



Shropshire  
Council

# **Shropshire Council**

## **Consultation Response**

### **LGBCE Electoral Division Proposals**


Date: 10<sup>th</sup> July 2023

<b>Contents</b>	
Introduction	2
Summary Map	3
<b>North-Eastern Shropshire</b>	4
Market Drayton Electoral Divisions	5
Wem, Wem Rural and Whixall recommendation	6
<b>North-Western Shropshire</b>	8
Morda question	9
Oswestry Electoral Divisions	11
<b>West and Central Shropshire</b>	12
Bayston Hill	13
Burnell	16
Bishop's Castle	18
Loton and Longden	19
<b>Shrewsbury</b>	23
<b>Southern Shropshire</b>	27
Broseley	28
Cleobury Mortimer and Cleobury Mortimer Rural	30
Clee	31
Severn Valley	32
Corvedale	34
Clun and Brown Clee	38
Ludlow	41
<b>Eastern Shropshire</b>	43
Albrighton, Shifnal North, Shifnal Rural and Shifnal South	44
Bridgnorth Rural, Bridgnorth West & Tasley, Bridgnorth East	44
Claverley and Worfield	45
<b>Appendix A: Elector Forecasts 2028 based on recommendations</b>	46
<b>Appendix B: Evidence to support Bayston Hill recommendation</b>	48

## Introduction


- 1.1 This document sets out Shropshire Council's response to the current Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) consultation ending 10<sup>th</sup> July 2023. The Council's response has tried to address the LGBCE requests for feedback and to make some recommendations for adjustments that are consistent with the criteria set out in the LGBCE guidance. Maintaining community interests and identities and boundaries that are identifiable has been at the forefront of these recommendations.
- 1.2 This consultation response has been prepared by Shropshire Council officers, through consultation and feedback from Shropshire's current elected councillors. This has been managed through a cross party working group and consultation with councillors through party leaders. This response has not been taken to full council, for approval but has the support of the Conservative, Liberal Democrat, Labour, Independent and Green Political Groups.
- 1.3 Having reviewed the LGBCE's proposals, the Councillors have accepted the proposal for 74 councillors and the proposal for a two-member electoral division in St Martins. However, the Council's recommendations include a Wem two-member electoral division and the separation of Burnell and Bayston Hill into two single member divisions.
- 1.4 Shropshire's rurality and landscape features present complex challenges when trying to achieve electoral equality and Shropshire Council is pleased that in some rural divisions the LGBCE has accepted that some divisions will have a below average number of electors.
- 1.5 The Council would like to reiterate that Councillors representing rural communities in Shropshire will be required to cover large geographic areas, shaped by natural topographical features, in order to effectively undertake their community leadership roles. It can be difficult to appreciate this through only a virtual tour of the County and the Council would encourage the LGBCE to undertake an independent visit, before finalising the new electoral boundaries for Shropshire.
- 1.6 Travelling along country lanes at night to attend community meetings and events also brings with it safety issues. In the LGBCE proposal for Brown Clee electoral division the future Councillor will need to cover 15 civil parishes.
- 1.7 This document has followed the same format as the LGBCE's consultation document. There is a section for each area of the County, together with a map including Shropshire Council's recommended adjustments and a summary table indicating which LGBCE division boundaries are fully supported, accepted, or are recommending adjustments.

**Summary Map (incorporating recommended adjustments to the LGBCE draft proposals)**





## North-Eastern Shropshire




LGBCE Electoral Division	Councillors	Variance 2028	Shropshire Council Response
Cheswardine	1	-1%	Yes, supported
Hodnet	1	-7%	Yes, supported
Shawbury	1	-9%	Yes, supported
Market Drayton East & Rural	1	9%	Yes, supported
Market Drayton North	1	10%	Yes, supported
Market Drayton South	1	7%	Yes, supported
Prees	1	6%	Yes, supported
Whitchurch North	1	9%	Yes, supported
Whitchurch South & Rural	1	-6%	Yes, supported
Whitchurch West	1	4%	Yes, supported
Wem Town	2	Not supported. Alternative proposal included.	
Wem Rural & Whixall			

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

- 2.1. Shropshire Council's cross-party working group have considered the comments made by Adderley Council, that the parishes of Adderley, Moreton Saye and Norton on Hales should remain in the same electoral division. This would be desirable as they are working together to prepare a joint Neighbourhood Plan, demonstrating the strong links between the communities. However, the Councillors acknowledge this would leave the parish of Woore totally isolated from the east of Market Drayton, with too few electors to justify its' own single member electoral division.
- 2.2. The LGBCE proposals estimate Market Drayton East and Rural electoral division would have 3,907 electors (+9% variance) and neighbouring Prees electoral division would have 3,797 (+6%). In April 2022, there were 563 electors living in Norton in Hales parish. This means electoral equality would not be possible if Norton in Hales parish were moved into Prees electoral division.
- 2.3. For these reasons, the Shropshire Council cross-party working group must support the LGBCE recommendations for Market Drayton East and Rural, Market Drayton North and Market Drayton South.

**Map: Market Drayton Electoral Divisions with Civil Parishes**






## Response to Wem Town electoral division and Wem Rural and Whixall electoral division


- 2.4. The Shropshire Council cross-party working group and current serving elected councillors for Wem fully support the position of Wem Town Council and object to the proposals put forward by the LGBCE. The proposals would create two single-Councillor Divisions with one being the majority of Wem Urban and the other Wem Rural, Whixall and a segment of Wem Urban using the railway line as a boundary. It is therefore recommended that Wem should continue as a two-member division, as is the current arrangement.

### LGBCE Proposal



Two single member electoral divisions  
Wem Rural and Whixall – 3,231 (-10%)  
Wem Town – 3,958 (+10%)

### Shropshire Council preferred option



One 2-member electoral division  
Wem Town, Wem Rural and Whixall  
7,189 electors (0%)

- 2.5. The LGBCE proposals refer to the need for boundaries that ***“reflect community identities and provide for clear and identifiable boundaries”*** but creating an electoral division from the entire Wem Rural area plus an area in the SE of Wem Urban satisfies neither of these conditions.
- 2.6. Wem Town is a relatively small, ancient, coherent ‘market town’ community as a whole (served by Wem Town Council). The proposed Wem Urban Division could meet the needs of most of the town but those living in the detached SE section of Wem in the rural Division are very much part of the town, not the rural hinterland. They could be largely disenfranchised as most of their services and infrastructure would lie in a different Division.


