APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE OF CONSULTATION ON PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL ELECTION COSTS

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
1.	Clive Parish Council	✓			
2.	Clungunford Parish Council	✓			Would like to see a variable rate for counting votes and a cap on the cost of a contested election at, say, £800.
3.	Hodnet Parish Council	✓			Concern about the exorbitant cost of a contested election and consider that the solution is to ensure a non-contested election.
4.	West Felton Parish Council	✓			

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
1.	Church Stretton Parish Council		✓		
2.	Condover Parish Council		✓		Expressed concern over the level of precept required to provide for an all out election and would prefer to see a deferred payment arrangement introduced so that the parish is billed for the costs in the following financial year. Option D is considered to be too complex to apply.
3.	Loppington Parish Council		✓		
4.	Montford Parish Council		✓		Regard the fee of £100 for an uncontested election and £655 for a contested election to be similar which were levied previously and are therefore acceptable.
5.	Rushbury Parish Council		✓		The charges outlined in Appendix C are regarded as fair and do not seem unlike the charges previously levied by South Shropshire District Council.
6.	Welshampton and Lyneal Parish Council		✓		Reluctantly accepts the charges but finds it hard to understand how the cost for an uncontested seat has risen by 25%.
7.	Worthen with Shelve Parish Council		✓		

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
1.	Culmington Parish Council			✓	

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
1.	Acton Burnell, Pitchford, Frodesley, Ruckley and Langley				Consider the proposed fees would provide extortionate and a massive increase over those previously levied by Shrewsbury and Atcham. The Parish is also concerned about the possibility of group parish councils being charged multiple fees and for the lack of a deferred payment arrangement.
2.	Astley Abbotts, Easthope, Shipton and Stanton Long and Ditton Priors Parish Councils				Concerned that large reserves will need to be held to cover the cost of the four yearly election. A sum is already kept in reserve but not enough to cover the costs now being proposed.
3.	Badger Parish Council				Proposals will result in a substantial and disproportionate rise in electoral costs to small councils which risk deterring democratic competition for vacant seats. In combined elections the share of costs attributable to parish/town councils in a division/ward should be apportioned on electoral numbers, although the total cost should not exceed 10% of a parish's precept.
4.	Berrington Parish Council				Have no clear preference but believe proposed charges too high.
5.	Billingsley Parish Council Aston Botterill, Burwarton & Cleobury North, Chetton, Eardington and Morville Parish Councils				Support the principle of one charge to cover small grouped and warded parish councils.

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
6.	Bishop's Castle Town Council				The sharing of costs for combined election seems reasonable, although it is felt that the parish/town councils should not bear any of the cost of poll cards or postage when combined elections are held. The estimated cost of casual vacancies could also deter parishes from encouraging people to stand for election.
7.	Boningale Parish Council				A small parish of less than 250 electors which has not held a contested election since the early 1980s but believes proposed fees are a disincentive to democracy. Suggest a flat fee for parishes below £500 (no figure given), or a nominal fee of £0.50 per elector.
8.	Bridgnorth and Shifnal SALC Area Committee				Consider the fees to be excessive. Financial problems for parish/town councils without precepted resources could arise.
9.	Broseley Parish Council				Expresses the view that the proposed fees appear to have escalated.
10.	Chelmarsh Parish Council				Parish Council did not find the information very clear and consider that an example would have been helpful.

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
11.	Church Pulverbatch Parish Council				Apparent conflict between the community strategy consultation which is trying to encourage local participation in democratic institutions and the increased cost of elections for small rural parish councils. Concern over the suggestion of increasing substantially these costs, as opposed to the being borne centrally.
12.	Great Hanwood Parish Council				Great concern over charging full cost in the year of an election. Costs seem to be high compared to those levied in May 2007 when a deferred payment arrangement was applied by the former SAB Council. Budgeting for a single election in any one year is unlikely to be sufficient to meet all eventualities. The Parish Council would like to see a scheme introduced which allowed parishes to build up a provision over three years. In the interim the cost could be capped at £1,000 in the year one, £1,500 in year two and £2,000 in year three, with the balance deferred to the following financial year.
13.	Hopesay Parish Council				The scale of the charges proposed which are substantial in relation to the present precept levied by most small councils, will discourage small councillors from promoting elections. A simple scale of fees would be the preferred option although a cap per elector set at, say, £2 per head, would be the most appropriate method for small parishes with less than 600 electors.

14.	Hopton Cangeford & Stoke St Milborough Parish Council				Democracy is not best served if candidates stand down to avoid the parish council having to pay election fees which will happen due to the sums proposed. Also, any reserve funds over and above the annual precept level will cause problems with auditors.
15.	Leyton and Eaton Constantine Parish				Identical response to Wroxter and Uppington.
	Longden Parish Council				Expresses dismay at the proposed costs and that the costs would have to be included in the precept which could mean a 50% increase in the precept.
16.	Morton, Corbet and Leebrockhurst Parish Council				Parish Council has never had a contested election in the last 12 years and have thus paid £80 per ward every four years for uncontested elections. To make provision in advance of a contested election in just one of the two wards would necessitate raising the precept disproportionately.
17.	Oswestry Rural Parish Council				The Parish Council ask that every effort is made to ensure that costs are kept as low as possible. Concern that a parish with five wards would be required to pay multiple fees. Council will reserve monies for elections in the future as it has in the past.
18.	Oswestry Town Council				Double charging should be removed; e.g. Returning Officer charges. As a principle Shropshire Council should meet all future parish/town council election costs to promote local democracy. It should also undertake the display of relevant material within the area in which the election is taking place.

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
19.	Quatt Malvern Parish Council				Considers there to be too many options and is appalled at the prospect of paying election costs.
20.	Ruyton-XI-Towns Parish Council				Concern over possible increase in costs and need to raise precept. Parish councils face challenge from the District Auditor when holding reserves this can be regarded as poor use of taxpayers' money. Shropshire Council should defer recharges to the following year to avoid funding difficulties.
21.	Stottesdon and Sidbury Parish Council				Recognises the need for change but feels the cost should be relevant and proportionate to parish size. Proposed charges should result in some parishes facing financial difficulties. Filled three vacancies during the last nine months by co-option.

	Name of Council	Preference of Option			Comments
		Option A	Option C	Option D	
22.	Wroxeter and Uppington Parish				Extreme concern over the cost of the proposal. The Parish Council considers that the proposed fees not only will discourage parish councils from holding elections and recruiting new councillors by this method but that they will promote the practice of co-opting parishioners at nil cost.