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I am responding to the Birmingham Review.

Firstly I do feel that Sutton Coldfield should have a further councillor - it is quite possible with the large number of houses planned by the Council and which could be completed before 2021, that a new Whitehouse Common Ward could be created. The figures also appear to show, that we have a quota of 10.5 (as per figures supplied by our MP) and thus the numbers should be rounded up to eleven and not kept at ten.

I support the Conservative proposed changes for a range of reasons:

**Wylde Green** proposed ward does follow 'community lines' and from discussions with residents and the local neighbourhood forum is popular. The Conservative changes give the numbers required, with clear and understandable boundaries that don't run down the middle of roads.

**Walmley and Minworth Ward**. The moving of the Springfield Road Estate to Sutton Reddicap Ward makes great sense. This area cleaves more to Reddicap than to Walmley with residents shopping in the former area or Sutton and not Walmley. This fits with the intention of splitting down community lines. The boundaries themselves in this area are also much clearer and logical.

**Whitehouse Common.** The proposed new ward represents a distinct area and community, and should be treated as such. The Conservative proposals show that a new ward can be created accordingly with sensible boundaries and fitting the criteria for numbers of electors. Again from discussions with residents and a public meeting held this appears to be a popular proposal which would receive strong support.

Previous changes that I would support - Minworth residents clearly want to remain part of a Walmley Ward, and this is where their community belongs.

Best Wishes

Clr David Barrie

Find New Hall Conservatives on facebook, for all the latest news
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Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Oscott Ward  
Annotation 2: Kingstanding Ward  

Comment text:

As a resident of Sundridge Road, in Bandywood for 48 years, I have always lived in Oscott Ward, our area has always been in Oscott Ward. Therefore it should not be moved into Kingstanding now. Particularly when the area to the south of Hawthorn Road has previously been in Kingstanding Ward and is known as being part of Kingstanding Community. It shares a shopping centre, Hawthorn Road, has the same postcode, and its postal address is Kingstanding. Schools like Sundridge Primary School are made up of children from Oscott not Kingstanding area. The local clubs are connected to Oscott, the whole community knows that the boundary is Kingstanding Road and always has been. I hope the commission will therefore listen to local residents and keep us in Oscott Ward. Thank you

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I very much hope you will consider these changes.

Regards

Councillor Matt Bennett
Edgbaston Ward
Shadow Cabinet Member for Children & Family Services
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Please find letter attached

We write as Councillors of the Brandwood Ward regarding the new 'Monyhull Ward'

Below is a list of residents of Druids Heath who support our campaign to name the new ward currently called 'Monyhull Ward' 'Druids Heath and Monyhull Ward'.

Geographically, Druids Heath is the largest housing estate in Europe. It has clearly defined boundaries and the name derives from 'Drews Heath', after a family that farmed here in the mid 19th century.

Druids Heath is one of the most deprived areas in the country. We have finally got Government money for a regeneration plan, and as it has been so neglected we are hopeful this will result in significant regeneration in the near future. It would be a crying shame to lose the name from our political map at this time.

Whilst there is a strong community on Druids Heath with active community centres and residents who work together to help each other, citizens are working to feed their children and heat their homes, few are engaged with formal political process. It is utterly wrong that the Boundary Commission listens to those who have the luxury of time and skills to write letters and submissions and ignores those who are already marginalised - that is why we have tried to talk one-to-one with as many residents as we could, though not nearly as many as we would have liked to. Overwhelmingly, residents wanted their estate recognised within the new ward.

We ask you to reconsider and rename the ward 'Druids Heath & Monyhull'

Councillor Eva Phillips
Councillor Mike Leddy
Councillor Barry Henley

The information contained within this e-mail (and any attachment) sent by Birmingham City Council is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended only for the named recipient or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient please accept our apologies and notify the sender immediately. Unauthorised access, use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted and may be unlawful. Any e-mail including its content may be
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We write as Councillors of the Brandwood Ward regarding the new 'Monyhull Ward'

Below is a list of residents of Druids Heath who support our campaign to name the new ward currently called 'Monyhull Ward' 'Druids Heath and Monyhull Ward'.

Geographically, Druids Heath is the largest housing estate in Europe. It has clearly defined boundaries and the name derives from 'Drews Heath', after a family that farmed here in the mid 19th century.

Druids Heath is one of the most deprived areas in the country. We have finally got Government money for a regeneration plan, and as it has been so neglected we are hopeful this will result in significant regeneration in the near future. It would be a crying shame to lose the name from our political map at this time.

