

# Shropshire

## Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

Email:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name: (Member of the public)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** Pulverbatch

I object to the proposed break up of Burnell Ward and the transfer of Pulverbatch Parish to Bishops Castle .

From a geographical aspect including social, spiritual, road and rail transport , retail and employment facilities, Pulverbatch looks to Shrewsbury rather than Bishop's Castle . There are relatively poor roads , no public transport and virtually no education , or social links to that town.

Local shops and post offices to Pulverbatch are in Dorrington , Longden and Pontesbury ; the primary school is at Longden and the main secondary schools serving the Parish are easily accessible on the south side of Shrewsbury, or otherwise in Pontesbury.

I'm told that Burnell is the 'ideal size' for a ward , with about 3,500 voting residents, and to keep it as it is has universal cross-party Member support . So 'if it ain't broke why try to fix it ' ?

I understand that the problems lie with neighbouring wards ; Bayston Hill is too small for two Councillors and too large for one ; Bishops Castle also has too low a voting population (although I don't think that the proposals take into account the current investment in new employment which should lead to growth there ) .

If it essential that Burnell is broken up then a more logical solution might be to combine Pulverbatch with Longden and Hookagate , Dorrington and Condover ?

With the expansion of the Shrewsbury urban area to the south and west (Oteley Road , Radbrook, Bicton , etc ) is there more scope to take this into account , incorporating an extension of the Shrewsbury Town Council administrative area ?

Thanks for the opportunity to comment .

## Attached Documents:

*None attached*