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Local Government Boundary Commission for England

Review Officer for Shropshire

LGBCE

PO Box 133

Blyth

NE24 9FE

10 July 2023

Dear Sirs

**Electoral Review of Shropshire Council**

I write further to recent correspondence in relation to your draft recommendations on the above review. We note your comments that your proposed electoral arrangements may also change Shrewsbury Town Council’s electoral arrangements.

We maintain our position that the Town Council Boundary should follow the geographical boundary of the A5/A49/Proposed Northwest Relief Road. Where the external Parish Boundaries meander across these primary roads, those residents do retain a greater sense of identity to Shrewsbury than the Parish Council areas they reside in. There is also an expectation that Shrewsbury Town Council will provide community infrastructure for these locations rather than the Parish Council they pay their Council Precept to.

We have incurred significant difficulty in appeasing residents who they believe are part of Shrewsbury on the Shrewsbury South Urban Extension that they do not live in Shrewsbury and as such we are not responsible for play. This has been further exacerbated by plans to add that parish council into the Ludlow Parliamentary Constituency.

I have appended your proposed map of the Shrewsbury Town Council boundary to this response showing the areas (in pink) we believe should be incorporated into the Shrewsbury Town Council Boundary and we will present this request to Shropshire Council when they undertake the Community Governance Review in the Autumn. From our discussions with colleagues of Shropshire Council they are fully supportive of our proposals given that this best meets our residents needs and their personal sense of community.

Critical to all of this is the need that the Town & Unitary Boundaries remain co-terminus with each other to ensure democratic cohesion across the town; again, this is something that the Town and Unitary are fully in agreement with.

We are aware of various representations around redistributing residents in the Radbrook Division into Copthorne, Bowbrook and Porthill given that this area is seeing the biggest direction of growth of any other Division.

We would however wish to make the following comments:

* Proposals of moving Ridgebourne Road and the portion of Roman Road and the top end of Radbrook Road (plus a couple of cul de sacs) into Porthill ward makes sense.
* The movement of the Oakfield Estate into Copthorne makes sense - this area IS in Copthorne.
* Proposals to relocate Alan Gutridge Drive, Radbrook Hall Court and Ryelands/Sandiway does not make sense as residents most definitely see themselves in Radbrook and identify as such.
* Proposals also keep the roads west and north of the Radbrook (NOT the Bowbrook as it is shown on Google Maps...) - Churchill Road, Falcons Way, Ravenscourt Walk and their associated cul de sacs - plus the newer development opposite the Royal Shrewsbury Hospital (which until 1977 was known as Copthorne Hospital, and still is to many people) which include Toronto Avenue, Seacole Way, Cavell Drive and their associated roads in Radbrook Division. These areas are however in Copthorne, their postal addresses include 'Mytton Oak Road, Copthorne, Shrewsbury' and they most definitely use the services of Copthorne than Radbrook.
* We would respectfully suggest that the areas bounded by the Radbrook water course and Radbrook Road, i.e. Alan Gutridge Drive, Radbrook Hall Court, the bottom end of Crowmeole Lane and Ryelands/Sandiway et al stay in Radbrook and the areas bounded by the Radbrook and Mytton Oak Road (going as far west as Falcons Way) go to Copthorne. The number of voters in the latter areas exceed the number of voters in the former area by roughly 100, which would also bring the variance within 10% - it is 12% under the Commission's own proposals.

We believe that the sense of community is hugely important to residents; not just the external boundary of them being in Shrewsbury but also the community hubs they connect most to.

We would respectfully ask that you reconsider your position not just about our external boundary but also address some of those anomalies that have been created both at unitary creation stage back in 2009 but also to address the larger picture of future development within the town.

We would be more than happy to discuss this with your staff.

Yours sincerely

Helen Ball BA (Hons) FSLCC

Town Clerk