Whilst there is a strong community on Druids Heath with active community centres and residents who work together to help each other, citizens are working to feed their children and heat their homes, few are engaged with formal political process. It is utterly wrong that the Boundary Commission listens to those who have the luxury of time and skills to write letters and submissions and ignores those who are already marginalised - that is why we have tried to talk one-to-one with as many residents as we could, though not nearly as many as we would have liked to. Overwhelmingly, residents wanted their estate recognised within the new ward.

We ask you to reconsider and rename the ward 'Druids Heath & Monyhull'

Councillor Mike Leddy       Councillor Barry Henley       Councillor Eva Phillips
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Hepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Tapley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Garbett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Foxall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynold</td>
<td>Galway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Slater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Eustace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Pencheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Rees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Packer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Heath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; G</td>
<td>Hewitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Sturgess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Dutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; P</td>
<td>Buckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Hanslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Chisholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P</td>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sir

i've lived in Northfield all my life and have served as a Councillor in the Ward for twelve years. It's been a long time since I went to the local school or been part of the Northfield Scout Group but over the years I've seen many, many improvements to the area with our Parish Church and Schools playing a huge part in them.

St Laurence Church has always been at the heart of "Northfield Village". Together with the St Laurence Infant and Junior Schools they have encouraged community cohesion. The Schools, together with the St Laurence Pastoral Centre provide the meeting places for community groups for young and old alike. It is unthinkable that the Church and Pastoral Centre could be in a different electoral Ward to the Schools as they are so very closely linked.

Your suggestion that Northfield's Victoria Common should be split between two electoral Wards is unfathomable. My colleagues and I campaigned for three years to get improvements to the children's play equipment and the changing facilities on the Common. We also included fitness equipment, benches and a picnic area for local families to enjoy. These facilities are well used and any visitor to the Common will see how much they are all appreciated one way or another, all year round. On 2nd July 2016 the annual Northfield Carnival will be held on the Common supported by Northfield traders, Northfield's Schools and Northfield's residents.

Victoria Common is not just a patch of parkland, it's a well used community facility and I, for one, have no confidence in it remaining in its current well maintained state if it's upkeep is divided between two electoral Wards particularly as Bournville and Cotteridge have their own parks to maintain for residents local to their own areas.

I can't stress enough that the St Laurence Schools and Northfield's Victoria Common have absolutely nothing in common with Bournville, Cotteridge and Stirchley and would ask that you reconsider your decision to make them part of that Ward. There is a way of keeping them in Northfield Ward by returning to a pre 2004 Ward Boundary which used St Laurence Road, Cornfield Road and Innage Road as a dividing line to Bunbury Road.

COUNCILLOR RANDAL BREW OBE
14th June 2016

LGBCE
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
London, SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir

Changes to Birmingham Local Ward Boundaries

I wrote to you on 4th February 2016 to express my concerns and disappointment about your draft proposals to changes to local ward boundaries in Birmingham and, in particular, my own area, which you were proposing to make considerable changes to.

In your latest draft proposals you have taken into account that Northfield Shopping Centre, Northfield Institute and Northfield Library should be included in the Ward, "Northfield" but totally ignored the Northfield YMCA, the St Laurence Schools and, devastatingly you have decided to divide Northfield's Victoria Common in two, including part in Northfield and part in Bournville, Cotteridge and Stirchley.

As I said previously the area of Northfield forms a well established Ward within the B31 postcode. We’re proud of our community links, benefit from bus services and in the older part of Northfield, where I live, it is unthinkable that the link between St Laurence Church and the St Laurence Infant and Junior Schools should be broken as you are proposing.

Evidence suggests that as early as 1622 a school was held in St. Laurence Church. The Church was instrumental in building the "Northfield National School" (now Northfield Institute). The present junior school was opened in 1964 and the infant school in 1973. Your draft proposals would be, for the first time, separating the Church (Northfield Ward) and their Schools (Bournville, Cotteridge and Stirchley) which they have nothing in common with at all.

I can see that someone who does not know the area would look at a map and see what might be defined as a "natural border" when trying to reduce a Ward size. However, what your line drawing is actually doing is dividing not only historic links between our Church and their Schools, and Victoria Common but also dividing strong community links.
Northfield's Victoria Common was opened to the public in 1897. The park is at the heart of Northfield Town Centre and greatly valued by the local Northfield community. Each year it hosts Northfield events with the biggest being Northfield carnival bringing together traders, businesses and Northfield residents.

I've lived in my present home for forty years and I can assure you that we have absolutely no links with Bournville, Cotteridge and Stirchley and I would respectfully ask that you look again at your suggestion of splitting the St Laurence Church and the St Laurence Schools and put them, together with the whole of Victoria Common, back where they belong in Northfield Ward. This could be achieved by using a previous Ward boundary, as shown on the enclosed map.