- 2.7. Creating an electoral division from the whole of Wem Urban Parish would not be feasible in terms of electoral numbers. However, removing part of the town into a different electoral division is not logical in terms of maintaining community identity or community cohesion.
- 2.8. If this proposal by the Boundary Commission is based largely on achieving single member divisions with electoral numbers between 3,235 and 3,953 with 3,594 as the mean average, then:
- the proposed division numbers of 3,231 for Wem Rural, Whixall and a small wedge of Wem Urban would be -10.1 % below the mean average.
  - The proposed Division numbers of 3,958 for the remainder of Wem Urban would be +10.1 % above the mean average.
- 2.9. The LGBCE proposals conclude that, notwithstanding the suggestion of creating two separate electoral divisions, ***“We remain open to the possibility of retaining a two-member division in this area”***. Wem Town Council and all locals, without exception, when informed of these LGBCE Proposals felt that this would be the best course of action. This was the decision that was also arrived at, after full consideration by the LGBCE, when the Unitary authority was formed in 2009. Nothing has changed.
- 2.10. Consequently, Shropshire Council and the serving elected Councillors for Wem Division, agree with the position of Wem Town Council (as the constituted body in this area) that the current two-member Wem division works effectively in serving the needs of both the whole town and rural areas and would strongly recommend the retention of the present two-member Division. The reasoning for this is.
- It would mean 7,189 electors for the two members to represent which is only - 0.6% below the average number of electors per electoral division in Shropshire. This would provide better electoral equality of representation in Wem.
  - It complies with clear and identifiable boundaries, that reflect three differing community identities of Wem Urban, Wem Rural and Whixall as shown by their Parish Boundaries.
  - Eases ongoing administration, as well as representation, because the Division boundary then follows those of the outer edge of these three Parish Boundaries.
  - Is that nothing has changed in the electoral balance in this area since the LGBCE agreed that this should be a dual member division when the Shropshire Unitary Authority was created in 2009.
- 2.11. Shropshire Council would recommend an independent visit to Wem to better understand the location and community, before reaching a final decision.
- 2.12. As discussed later, the LGBCE Guidance discourages the creation of doughnut electoral divisions. By creating a two-member Wem electoral division this would be avoided.



## North-Western Shropshire

LGBCE Proposed Divisions	Councillors	Variance 2028	Shropshire Council Response
Llanymynech	1	5%	Yes, supported
Ruyton & Baschurch	1	9%	Yes, supported
St Oswald	1	5%	Yes, supported
The Meres	1	-9%	Yes, supported
Whittington	1	6%	Yes, supported
Ellesmere Urban	1	0%	Yes, supported
St Martin's & Western Rhyn	2	+3%	Yes, supported
Selattyn & Gobowen	1	0%	Yes, supported

Please note: Ellesmere Urban electoral division is subject to a community governance review (paused until LGBCE Review completed) and so the boundary shown on the map has been adjusted to reflect this.




**Response to LGBCE question on which division Morda should be placed in.**

- 3.1. The Shropshire Council cross party working group supports the inclusion of Morda in St Oswald electoral division. It is recognised that Morda is a community with its own identity and heritage in coalmining, brick-making and other industry. Morda has its own Morda CE Primary School attended by pupils living in Morda and its' rural surround including Maesbury, Nant y Caws, Ball and Gwern y brenin. The catchment area follows the same boundary line that separates Morda from Oswestry South electoral division and St Oswald electoral division.
- 3.2. Morda has Morda Methodist Church, Weston Pools Park, Morda United's football ground, Morda and Sweeney village hall, Parker Leighton Way playground, a Corner Shop and an active parish council serving the local community. The area is well connected by the B5069 / A483 and A5, with regular bus services.
- 3.3. The long-standing local Councillor has received **no** representations from residents of Morda supporting the inclusion of Morda into Oswestry and strongly refutes any suggestion that local residents would be content to be moved into the Oswestry South electoral division.
- 3.4. The LGBCE in their proposals raise the question of *"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."*
- 3.5. Looking at an aerial view of Morda (see following map), new development along the Morda Road (in particular the former Ambulance Station site), may give the mistaken impression that the urban and rural communities have merged. This is not the case and is evident when visiting the community. As shown on the following maps Glentworth Avenue provides a boundary to Weston Lane, as does the footpath known locally as Love Lane, these are the boundaries.
- 3.6. Using the River Morda (a key feature of the community) as a natural border would split the community in two parts which would seem contrary to the LGBCEs guidelines that states, *"Ward patterns should – as far as possible – reflect community interests and identities."*
- 3.7. The River Morda does not provide an easily recognizable boundary in the way that a highway (A5/A483) or a railway line does – both of which features are cited as reasons by the Commission for setting boundaries. Nor is there any identifiable boundary past the Morda river to allow for the whole settlement to be moved into Oswestry South Division.



- 3.8. Moving the whole village, with approaching 1,500 electors into Oswestry South electoral division would not be feasible in terms of maintaining electoral equality. The LGBCE's proposals have estimated St Oswalds electoral division will have 3,783 electors in 2028 (5% variance) and Oswestry South electoral division will have 3,600 electors (0% variance).






## Oswestry Electoral Divisions


LGBCE Division	Councillors	Variance 2028	Shropshire Council Response
Oswestry North-East	1	-9%	Yes, supported
Oswestry South	1	0%	Yes, supported
Oswestry South-East	1	2%	Yes, supported
Oswestry West	1	-2%	Recommend name change to Oswestry North

3.9. The Shropshire Council cross party working group has reviewed the LGBCE recommendations for the Oswestry electoral divisions and noted the similarity with the Council's proposals in January 2023. The Council is confident that the LGBCE proposals will ensure future electoral equality for the residents of Oswestry. It is proposed that Oswestry West should be re-named Oswestry North to be consistent with Oswestry South.



## West and Central Shropshire

LGBCE Division	Councillors	Variance 2028	Shropshire Council Response
Chirbury and Worthen	1	-9%	Yes, supported
Rea Valley	1	6%	Yes, supported
Tern	1	-1%	Yes, supported
The Strettons (Strettondale)	1	Recommended name change 'The Strettons'	
Bishop's Castle	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal set out below.	
Burnell & Bayston Hill	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal set out below.	
Longden	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal set out below.	
Loton	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal set out below.	






*(proposed changes to areas highlighted in pink)*



## LGBCE Proposal Burnell and Bayston Hill

- 4.1. There is consensus amongst Shropshire's cross party working group, the serving Councillors for Bayston Hill and Bayston Hill Parish Council, that the LGBCE proposal for a Bayston Hill and Burnell electoral division is totally inappropriate and strongly opposed. After considering every option possible for maintaining electoral equality across west and central Shropshire, together with maintaining the exceptionally strong community identity in Bayston Hill, the shared view is that in the case of Bayston Hill an exception should be made. This would enable the area of Bayston Hill Parish Council to be an electoral division on its own. This response has not been taken lightly and evidence to support this decision follows or is contained in Appendix B.

