]: Increase space below Hill

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2028)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
55 Shawbury	1	3,033	3,033	-10%	3,268	3,268	-9%
56 Shifnal North	1	3,666	3,656	9%	3,659	3,659	2%
57 Shifnal Rural	1	3,474	3,484	3%	3,449	3,449	-4%
58 Shifnal South	1	3,359	3,359	0%	3,385	3,385	-6%
59 St Martin's	2	6,162	3,081	-9%	7,029	3,514	-2%
60 St Oswald	1	3,694	3,694	10%	3,783	3,783	5%
61 Stottesdon	1	3,156	3,156	-6%	3,286	3,286	-9%
62 Strettondale	1	3,956	3,956	17%	3,989	3,989	11%
63 Sundorne	1	3,520	3,520	4%	3,428	3,428	-5%
64 Tern	1	3,523	3,523	5%	3,542	3,542	-1%
65 The Meres	1	3,562	3,562	6%	3,655	3,655	2%
66 Underdale	1	3,439	3,439	2%	3,343	3,343	-7%
67 Wem Rural & Whixall	1	3,175	3,175	-6%	3,231	3,231	-10%
68 Wem Town	1	3,650	3,650	8%	3,958	3,958	10%
69 Whitchurch North	1	3,430	3,430	2%	3,902	3,902	9%

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2028)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
70 Whitchurch South & Rural	1	2,819	2,819	-16%	3,381	3,381	-6%
71 Whitchurch West	1	3,450	3,450	2%	3,735	3,735	4%
72 Whittington	1	3,417	3,417	1%	3,797	3,797	6%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>249,308</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>265,988</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,369</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,594</b>	<b>-</b>

Commented [dM4]: See p. 8


Commented [dM5]: 3,595 in para 21

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Shropshire Council.


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

## Appendix B

### Outline map



## Outline map – Shrewsbury inset



Number	Division name
1	Abbey
2	Albrighton
3	Bagley
4	Battlefield
5	Belle Vue
6	Bicton Heath
7	Bishop's Castle
8	Bridgnorth Castle
9	Bridgnorth East
10	Bridgnorth Rural
11	Bridgnorth West & Tasley
12	Broseley
13	Brown Clee
14	Burnell & Bayston Hill

15	Castlefields & Ditherington
16	Cheswardine
17	Chirbury & Worthen
18	Claverley & Worfield
19	Clee
20	Cleobury Mortimer
21	Clun
22	Column & Sutton
23	Copthorne
24	Corvedale
25	Craven Arms
26	Ellesmere Urban
27	Harlescott
28	Highley
29	Hodnet
30	Llanymynech
31	Longden
32	Loton
33	Ludlow East
34	Ludlow North
35	Ludlow South
36	Market Drayton East & Rural
37	Market Drayton North
38	Market Drayton South
39	Meole
40	Monkmoor
41	Much Wenlock
42	Oswestry North East
43	Oswestry South
44	Oswestry South East
45	Oswestry West
46	Otley & Reabrook
47	Porthill
48	Prees
49	Quarry & Coton Hill
50	Radbrook
51	Rea Valley
52	Ruyton & Baschurch
53	Selattyn & Gobowen
54	Severn Valley
55	Shawbury
56	Shifnal North



57	Shifnal Rural
58	Shifnal South
59	St Martin's
60	St Oswald
61	Stottesdon
62	Strettondale
63	Sundorne
64	Tern
65	The Meres
66	Underdale
67	Wem Rural & Whixall
68	Wem Town
69	Whitchurch North
70	Whitchurch South & Rural
71	Whitchurch West
72	Whittington

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/shropshire](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/shropshire)

## Appendix C

### Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at:

[www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/shropshire](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/shropshire)

#### *Local Authority*

- Shropshire Council

#### *Political Groups*

- Shropshire Council Labour Group

#### *Councillors*

- Councillor C. Bagnall
- Councillor L. Bardsley
- Councillor T. Clarke
- Councillor R. Dartnall
- Councillor S. Hughes-Saunier
- Councillor H. Kidd
- Councillor C. Lemon
- Councillor R. Macey
- Councillor P. Moseley
- Councillor E. Norton
- Councillor T. Parsons
- Councillor E. Potter
- Councillor N. Rowley
- Councillor D. Thomas
- Councillor R. Thompson

#### *Parish and Town Councils*

- Barrow Parish Council
- Bayston Hill Parish Council
- Bridgnorth Town Council
- Broseley Town Council
- Chirbury with Brompton Parish Council
- Church Stretton Town Council
- Clive Parish Council
- Easthope, Shipton & Stanton Long Parish Council

- Edgton Parish Council
- Great Hanwood Parish Council
- Grinshill Parish Council
- Hopton Wafers Parish Council
- Llanymynech & Pant Parish Council
- Market Drayton Town Council
- Neen Savage Parish Council
- Oswestry Town Council
- Pontesbury Parish Council
- Rushbury Parish Council
- Ruyton-XI-Towns Parish Council
- Shifnal Town Council
- Shrewsbury Town Council
- Stockton Parish Council
- Stoke upon Tern Parish Council
- Sutton upon Tern Parish Council
- Worthen with Shelve Parish Council

*Local Residents*

- 61 local residents

## Appendix D

### Glossary and abbreviations

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 inequality	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. We only take account of electors registered specifically for local elections during our reviews.
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 can vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
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

The  
Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
for England

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government.

Local Government Boundary Commission for  
England  
1st Floor, Windsor House  
50 Victoria Street, London  
SW1H 0TL

**Telephone:** 0330 500 1525

**Email:** [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

**Online:** [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

[www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

**Twitter:** @LGBCE