

**From:** Griffiths, Phil <Phil.Griffiths@telford.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 May 2022 17:38  
**To:** Rutherford, Tom  
**Cc:** reviews  
**Subject:** Council Submission - Borough Warding  
**Attachments:** LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.cpg; LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.dbf; LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.prg; LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.sbn; LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.sbx; LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.shp; LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.shp.xml; LGBCE\_Draft13\_12\_21\_TelfordProposal.shx; Telford & Wrekin Final Submission Borough Warding 090522.pdf

**Categories:** Submissions, [REDACTED]

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

Regards,

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



[www.telford.gov.uk](http://www.telford.gov.uk)



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

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

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

#### Email Security

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

## **BOROUGH ELECTORAL REVIEW**

### **TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL - WARDING PATTERN SUBMISSION**

#### **RESPONSE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (LGBCE) DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

**9 MAY 2022**

#### **1. SUMMARY OF MAIN PROPOSALS**

1.1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) commenced an Electoral review of the Borough in May 2021. The Commission intends that the outcome of the review will be in place for local elections which are scheduled for May 2023. Initial consultation took place on an appropriate council size, LGBCE opted for a Council size remaining at 54. They then sought initial submissions on warding patterns and published draft recommendations in November 2021. Electorate projections produced by LGBCE at the beginning of the review forecast a Borough electorate of 147,062 by 2027. The average number of electors per councillor being 2,723 for a 54 member Council.

1.2 Members of the council's Boundary Review Committee have met regularly to work towards the submission of a warding pattern for the Borough. An initial warding pattern was submitted before draft recommendations were published and the Committee has now recommended a further submission in response to those recommendations. The Council delegates authority to the Boundary Review Committee to make responses to Electoral Reviews on behalf of the Council. The Boundary Review Committee, is a politically-balanced committee comprising 7 Members from across the political groups within the Council. The overall warding pattern proposals contained in this submission have been supported by a majority of the cross-party Committee.

The Committee has considered the initial proposals of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and felt that, on the whole, the majority of those proposals were reasonable and represented community identities well.

However, there were a small number of wards where it was felt that the proposals were not in the interests of community identity and did not recognise how our communities identify with each other and to ensure efficient and effective local government.

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

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

1.4 Proposals include adjustments to a number of proposed wards to allow better community identity and provide effective local government for those wards

1.5 Apley Castle ward should be retained as a single member ward, separate from Hadley & Leegomery to better reflect the differing community identities between these areas and provide more effective local government for residents of these areas.

1.6 Hadley & Leegomery. Proposals move parts of Hadley & Leegomery into a 2 member Apley Castle ward. Community identity for these areas would be better served by a single member Apley Castle ward and a larger Hadley & Leegomery ward

1.7 Lawley and Dawley & Aqueduct wards. The Council opposes the proposal to include part of Horsehay into the Dawley & Aqueduct ward. Under the wider proposals this area can only be placed in the Lawley ward, the area has no obvious affinity or connection with Dawley & Aqueduct. Our growth estimates show our proposed 3 member Lawley ward being close to

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

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

#### Naming proposals

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

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

## 2 **INFORMATION**

Average estimated electorate per councillor 2027 based on LGBCE projections

2723 electors per councillor for 1 member ward

5446 electors per councillor for 2 seat ward

8169 electors per councillor for 3 seat ward

### **Proposed Warding Pattern for 54 member Council**

Name	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
1. Admaston & Bratton	1	2574	-5
2. Apley Castle	1	2764	2
3. Arleston & College	2	5366	-1
4. Brookside	1	3084	13
5. Church Aston & Lilleshall	1	2750	1
6. Dawley & Aqueduct	3	7388	-9
7. Donnington	2	5916	9
8. Edgmond	1	2514	-8
9. Ercall Magna	1	3021	11
10. Ercall	1	2501	-8
11. Hadley & Leegomery	3	8058	-1

12. Haygate & Park	2	5473	0
13. Horsehay & Lightmoor	1	2897	6
14. Ironbridge Gorge	1	2652	-3
15. Ketley	1	2826	4
16. Lawley	3	8163	0
17. Madeley & Sutton Hill	3	8060	-1
18. Malinslee & Dawley Bank	2	5713	5
19. Muxton	2	5128	-3
20. Newport East	1	2621	-4
21. Newport North	1	2667	-2
22. Newport South	1	2628	-3
23. Newport West	1	2866	5
24. Oakengates & Ketley Bank	3	8361	3
25. Overdale & The Rock	1	2918	7
26. Priorslee	2	5698	5
27. Shawburch & Dothill	2	4977	-7
28. St Georges	2	5692	5
29. The Nedge	3	8737	7
30. Woodside	2	5226	-4
31. Little Wenlock & Wrockwardine	1	2533	-7
32. Wrockwardine Wood & Trench	2	5064	-7
	<b>54</b>	<b>146924</b>	

Rationale for proposed warding arrangements

**1 Admaston & Bratton**

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance %
Admaston & Bratton	WAA	1	2574	-5

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

The Council supports this proposal

**2 Apley Castle**

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance %
Apley Castle	WAC	1	2876	6

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

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

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



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

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

### 3 Arleston & College

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

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

### 4 Brookside

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

The LGBCE proposed that the properties around Lake End Drive be taken out of Brookside and placed into The Nedge with Brookside, broadly following the ring road around the Brookside estate. This proposal would transfer electors from north of the ring road and from the Lake End Drive area to The Nedge. The Council accepts moving electors from north of the ring road to The Nedge but opposes moving Lake End Drive electors. The Council proposes retaining the Lake End Drive area within a single member Brookside ward. Whilst it is recognised that it sits outside the ring road, it is also significantly geographically detached from all other residential areas within The Nedge and elected Members report that those living in that area are more likely to look to the facilities in Brookside (shops and community centre) than elsewhere, particularly given the infrastructure network around that area and the distances to be driven or walked to reach any facilities contained within The Nedge.