<p><b>Current 3-member electoral division – Bayston Hill, Sutton and Column</b></p> 	<p>Three-member electoral division Current electors (April 2022) - 10,526</p> <p>Includes Shropshire Local Plan proposals BAY050, BAY039, SHR145 and saved site SHREW001. Also, development at Oteley Road and Weir Hill.</p> <p>By 2028, there would not be electoral equality.</p>
<p><b>LGBCE Proposal – Burnell &amp; Bayston Hill electoral division</b></p> 	<p><b>Shropshire Council Preferred Option – single member Bayston Hill electoral division</b></p> 
<p>Two-member electoral division Estimated 7,662 electors by 2028 (+7%)</p>	<p>Single-member electoral division Estimated 4,370 electors (+22%)</p>



## **Electoral Equality**

- 4.2. The parish of Bayston Hill has been an issue because of its size of population since 2000 in electoral equality terms. In the 2008 LGBCE Review it was linked with two Shrewsbury Town Council seats, Column and Sutton and Reabrook to form the three member Bayston Hill, Column and Sutton Division. The links for this seat in terms of community were tenuous at best and nothing has changed in the following 15-year period. There is no way either on foot or by car to get from Bayston Hill to the two Shrewsbury areas without passing through the Meole division. There is no public transport between Bayston Hill and Column and Sutton. The Meole division in the south of the town has no community link with Bayston Hill whatsoever.
- 4.3. In looking at the 2022/23 review Shropshire Council believe the LGBCE have accepted that Bayston Hill should not be linked with Shrewsbury. The LGBCE suggest they have explored three other options: -
1. A Bayston Hill division with an electorate +22% above the average number of electors per electoral division in Shropshire by 2028.
  2. As proposed, a dual member seat covering Bayston Hill parish and a significant proportion of the current Burnell division.
  3. A review as to whether it is possible to trim the edges of Bayston Hill and link with other divisions such as Burnell, Severn Valley or Longden.
- 4.4. Shropshire Council understands at the time the LGBCE proposed the dual member Bayston Hill and Burnell seat there had been no comment regarding the review from Bayston Hill Parish Council. It is now understood that Bayston Hill Parish Council met on Monday 19 June 2023 to look at the proposals and they will now be making the case for a single Bayston Hill Division covering the Parish, option 1 identified here.
- 4.5. Bayston Hill Parish Council strongly believe a single member electoral division will better serve the communities interests and enable the elected councillor to focus on the needs of the Bayston Hill community. Shropshire Council fully supports the stance of the Bayston Hill Parish Council.
- 4.6. Bayston Hill Parish Council is very active in representing the local community. It has premises, accessible to the community and it operate a useful website ([baystonhillparishcouncil.org.uk](http://baystonhillparishcouncil.org.uk)) which has a gallery of photos taken at local community events. The parish has long had a parish plan, which has now become a Bayston Hill Community led plan. A Big Survey was undertaken in 2018 to better understand the views of the local community ([www.baystonhillcommunityplan.orh.uk](http://www.baystonhillcommunityplan.orh.uk).)

## **Strong Concerns – Option 3**

- 4.7. The Council do not believe the situation will be improved by option 3, trimming the edges of Bayston Hill. Comments have already been made that Lyth Hill would be difficult to separate and the electoral numbers involved would be too small. Similarly, to remove the area to the east of the A49 from Bayston Hill would remove the original settlement of the village.

## **Strong Concerns – Option 2**

4.8. In terms of the proposal to have the dual member division Shropshire have identified the following issues.

- Bayston Hill will be linked with a number of other communities. Whilst there are links with Condover, the links to Dorrington and Leebotwood in terms of community are very weak, despite the link of the A49. The links between Bayston Hill with Acton Burnell and Cound are non-existent.
- The reduction in size of the current Burnell Division to accommodate Bayston Hill will lead to Cardington Parish moving to Corvedale Division which already has the second largest area of the Shropshire Council divisions. Further reasoning on this is included in the Council's recommendations for Corvedale.
- It would also transfer the parish of Church Pulverbatch into Bishop's Castle division where there are no community links or shared interests. Shropshire Council and Church Pulverbatch Parish are of the view that Church Pulverbatch should be in Burnell division, as it is now. If this isn't possible then moving the community of Church Pulverbatch into Longden Division would be a better option.
- Whilst not a reason not to act, Shropshire Council believe that the LGBCE proposed dual member division will be represented by two MPs, Bayston Hill from Shrewsbury, and Burnell from South Shropshire, whereas Option 1 will clearly leave the two divisions in separate parliamentary constituencies.

## **Strongly Recommended Option 1**

### **Community identity and distinct natural boundaries**

4.9. Shropshire Council's recommended proposal has very much been influenced by Bayston Hill's unique identity, as a distinct urban village and the natural geographic boundaries that have shaped the local community. Included in Appendix B is evidence of Bayston Hills shared community interests and identity to support the Council's stance.

4.10. Bayston Hill is extremely well defined geographically, as its name suggests, it sits on Lyth Hill to the south of Shrewsbury, Sharpstone Hill to the north-west and is distinctly separated from Shrewsbury by the A5 dual carriageway. It is also in a separate parish (Bayston Hill) rather than the Shrewsbury Town Council area.

4.11. Bayston Hill originated from Condover parish, and the original settlement was the area to the left of the A49, if travelling from Shrewsbury to Church Stretton. The much larger part of the settlement is now developed on the right side of the A49.

- 4.12. Bayston Hill is an autonomous community, a sizeable proportion of its residents will work in Shrewsbury and the wider Shropshire. The community see themselves as distinct from both Shrewsbury in the north, but also south Shropshire. Lyth Hill separates Bayston Hill from the settlements of Conover and Acton Burnell and these communities look to towards Church Stretton as their service centre.
- 4.13. Conover and Acton Burnell have their own Parish Council and community buildings, and schools, and are more rural communities based around agriculture and rural businesses, while Bayston Hill is very much a settlement and community in its own right.
- 4.14. In summary, Option 1 is the best way forward for both the Bayston Hill and Burnell areas and Council would ask the LGBCE to consider accepting Bayston Hill to be a single member division based upon these exceptional grounds. The LGBCE is strongly encouraged to visit the contrasting areas of Bayston Hill and Burnell prior to making a final decision being taken.

#### **Burnell Electoral Division**

- 4.15. If the LGBCE were to agree to option 1 then we would propose that those areas of Burnell which were removed from the Division to bring the dual member size to an appropriate level, should be returned to Burnell Division, i.e., Cardington from Corvedale, Church and Castle Pulverbatch from Bishops Castle.



[illegible]

By 2028, there would not be electoral equality.

[illegible]

Three-member electoral division  
Current electors (April 2022) - 10,526

[illegible]

17 | Page



4.16. Shropshire Council’s recommendations for the future of Bayston Hill electoral division, leads to the creation of a single member Burnell division. It is recommended that.

- The parish of Church Pulverbatch is moved from the LGBCE proposed Bishop’s Castle electoral division, into the Shropshire Council proposed Burnell single-member division.
- The parishes of Church Preen, Kenley and Hughley should be moved into Burnell division, from the LGBCE proposed Much Wenlock electoral division.
- The parish of Cardington should be moved from the LGBCE proposed Corvedale electoral division and returned to Burnell.
- The parish of Cound should be moved to Severn Valley division, from the LGBCE proposed division.