Yours faithfully
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: deirdre alden
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Birmingham City Council

Comment text:

Comment from Cllr Deirdre Alden: I am pleased the Commission has listened over some of the changes previously made to Edgbaston Ward (the ward which I represent on the City Council). It is good that the chunk of residential Harborne has been taken out, and good that Edgbaston’s County Cricket Ground has been put back in. With regard to the part of the ward now hived off into a new North Edgbaston Ward (a better name than Summerfield I am pleased to say), I believe this ward should be split into two single member wards. The various components do not have anything in common with each other and it does not warrant being a two member ward therefore when most of the city is to be single member wards. I think there should be a one member ward called your proposed name of North Edgbaston which would cover the polling districts previously in Harborne and Edgbaston Wards, and also the polling district (previously in Ladywood Ward) which is around the northern boundary of the reservoir. The residents of these areas all consider themselves part of Edgbaston and I think almost entirely have an Edgbaston postal address despite having a B16 or B17 post code. That area would therefore make a sensible single member North Edgbaston Ward; and the other half of your proposed two member ward (which I believe was mostly in Soho ward formerly) could form a second single member ward with a different name. Cllr Deirdre Alden

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

I refer to the proposed revised boundaries for Harborne Ward.

I agree to Metchley Estate being retained in Harborne Ward rather than being transferred to Edgbaston Ward.

I do not however agree to Sir Richards Drive Estate being put into Harborne Ward from Quinton Ward as it has never been in Harborne Ward. It was however in the former Harborne and Quinton combined Ward many years ago.

I believe that Welsh House Farm Estate between West Boulevard, Tennal Road and the golf course should rejoin Harborne Ward as it was in the Ward until 2004.

If these two changes are made Harborne Ward will not be 11% oversize, as per your proposals.

This will be fair as on your proposals Harborne is the only Ward in the City that will be 11% oversize.

The information contained within this e-mail (and any attachment) sent by Birmingham City Council is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended only for the named recipient or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient please accept our apologies and notify the sender immediately. Unauthorised access, use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted and may be unlawful. Any e-mail including its content may be monitored and used by Birmingham City Council for reasons of security and for monitoring internal compliance with the office policy on staff use. E-mail blocking software may also be used. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the originator and do not necessarily represent those of Birmingham City Council. We cannot guarantee that this message or any attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted and amended.
Dear Commission,

I write as a ward Councillor for Erdington Ward. I have represented the Erdington Ward since 2006, I live locally and my family has been involved in Erdington since the 1970’s. I have been inundated by residents who have been extremely distressed by the proposal to break up the Erdington area. While we are grateful the commission made some changes for this consultation there is still a sense of upset locally that part of the core Erdington area is being left out of the proposed ward.

Locally we are very proud of the place we call home. Erdington, which was in the Doomsday Book, is an area of huge heritage and character. With a collection of listed buildings from the Conservative Club on Orchard Road, to the Abbey on Sutton Road, down past the 17th Century Cottages on Station Road to Stuart Court on Gravelly Lane and the Erdington coat of arms on Birmingham/Sutton Road. These and more, combined with the Victorian housing which built up around the Erdington Train Station form a key part of the identity of Erdington and the proposed Conservation Zone.

It would be unthinkable for an Erdington not to contain all this history.

From Court Lane to Grange Road everyone in between would clearly consider themselves to be part of our Erdington Community.

Over the last few months many residents have been vocal in helping the North Birmingham Community Together Group campaign to save the local community area. I think it is clear from the efforts the people involved have gone to, just how strongly Erdington and the surround area feels about the draft proposals. I therefore ask the Commission to support the alternative scheme for the Erdington area the North Birmingham Community Together Group have put forward. There changes would safeguard the Erdington community protecting our character and identity. Therefore Erdington should be represented by a ward which covers the area between Court Lane to the West, down part of Short Heath Road to Station Road, down Summer Road, left down Wood End Road at Six Ways island, then along Kingsbury Road, up Holly Lane and then through the playing fields to the back of Woodcote Road and then north to the border with Sutton, along the backs of Berwood Farm Road, down Harman Road and continue along the Sutton Coldfield border until you are back at Court Lane.

Please see the following maps as part of my submission to the boundary commission consultation.