Residents from Lake End Drive are engaged with the Brookside Community Centre which is located within a well-served parade of shops, close to the local primary school and the toddler's group which operates from the Community Centre. There are also pedestrian linkages with the remainder of the Council's proposed Brookside ward and, furthermore, the two main highways leading from the Lake End Drive area exit onto the ring road, the name of this road is Brookside Avenue – to suggest that the properties serviced by the two roads that are only accessible from Brookside Avenue falls into anything but Brookside is flawed reasoning. For road users, all entry points into Brookside lead from Brookside Avenue. Therefore, road users travelling from Lake End Drive to the rest of the Holmer Lake area would bypass natural routes leading to community facilities before reaching any facilities in the ward as proposed by the Commission.

The school located near Lake End Drive, although it is Holmer Lake Primary School, is attended by a high proportion of children from Brookside. The catchment area for this school covers approximately 80% of Brookside with the properties north of Holmer Farm Road being on the outermost reaches of the catchment area. Conversely, Grange Park Primary School, located to the north of Holmer Farm Road serves all of the Holmer Lake area and Stirchley with Lake End Drive properties being on the absolute periphery of the catchment area for that school.

These residents form part of the Brookside community and should be retained within the Borough ward. It is acknowledged that this places the ward slightly above the expected variance but would emphasise that joining these electors with The Nedge ward would not be in the interests of community identity or effective and convenient local government. It is also pertinent to note that representation for Brookside has been reduced from 2 seats to 1 under current proposals.

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

#### 5 Church Aston & Lilleshall

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

The Council accepts the proposals

#### 6 Dawley & Aqueduct

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Dawley & Aqueduct	TDA TDM TDY TDZ TDP	3	7388	-9

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

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

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

### 7 Donnington

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Donnington	WDE WDG WDO and part of TPW from Priorslee	2	5916	9

The Council accepts the proposals for Donnington ward

### 8 Edgmond

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

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

### 9 Ercall Magna

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Ercall Magna	WEM WEP WER WEW WEY WEZ	1	3021	11

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

### 10 Ercall

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

The Council supports the proposals for a revised Ercall ward

### 11 Hadley & Leegomery

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Hadley & Leegomery	WHL WHM	3	8014	-2

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 12 Haygate & Park

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

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

### 13 Horsehay & Lightmoor

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Horsehay & Lightmoor	THC	1	2897	6

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

#### 14 Ironbridge Gorge

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

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

#### 15 Ketley

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

The Council opposes the proposal to combine Ketley with Ketley Bank and further proposals affecting Oakengates and Wrockwardine Wood.

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



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

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

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

## 16 Lawley

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 17 Madeley & Sutton Hill

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

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

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

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

The engagement event carried out in April indicated that:-

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

Further rationale is as follows:-

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

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

### 18 Malinslee & Dawley Bank

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Malinslee & Dawley Bank	TME TMG TMH TML TLE	2	5713	5

The Council accepts the proposals for Malinslee & Dawley Bank

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

### 19 Muxton

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Muxton	WMH WMM WMO	2	5216	-6

The Council supports the proposals for Muxton.

### 20 Newport East

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Newport East *	WNE and takes 415 from WNS	1	2621	-4

### 21 Newport North

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Newport North *	WNN	1	2667	-2

### 22 Newport South

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

### 23 Newport West

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

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

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

## 24 Oakengates & Ketley Bank

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Oakengates & Ketley Bank	TOE TOH TOO TOT TOW part TKY from Ketley WOB WOL	3	8361	2

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

### 25 Overdale & The Rock

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

The Council supports the proposals

### 26 Priorslee

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Priorslee	TPP TPR TSS	2	5698	5

The Council supports the proposals

### 27 Shawburch & Dothill

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Shawburch & Dothill	WSH and WDT	2	4977	-9

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

### 28 St Georges

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
St Georges	TSE TSG TSP TSW part TPW, TPG TPZ from Priorslee	2	5692	5

The Council accepts the proposals

### 29 The Nedge

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

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

### 30 Woodside

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Woodside	TWO part TIH from Ironbridge part THC from Horsehay	2	5226	-4

The Council supports the proposals

### 31 Little Wenlock & Wrockwardine

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Wrockwardine	WWC WWD WVN WVR Gives WWL to new Lawley	1	2533	-7

The Council accepts the proposals.

### 32 Wrockwardine Wood & Trench

Name	Current Polling districts	Seats	2027 electors	Variance
Wrockwardine Wood & Trench	TWR TWT	2	5064	-7

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

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

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