4.17. It is estimated that this would leave Burnell division with 3,749 electors (+4.3%), within the parameters of achieving electoral equality.


## Bishop’s Castle

4.18. Shropshire Council recommends the parish of Church Pulverbatch should be moved from the LGBCE proposed Bishop’s Castle division into Shropshire Council’s proposed Burnell division. The community of Church Pulverbatch is quite remote from Bishop’s Castle and has no community of interest to justify its inclusion in Bishop’s Castle. There is a significant natural barrier between Church Pulverbatch and the rest of the proposed Bishop’s Castle division. The preference (and that of the Parish Council) is that Church Pulverbatch be included in the Burnell division. If this is not suitable then the LGBCE should consider moving the community into Longden division.

LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
	
<p>LGBCE estimate Bishop’s Castle – 3,589 (0% variance)</p>	<p>Shropshire Council estimate Bishop’s Castle – 3,198 (-11%)</p>



**Map: Recommended inclusion of Church Pulverbach parish into Burnell Electoral Division**



### **The Strettons (LGBCE name Strettondale)**



4.19. Shropshire Council supports the boundary recommendations for Strettondale electoral division but proposes changing the name to The Strettons to reflect the character of this division.

### **Loton and Longden**

4.20. Shropshire Council recommends moving the parish of Ford into Longden electoral division, removing it from Loton electoral division. The parish of Bicton can then be moved into Loton electoral division. These proposals are supported by both Bicton and Ford Parish Councils.



- 4.21. The A5 creates a barrier between the rest of Longden division and Bicton parish. The recommended move would resolve this issue. However, Loton division intertwines with Tern all the way through Montford Bridge and Fitz. It would be entirely sensible for Bicton parish to be included in the Loton division.
- 4.22. Shropshire Council is supportive of Ford Parish Council's reasoning behind this recommendation. The Trinity CE School has close links with Hanwood and Longden schools through the school development group and both schools are located in Longden Division. Trinity School and neighbouring schools in Longden are located in the diocese of Hereford which extends southwards, but Bicton school is within the diocese of Lichfield to the north. The A458 runs through Ford Parish and local communities in Longden access services within Ford Parish.
- 4.23. Bicton Parish Council supports this suggestion expressing a preference to be in Loton division. It is logical that Bicton parish should share the same division with its immediate neighbours, and it would remove the anomaly of Montford Bridge being divided between divisions.

## Loton


LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
	
LGBCE estimate Loton – 3,569 (-1% variance)	Shropshire Council estimate Loton – 3,605 (0%)



## Longden

LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
	
<p>LGBCE estimate Longden – 3,503 (-3% variance)</p>	<p>Shropshire Council estimate Longden – 3,535 (-1.7%)</p>


**Map: Recommended changes to Bishop's Castle, Loton and Longden Electoral Division**





## Shrewsbury Electoral Divisions




- 5.1. Shropshire Council supports the LGBCE proposals for Shrewsbury which mainly follow the current boundaries. The change of name from Bowbrook division to Bicton Heath division is fully accepted. Local people will have a much better grasp of where the division is located in Shrewsbury. The Council would like to propose two minor changes to better reflect the communities that Shrewsbury residents identify with.
- 5.2. Please note that the LGBCE proposed electoral division for 'Otley & Reabrook' is misspelt. The name should be 'Oteley and Reabrook.'



LGBCE Division	Councillors	Variance 2028	Shropshire Council Response
Bagley	1	-9%	Yes, supported
Battlefield	1	-7%	Yes, supported
Belle Vue	1	-2%	Yes, supported
Castlefields & Ditherington	1	1%	Yes, supported
Harlescott	1	-5%	Yes, supported
Meole	1	4%	Yes, supported
Monkmoor	1	-10%	Yes, supported
Oteley & Reabrook	1	-9%	Yes, supported
Porthill	1	-5%	Yes, supported
Quarry & Coton Hill	1	-3%	Yes, supported
Underdale	1	-7%	Yes, supported
Abbey	1	Small adjustment to shared boundary required	
Column & Sutton	1		
Copthorne	1	Small adjustment to shared boundary required	
Radbrook	1		
Bicton Heath	1	Change of name fully supported.	
Sundorne and Old Heath	1	(-5%) Yes, supported. Proposed re-naming to Sundorne and Old Heath	






## Shared boundary between Radbrook and Copthorne electoral divisions

LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
	
<p>LGBCE estimate</p> <p>Radbrook – 4,041 (+12% variance)</p> <p>Copthorne – 3,792 (+5% variance)</p>	<p>Shropshire Council estimate</p> <p>Radbrook – 3,865 (+7.5%)</p> <p>Copthorne – 3,968 (+10.4%)</p>
<p>This would entail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Moving the area along Radbrook Road including Crowmeole Farm Estate (Ryelands, Sandiway, Woodside et al.), Radbrook Hall Court and Alan Guttridge Drive from Radbrook Division to Copthorne Division. This would move 319 electors.</li> <li>B. Moving the area along Mytton Oak Road (Churchill Road, Falcons Way et al and Toronto Avenue et al.) from Copthorne Division into Radbrook Division. This would move 495 electors.</li> </ul>	
<p>The benefit of this is that the level of variance in Radbrook would fall within the accepted level of variance and the electors would more closely relate to the amended divisions.</p>	
	




### Shared boundary between Abbey Division and Column and Sutton Division

LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
	
<p>LGBCE estimate</p> <p>Abbey – 3,950 (+10% variance)</p> <p>Column and Sutton – 3,729 (+4% variance)</p>	<p>Shropshire Council estimate this would mean moving 320 electors from Abbey to Column and Sutton</p>
	<p>This would entail moving the area of Armoury Gardens, St Giles Church and St Giles Road from Abbey Division into Column and Sutton Division. This is beneficial as it reduce slightly the size of the Abbey Division and allows the boundary to follow London Road rather than Much Wenlock Road.</p> <p>This will enable Abbey to absorb some of the development from Weir Hill, whilst retaining electoral equality.</p>

- 5.3. The proposed Bicton Heath electoral division will require a community governance review following the completion of this Shropshire Council Electoral Boundary Review.
- 5.4. The proposed Bicton Heath electoral division will require a community governance review following the completion of this Shropshire Council Electoral Boundary Review. Shropshire Council supports the boundary recommendations for Sundorne electoral division but proposes changing the name to “Sundorne and Old Heath” to reflect the two distinct communities of this division.

