

# Shropshire

## Personal Details:

**Name:** [REDACTED]  
**Email:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** (Member of the public)

## Comment text:

Dear Sirs

I write to indicate my opposition to the suggestion that Pulverbatch should be moved from Burnell into Bishops Castle.

Pulverbatch has a strong community identity, comprising Wrenthall, Church Pulverbatch and Castle Pulverbatch. We have a church, a pub and a thriving village hall that regularly holds community events for occasions such as the Platinum Jubilee or Coronation. We have resident builders and electricians, and look to our community for services, such as farming assistance (shearing, haymaking, hedge trimming) before looking further afield. We have regular community events such as the Candlelight Carol Service and the Walking Nativity which are organised and performed by members of our community. A community has existed here since before the Domesday Book, and residents have a clear idea of where they fit into the landscape and area.

Geographically Bishops Castle is divided from Pulverbatch by the physical bulk of the Long Mynd. There are no bus links, no church links and no school links. Would a council member who was based in Bishops Castle be willing or able to attend a community meeting in Pulverbatch, half an hour away on a dark winter evening? While it is technically possible, Pulverbatch is far more likely to be better served by a local councillor who lives in the area. With the best will in the world, a councillor based in Bishops Castle will be remote and not connected to the issues that face residents of Pulverbatch. When Pulverbatch was subjected to a prolonged series of thefts from outbuildings, our local councillor, because of his local residence, was interested and motivated to assist the community deal with the problem and did so. A councillor living in Bishops Castle would not be so immediately affected and therefore would be less motivated to assist.

Pulverbatch is already being forced to change MP by being allocated to Ludlow, rather than Shrewsbury, for General Elections. If your proposals for Burnell Ward are implemented, half of the new "Burnell and Bayston Hill" area will be represented by one MP and the other half by a different MP which is unnecessarily confusing.

There is no synergy with Bayston Hill either, for Condover, Acton Burnell and Leebotwood/Longnor as they are all very rural, and Bayston Hill is distinctly urban, and would have far more in common with Reabrook being a similar type of community on the fringes of Shrewsbury.

It appears that the proposals in your review are being driven by numbers, rather than the consideration of local communities, their needs and identities. The numbers issue could be resolved by allocating Reabrook and Otley to Bayston Hill. Burnell does not need any changes, and should be left as it is, a group of rural villages with many issues in common, geographical proximity, and very little in common with more urban town areas.

Yours faithfully

## **Attached Documents:**

*None attached*