## Southern Shropshire





LGBCE Division	Councillors	Variance 2028	Shropshire Council Response
Clun	1	-8%	Yes, supported
Highley	1	-9%	Yes, supported
Ludlow North	1	-8%	Yes, supported
Craven Arms	1	3%	Yes, supported
Corvedale	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal provided.	
Brown Clee	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal provided.	
Broseley	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal provided.	
Much Wenlock	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal provided.	
Severn Valley	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal provided.	
Cleobury Mortimer	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal provided.	
Cleobury Mortimer Rural	1	Propose re-naming.	
Clee	1	Not supported. Alternative proposal provided.	
Ludlow East	1	Not supported. Minor boundary change proposed between Ludlow East and Ludlow South.	
Ludlow South	1		





## Broseley

- 5.4. Shropshire Council is supportive of moving the area of Jackfield (highlighted pink) into Much Wenlock electoral division. The Jackfield area is defined by the polling district LEC and the western section of polling district LEB. It is estimated this area would include 185 electors by 2028. This would enable the parish ward of Broseley Wood to be included into Broseley electoral division, whilst retaining electoral equality and community identity. It is estimated this area would include 248 electors by 2028.


LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
	
LGBCE estimate Broseley – 3,936 (+9% variance)	Shropshire Council estimate Broseley – 3,974 (+10.6%)

## Much Wenlock

LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
Includes the parishes of Church Preen, Kenley, Hughley, Harley, Much Wenlock, and Barrow. 	
LGBCE estimate Much Wenlock – 3,836 (+7% variance)	Shropshire Council estimate Much Wenlock – 3,720 (+3.5%)


- 5.5. It is difficult to appreciate the topography of Much Wenlock from just a virtual tour. As you leave Much Wenlock heading towards Harley, you have to travel over the National Trust's Wenlock Edge, which runs along the B4378 towards Church Stretton. This amazing natural feature is very popular with walker's and presents a natural boundary dividing Much Wenlock electoral division from Severn Valley, Burnell and Corvedale electoral divisions in the west.
- 5.6. Shropshire Council is therefore recommending that the parishes of Easthope, Stanton Long and Shipton be moved into Much Wenlock electoral division from the LGBCE proposed Brown Clee electoral division. The parish of Harley is recommended for inclusion in Severn Valley division and Church Preen, Hughley and Kenley parishes are recommended for inclusion into Burnell division.

### Map: Recommended changes to Broseley Electoral Division







## Map: Recommended changes to Broseley and Much Wenlock Electoral Division




## Cleobury Mortimer Rural (Stottesdon) and Cleobury Mortimer

- 5.7. Shropshire Council supports the boundary recommendations for Stottesdon electoral division but proposes changing the name to Cleobury Mortimer Rural to reflect the character of this division.
- 5.8. Shropshire Council recommends moving Nash and Boraston parishes from the proposed LGBCE Cleobury Mortimer electoral division into Clee electoral division. Nash and Boraston Parishes are currently located in Clee electoral division and have close linkages with neighbouring parishes of Burford, Greete, Whitton and Hope Bagot. The landscape is undulating, with country roads navigating through the Clee Hills, located in the South Shropshire Hill AONB.





LGBCE proposed boundary line Cleobury Mortimer	Shropshire Council suggested amendment Cleobury Mortimer
	
LGBCE estimate Cleobury Mortimer – 3,533 (-2% variance)	Shropshire Council estimate Cleobury Mortimer – 3,073 (+14.5%)

### Map: Recommended changes to Cleobury Mortimer electoral division



### Clee



5.9. As explained in paragraph 5.8, the Council recommends that Nash and Boraston parishes should be moved into the Clee electoral division. The impact of this is illustrated in the following table.

LGBCE proposed boundary line Clee	Shropshire Council suggested amendment Clee
	
LGBCE estimate Clee – 3,332 (-7% variance)	Shropshire Council estimate Clee – 3,767 (+4.8%)


## Severn Valley

- 5.10. Shropshire Council would like to recommend that the parishes of Cound and Harley should be included in Severn Valley electoral division. The communities are all closely linked via two well used roads and the River Sever. The A458 runs from through Much Wenlock towards Shrewsbury, navigating through Harley, Cressage, Cound and Berrington parishes. The B4380 / B5061 flows through the parishes of Leighton and Easton Constantine, Wroxeter and Uppington and Atcham heading towards Shrewsbury. The River Sever meanders between these two roads. Many of these rural parishes experience flooding during the winter / early spring.
- 5.11. Cound and Harley are located within the current Severn Valley electoral divisions. Harley, Cressage and Sheinton are currently in the same parish grouping.



LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
<p>Includes the parishes of Berrington, Atcham, Wroxeter and Uppington, Leighton and Eaton Constantine, Buildwas, Sheinton, Cressage.</p> 	 <p>It is proposed that Harley parish and Cound parish should also be included in Severn Valley electoral division.</p>
<p>LGBCE estimate Severn Valley – 3,529 (-2% variance)</p>	<p>Shropshire Council estimate Severn Valley – 3,935 (+9.5%)</p>

**Map: Recommended changes to Severn Valley electoral division to include Harley and Cound Parishes (highlighted in pink)**






## Corvedale

5.12. The LGBCE have proposed that Cardington Parish should be included in Corvedale electoral division. Shropshire Council is strongly opposed to this and recommends that Cardington Parish should be located in Burnell electoral division. This would make Corvedale electoral division consistent with the current arrangements, which function very well. It is estimated this would result in 3,104 electors by 2028, a variance of 13.6%.



5.13. The area covers 19,953 hectares (6.2% of Shropshire land area) and includes 12 civil parishes. It is the second largest proposed electoral division after Tern division. The land area of Corvedale division is covered by 80% of the South Shropshire Hills AONB and so only very small-scale development is permitted within Shropshire's current planning policy framework.



- 5.14. Corvedale has relatively high median house prices, and the affordability ratio of housing costs to household income levels is high. Therefore, it is difficult to envisage a sudden surge in population by 2028.
- 5.15. Shropshire Council believes the communities in Corvedale share a common rural identity and character and would be best served by being permitted to remain with the current electoral arrangements. It is only just below the LGBCE's criteria for achieving electoral equality, which the LGBCE have accepted as unavoidable in The Strettons (+11%) and Radbrook (+12%).
- 5.16. Before the LGBCE reach their final decision, it is important that the LGBCE understand the geography or topography of the Corvedale division and appreciate that each part of the division is separated from the rest by ranges of hills. If the LGBCE have the opportunity, the Council would encourage driving around Corvedale to appreciate its beautiful landscape and the natural boundaries that very much separate it from Cardington and neighbouring parishes to the east and south. The following maps illustrate this.
- 5.17. Cardington lies in a gap between Caradoc and the Lawley; driving to Apedale from Corvedale necessitates going over Wenlock Edge; and the southernmost four parishes lie either on or the other side of the range of the Brown Clee and Titterstone Clee often with very poor communications and very narrow lanes.
- 5.18. As the second largest division in the county; there seems little sense in expanding it further and stretching the administrative capacity of its Councillor. It appears that the LGBCE are basing their calculations on an urban model rather than trying to understand the complexities of servicing a large area with poor road connections and no public transport.
- 5.19. If the LGBCE determine to change their proposed Corvedale division and insist absorbing another parish the more logical approach is to expand the division to the east, taking in Shipton, Stanton Long and Easthope which together make up one combined parish council. These would have a stronger community of interest with the eastern Corvedale parishes than Cardington with the Apedale parishes (despite the parochial church council connections).




Cardington lies in a gap between Caradoc and the Lawley







Driving to Apedale from Corvedale necessitates going over Wenlock Edge





The southernmost four parishes lie either on or the other side of the range of the Brown Clee and Titterstone Clee





## **Clun**

- 5.20. Shropshire Council supports the proposed electoral division boundary for Clun. This will enable electoral equality in this very rural electoral division (3,289 electors, -8% variance). The only change from the present arrangements is that Mainstone civil parish is now included in Clun electoral division.


## **Brown Clee**

- 5.21. Shropshire Council recommends that Easthope, Stanton Long and Shipton civil parishes be moved from the LGBCE proposed Brown Clee electoral division into Much Wenlock division. These civil parishes make-up one grouped parish council and so it is logical to move them all. As indicated earlier these parishes have stronger links with Much Wenlock along the B4371 road that runs towards Church Stretton.
- 5.22. The LGBCE proposed division contains 18 civil parishes and covers an area of 16,300 hectares (5% of Shropshire's land area). By removing the civil parishes of Easthope, Stanton Long and Shipton, this will make representing Brown Clee a little bit more manageable. There are three main roads which navigate through Brown Clee division. The B4368 heading east towards Craven Arms, the B4364 heading towards Ludlow from Bridgnorth and the B4555 from Bridgnorth to Highley. Otherwise, the road network is just rural country roads.
- 5.23. The LGBCE raised a question about whether Chelmarsh and Eardington Parish Council's had more affinity with rural Brown Clee division or Highley electoral division. The Council has received confirmation from Chelmarsh Parish Council that the parish councillors have voted unanimously to be included in Brown Clee division. This is fully supported by Shropshire Council. Highley has its own unique character due to its mining heritage and location adjoining the River Severn.
- 5.24. The Council has also received confirmation that Burwarton Parish Council are submitting a response to the LGBCE. The Councillors met on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> July and agreed that the Parish of Burwarton should remain in Brown Clee electoral division.



LGBCE proposed boundary line	Shropshire Council suggested amendment
<p>Includes the parishes of Easthope, Shipton, Stanton Long, Monkthopton, Ditton Priors, Acton Round, Chetton, Astley Abbots, Neenton, Cleobury North, Burwarton, Chetton, Morville, Aston Eyre, Upton Cressett, Eardington, Chelmarsh, Glazeley, Deuxhill.</p> 	<p>It is recommended that Easthope, Stanton Long and Shipton civil parishes be moved from Brown Clee into Much Wenlock electoral division.</p> 
<p>LGBCE estimate Brown Clee – 3,874 (+8% variance)</p>	<p>Shropshire Council estimate Brown Clee – 3,494 (-2.8% variance)</p>

**Map: Shropshire Council recommendations for the LGBCE proposed Brown Clee electoral division**



## Recommended change to shared boundary between Ludlow South and Ludlow East


- 5.25. Shropshire Council recommends two minor changes to the shared boundary line between Ludlow East division and Ludlow South. These are set out in the following table.
- 5.26. The reasoning for change A is to retain community connectivity. The first mentioned estate road (feeds off the main road in Ludlow East) and so the community feel part of the same local area. Hence the agreement to transfer these to Ludlow East. The second set of estate roads using the same argument feed off the main road (Parys Road) which services the Ludlow South area. Also, just north of where Baker Close comes off this main road is a traffic calming build out which effectively narrows a section to single lane. This is also where the play park is and hence, they together provide an easily marked demarcation between Ludlow East and Ludlow South divisions.
- 5.27. To ensure electoral equality is maintained, it is recommended that the area of Rock Green (shown in map B) is moved from Ludlow South division to Ludlow East division. This is new development and although the A49 divides this from the rest of Ludlow East division, this community is very different in character to the other parts of the Rockgreen area. This small estate is closer in character and share many of the issues with the Ludlow East division. This would require a warding order for these houses. It is believed that Ludlow Town Council will be looking to incorporate these homes into its area under the next Community Governance Review.

### Shropshire Council suggested amendment



Change A

Area includes 231 electors.



Change B – Area includes 126 electors.

Change A. It is proposed that the small area of Baker Close, Vashon Close, Ballard Close and Corfield Road (highlighted in map A) should be moved from Ludlow East division to Ludlow South division.

Change B. It is proposed that the development at Rock Green Crescent, Ferney Avenue and Duncan Road (highlighted in map B) be moved into Ludlow East division from Ludlow South.

#### LGBCE estimate

Ludlow East – 3,403 (-5% variance)

Ludlow South – 3,407 (-5% variance)


#### Shropshire Council estimate

Ludlow East – 3,298 (-8.2% variance)

Ludlow South – 3,512 (-2.3% variance)




## Overview map showing the location of the changes



## Eastern Shropshire

LGBCE Division	Councillors	Variance 2028	Shropshire Council Response
Bridgnorth Rural	1	-10%	Yes, supported
Bridgnorth West & Tasley	1	-3%	Yes, supported
Bridgnorth East	1	-7%	Yes, supported
Bridgnorth Castle	1	-0.2	Yes, supported
Claverley & Worfield	1	-4%	Yes, supported
Shifnal North	1	Not supportive of the donut approach, but no alternative proposed.	
Shifnal South	1		
Shifnal Rural	1	Concerned about the size of the proposed division.	
Albrighton	1	Concerned about donut approach suggested, but no alternative proposed.	



**Map: LGBCE proposed electoral divisions for Shifnal North, Shifnal South, Shifnal Rural and Albrighton.**



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

- 6.1. In preparing the Council's recommendations in January 2023, the parameters set out in the LGBCE's guidance were followed in trying to create single member electoral divisions with electoral equality. This included avoiding the creation of doughnut electoral divisions<sup>1</sup>.

### **"Doughnut wards**

From time to time, we receive proposals for what we have called doughnut wards, where one ward, normally based on a small town, is completely surrounded by a rural ward. Generally speaking, the rationale sometimes put to us for such a warding pattern has been that it ensures urban and rural interests are separately represented. Such considerations do not form part of our statutory criteria. In any event, they ignore the tendency for the town to be the focus for the rural areas, for shopping, medical and other services. Indeed, rural communities to, for example, the north and south to the town area are likely to identify more with the town than with each other. Accordingly, we will not normally recommend such warding patterns unless it can be clearly demonstrated to us that they would better meet our statutory criteria than any other alternative pattern."

- 6.2. In the case of both Shifnal and Albrighton electoral division proposals, the LGBCE have adopted 'doughnut' divisions. Shropshire Council are concerned that Shifnal Rural will now cover such a large land area, including Sherrifhales, Tong, Boscobel, Donington, Boningale, Sutton Maddock, Ryton, Beckbury, Kemberton and Stockton Parishes, the rural area of Shifnal and Albrighton Rural parish ward. The area covers 13,545 hectares (4.2% of Shropshire Council's land area) and elector density of 0.25 electors per hectare (3,449, -4%). To drive from Beckbury to Heath Hill in the North a Councillor would have to travel on rural country roads and A roads either via Shifnal or Telford crossing the M54 and the A5.
- 6.3. It was suggested that a two-member division might work covering Albrighton and the southern rural parishes. However, this would not achieve electoral equality across Shifnal divisions. After exploring many options, the Council is not able to supply an alternative approach that would satisfy the requirements for electoral equality and retaining community identity in Shifnal and Albrighton. As a consequence, the LGBCE's recommendations are accepted.


## **Bridgnorth Rural, Bridgnorth West & Tasley, Bridgnorth Castle, Bridgnorth East**

- 6.4. The Council supports the LGBCE proposals for the Bridgnorth electoral divisions. The LGBCE raised a question regarding which division the area of Three Ashes Road, Farmland's Road, and Highfields Road, together with Portman's Way in Bridgnorth should be located in (highlighted on the following map). The Council can confirm that this area should be in Bridgnorth West and Tasley electoral division, as shown on the LGBCE's map.

---

<sup>1</sup> The LGBCE Electoral Reviews Technical Guidance, updated April 2022 (page 23, paragraph 4.57) - <https://www.lgbce.org.uk/sites/default/files/2023-03/technical-guidance-2021.pdf>

**Map: Confirmation that the highlighted area on this map should be located in Bridgnorth West and Tasley LGBCE proposed electoral division**



### Claverley and Worfield

6.5. The proposal for Claverley and Worfield is fully supported. These neighbouring areas are located in the Greenbelt and are criss-crossed by country lanes, small rural settlements, and the countryside. These areas are closely linked and share more similarities than placing Claverley with Alveley, as it the case currently.

*Please note with regard to the maps included: © Crown copyright and database rights 2022 OS 100049049. You are granted a non-exclusive, royalty free, revocable licence solely to view the Licensed Data for non-commercial purposes for the period during which Shropshire Council makes it available. You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute, sell or otherwise make available the Licensed Data to third parties in any form. Third party rights to enforce the terms of this licence shall be reserved to OS.*



## Appendix A: Forecast Electors (if suggested amendments accepted)

Electoral Division	Electors 2028	Variance (%)
Abbey Electoral Division	3,630	1.0
Albrighton Electoral Division	4,002	11.4
Bagley Electoral Division	3,901	8.5
Battlefield Electoral Division	3,342	-7.0
Bayston Hill Electoral Division	4,370	21.6
Belle Vue Electoral Division	3,512	-2.3
Bicton Heath Electoral Division	3,972	10.5
Bishop's Castle Electoral Division	3,198	-11.0
Bridgnorth Castle Electoral Division	3,588	-0.2
Bridgnorth East Electoral Division	3,360	-6.5
Bridgnorth Rural Electoral Division	3,232	-10.1
Bridgnorth West & Tasley Electoral Division	3,496	-2.7
Broseley Electoral Division	3,974	10.6
Brown Clee Electoral Division	3,494	-2.8
Burnell Electoral Division	3,749	+4.3
Castlefields & Ditherington Electoral Division	3,625	0.9
Cheswardine Electoral Division	3,572	-0.6
Chirbury & Worthen Electoral Division	3,263	-9.2
Claverley & Worfield Electoral Division	3,449	-4.0
Clee Electoral Division	3,767	4.8
Cleobury Mortimer Electoral Division	3,073	-14.5
Cleobury Rural Electoral Division	3,286	-8.6
Clun Electoral Division	3,289	-8.5
Column & Sutton Electoral Division	4,049	12.7
Copthorne Electoral Division	3,968	10.4
Corvedale Electoral Division	3,104	-13.6
Craven Arms Electoral Division	3,709	3.2
Ellesmere Urban Electoral Division	3,587	-0.2
Harlescott Electoral Division	3,412	-5.1
Highley Electoral Division	3,259	-9.3
Hodnet Electoral Division	3,341	-7.0
Llanymynech Electoral Division	3,775	5.0
Longden Electoral Division	3,535	-1.6
Loton Electoral Division	3,605	0.3
Ludlow East Electoral Division	3,298	-8.2
Ludlow North Electoral Division	3,321	-7.6
Ludlow South Electoral Division	3,512	-2.3
Market Drayton East & Rural Electoral Division	3,907	8.7
Market Drayton North Electoral Division	3,948	9.8
Market Drayton South Electoral Division	3,837	6.8

Electoral Division	Electors 2028	Variance (%)
Meole Electoral Division	3,746	4.2
Monkmoor Electoral Division	3,244	-9.7
Much Wenlock Electoral Division	3,720	3.5
Oswestry North-East Electoral Division	3,266	-9.1
Oswestry South-East Electoral Division	3,665	2.0
Oswestry South Electoral Division	3,600	0.2
Oswestry West Electoral Division	3,517	-2.1
Oteley & Reabrook Electoral Division	3,261	-9.3
Porthill Electoral Division	3,408	-5.2
Prees Electoral Division	3,797	5.6
Quarry & Coton Hill Electoral Division	3,488	-2.9
Radbrook Electoral Division	3,865	7.5
Rea Valley Electoral Division	3,819	6.3
Ruyton & Baschurch Electoral Division	3,900	8.5
Selattyn & Gobowen Electoral Division	3,605	0.3
Severn Valley Electoral Division	3,935	9.5
Shawbury Electoral Division	3,268	-9.1
Shifnal North Electoral Division	3,659	1.8
Shifnal Rural Electoral Division	3,449	-4.0
Shifnal South Electoral Division	3,385	-5.8
St Martin's and Western Rhyn Electoral Division	7,431	3.4
St Oswald Electoral Division	3,783	5.3
Sundorne and Old Heath Electoral Division	3,428	-4.6
Tern Electoral Division	3,542	-1.4
The Meres Electoral Division	3,253	-9.5
The Strettons Electoral Division	3,989	11.0
Underdale Electoral Division	3,343	-7.0
Wem Town, Wem Rural & Whixall Electoral Division	7,145	-0.6
Whitchurch North Electoral Division	3,902	8.6
Whitchurch South & Rural Electoral Division	3,381	-5.9
Whitchurch West Electoral Division	3,735	3.9
Whittington Electoral Division	3,797	5.6




## Appendix B: Evidence to support Shropshire Council’s Bayston Hill recommendations

Residents of Bayston Hill see themselves as distinct from Shrewsbury, but also to South Shropshire. As outlined the hill known as Lyth Hill separates Bayston Hill physically from the settlements of Conover and Acton Burnell, and those settlements look more towards Church Stretton as their service centre. Conover and Acton Burnell have their own Parish Council and community buildings, and schools, and are more rural communities based around agriculture and rural businesses, while Bayston Hill is very much a settlement and community in its own right.

### Shared Community Facilities and Interests

#### Key Facts

- The 2021 Census estimated Bayston Hill Parish had a resident population of 5,200 and 2,200 households.
- Approaching 30% of the population are aged over 65 years and 18,4% of residents are disabled under the equality act 2010 (influenced by The Vicarage Nursing Home – up to 52 residents.)
- 5.4% of households live in social housing, but 84.4% are owner occupiers (owned or owned with a mortgage). 96.6% of household live in houses or bungalows.
- 55.6% of residents age over 16 years are economically active in employment.
- Interestingly, 26% of residents worked mainly from home during the Covid pandemic.
- 44% of residents worked in professional / technical and managerial positions.




Based on the Spring 2023 School Census, **Oakmeadow Primary and Nursery School** had 424 pupils on their register. Of which 358 pupils came from their own catchment area (84.4%).

There is also Hillside House, Lyth Hill Nursery School.

Previously Bayston Hill had two smaller schools which have merged to form a larger school.

The **Beeches Medical Practice**, located in the centre of Bayston Hill, has 6,764 patients registered. The catchment area extends south to Conover but approaching 60% of patients registered live within the parish of Bayston Hill.

(<https://thebeechesmedicalpractice.co.uk/>) The Beeches has a sub-practice in Dorrington which serves the needs of more rural communities.

	<p>Bayston Hill has <b>Rowlands Pharmacy</b> (Lansdowne Road) which is open 9.00am-5.30pm Monday to Friday and 9.00-1.00pm. The pharmacy is always very busy.</p>
<p>The community is fortunate to have <b>Bayston Hill Dental Practice</b>, which is open Monday-Thursday.</p>	
<p><b>Bayston Hill (Mary Webb) Library</b> provides an important community resource. It is open every day of the week except Monday, Wednesday, and Sundays.</p>	
<p>The community benefits from a parade of shops including the Atlantic Fish Bar, a hairdresser, a charity shop, Zap Coffee shop, a Spar, ATM, the Shropshire Oven bakery, Mahim Indian Takeaway, Bayston Hill Food and Booze and Blue Bird Homecare Services and a vehicle repair shop. Nearby is the Quarry Veterinary Surgery, Violet James Boutique, Star Kitchen, Hong Kong City Chinese Takeaway, Blas &amp; Co pet shop and Daisy &amp; Tilly's Shop on the Hill. Bayston Hill residents are able to access key services without having to leave Bayston Hill making the community quite self-contained and autonomous.</p>	
<p>Bayston Hill Methodist Church, Bayston Hill Christ Church and Church Hall, Bayston Hill Memorial Hall, three public houses (The Three Fishes, The Compasses Inn and Beeches) all provide social centres for the local community.</p>	
<p><b>Community Groups</b> A less formal faith group regularly meets at the Memorial Hall. This also supports a range of community groups including the Women's Institute, Bayston Hill Reading Group, and fitness sessions. The Church Hall also runs coffee mornings and a playgroup. The Methodist Church runs the community art group.</p>	
<p>There is Bayston Hill 1<sup>st</sup> Scout and Guide Group including Beavers, one cub pack and two scout troops based at the community scout and guide hut.</p>	



### **Outdoor Leisure facilities**

The Parish Council manage the parish allotments, children's play areas (including Long Meadow), tennis / netball courts (including one floodlit macadam court), an Astro turf pitch, as sports playing field / complex, as well as a BMX, outdoor gym, and skateboard track. The community is fortunate to benefit from extensive playing field (including Stanley Park), which includes a crown green bowling pitch, actively used by the Bayston Hill Bowling Club which has 56 members. They also have ambitions to improve their facilities. Parris Pool is an accessible natural beauty spot that wheelchair users / people with push chairs can access.

The facilities mentioned are included in Shropshire Council's Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy (<https://www.shropshire.gov.uk/shropshire-leisure-time/project-development/playing-pitch-and-outdoor-sports-strategy-pposs/>). In terms of football, Bayston Hill has facilities to accommodate three adult teams, one youth team and a smaller 5v5 mini pitch. The pitches are mainly played to full capacity at peak times, with more capacity required. Shropshire Council is keen to support the Parish Council who are keen to build on-site ancillary facilities (i.e., additional changing rooms), improve pitch quality and car parking. The facility includes a small floodlit 3G pitch.

For a village, Bayston Hill has some very good sports facilities, that are fully supported and used by the local community. Bayston Hill Juniors football club runs free activities for children ages 6-16 year during the school holidays and is well supported. They have an under 6 team as well.

On the edge of Bayston Hill is Lyth Hill Countryside site and local nature reserve (<http://www.shropshiresgreatoutdoors.co.uk/site/lyth-hill-countryside-site/>). This site has spectacular views of the Shropshire Hill and provides many walking routes. These views inspired the work of the famous Shropshire author Mary Webb who used to live here.

### **Indoor Leisure facilities**

The community have access to Lythwood Sports Complex and a Bayston Hill Youth Club and community building.

### **Community News**

Bayston Hill parish has an active volunteer base, co-ordinated by the Village Association, which also produces its own regular newsletter called the Bayston Hill Villager magazine. This is distributed free of charge to over 2,500 homes in the Parish. It contains a mixture of community news and notices, as well as advertisements for local traders and businesses.

**Commercial businesses**

You only have to look at Google Maps to appreciate how many businesses are based in Bayston Hills from the Tarmac Bayston Hill Quarries which provide significant employment in the area. There is also a large motor vehicle dealer named Oak Garage and Welland Cars (second hand care sales) and an array of small traders and retailers. The 2011 Census data showed 11.4% of Bayston Hill residents were able to live and work within the community. In terms of jobs in Bayston Hill a quarter are filled by local residents.

**Community events**

The community held an Eco Week in June 2023 which included litter picking walks, a fayre at the school and events at the library, which were well attended. There are a few walk-round markets for people to sell stuff from their driveways. Last year Bayston and Lyth Hill 10k was held in July 2022. This was very well supported, and the event is now planned for 16<sup>th</sup> July 2023. An annual Christmas carol concert is held at the Parade.

**Bayston Hill Planning Policies**

As part of the development of the Shropshire Plan (2016-2038) (under examination) an assessment of local services and facilities, employment and public transport links was undertaken in order to identify community hubs in Shropshire. From this Bayston Hill was identified as a community hub and large urban village in a rural setting, distinct from Shrewsbury.

**Local Democracy**

The parish council elections have been uncontested in both 2017 and 2021, so it is difficult to demonstrate local participation in the democratic process. This suggests local people are content with the activity of the Parish Council. The community has a long-serving Councillor (since 1994) called Ted Clarke, who is heavily invested in supporting the health and well-being of Bayston Hill.