Cllr Robert Alden
Erdington Ward

Please take pride in Erdington – Don’t drop litter
Draft Conservative Response to Boundary Commission Proposal

Key
- Boundary Commission Proposal
- Conservative Group Response

© Crown Copyright and database right 2018 ( Except for the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988). You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.
From
Cllr. Peter Griffiths

To the Boundary Commission England

10.6.16

In respect of Consultation on amended proposals for Birmingham City Council boundaries 2018 onwards

Thank you for considering the suggestions brought forward in the first consultation period. The revisions that you have made in the amended proposals incorporate many of those suggested by residents and organisations in the South of the City and so I am content to endorse them. Most of the changes use clear linear barriers which chime with the sense of community in the areas concerned. I understand the wish to incorporate as many single member wards as is realistic, not withstanding historical associations.

It is good that many of the amendments to ward names have reflected the comments from local residents. I am particularly pleased that the previous pre-eminence of Kings Norton has been recognised with a North and South ward, West Heath North and South have been created recognising the community structures in the area. Finally, it is right that one of the biggest regeneration areas in Europe is given inclusion in the new title of Longbridge, Rubery-Rednal ward.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Griffiths

Councillor Peter Griffiths, Kings Norton ward.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Gary Sambrook
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: Birmingham City Council

Feature Annotations

Map Features:
Annotation 1: Oscott
Annotation 2: Kingstanding
Comment text:
Dear Commission, I am writing to you as a Kingstanding ward Councillor. I have over the last year been speaking with many local residents and community groups concerning the proposed boundary changes. I am in broad agreement with the boundaries for Kingstanding ward, however I feel the swapping of two polling districts would be more representative of community links. I believe that Bandywood area should go back into Oscott Ward where it has always been, (Council polling districts CVA and CVB) and move the Kingstanding area (Council polling districts CVG and CVH) around Hawthorn Road shopping centre and Kingstanding Road back into Kingstanding Ward where it has community connections. These changes would allow for the whole of Hawthorn Road Shopping Centre to be in Kingstanding ward, which makes sense. Many of the residents who live in the area surrounding Hawthorn Road contact me, as they believe they live in Kingstanding. Bandywood, contrary to many some of the submissions you received for the last submission, has never been part of the Kingstanding ward. For as long as Oscott ward existed Bandywood has been a part of that ward. This can be easily researched from previous boundary maps. This is because of the estates strong links with the Pheassey Farm Park area around Queslett Road, which is similar in character and history. If these easy changes were to be made, it would be supported by many hundreds of local people, and community groups such as Hawthorn Road Traders Association, who currently find it very confusing and difficult to work among cross boundaries, whereas Bandywood has no cross-boundary groups. Yours sincerely, Cllr Gary Sambrook

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Ken Wood  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]  
Organisation Name: Birmingham City Council

**Comment text:**

As a Councillor in the Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield - New Hall Ward I witnessed at first hand the desire of local residents for the establishment of a Whitehouse Common Ward. The public meeting was extremely well attended and support was evident from all sides be they political, independent or otherwise. It is concerning that a) the request for this additional ward has been ignored despite the public desire for one b) in doing so I believe that there is a clear imbalance of electorate per councillor when compared with some other wards in the City and c) having received information that the constituency is apparently judged as being just 0.1 short of "qualifying" for the extra Ward I find it difficult to understand why when the margin is so close and growth is clearly predicted in an area where number of electors per household will be above average that the Commission is apparently prepared to take the risk that the numbers don't go over the qualifying line. Sutton Coldfield needs to have the same level of representation as elsewhere, its wards are already geographically bigger than most inner city wards and it also has the same right to have its communities recognised as other parts of the City. With this in mind I would request that the Commission look at the revised boundaries as proposed by the Conservative Group, boundaries that certainly in the Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield has cross community support and revise the Commissions boundaries to suit. Cllr Ken Wood  
Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield New Hall Ward

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Boundary Review

It has come to my attention from a review of your statistics that we would be under represented in terms of residents per ward under the terms of your current plan for 10 councillors. We actually have a 10.5 entitlement.

Your calculation:
electorate of 83765 in 2021. This has been divided by average electors of 8053 (average per Cllr of for 102 Cllrs) giving quota of 10.4. However with 11 Cllrs the average electors would be 7975..with extra Cllr. This would be 813401 (residents in 2021) divided by 102. This results in quota of 10.5. This should be rounded to 11 under the commission’s guidance. This extra Cllr to represent a ward in Whitehouse. Common.

I hope you will look on this favourably as I am sure you would want a fair and balanced representation for residents in Sutton Coldfield.

Kind Regards
Cllr Lyn Collin
Chair Vesey Ward
Sutton Coldfield

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Sir or Madam

Please find enclosed a letter from Councillors Marje Bridle, Mariam Khan and I, together with two substantial petitions from residents of the present Shard End and Washwood Heath Wards, regarding the draft proposals for the Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Ward.

A map, showing a proposed alternative boundary for the Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Ward (marked in orange) is also enclosed.

If you require hard copies of any of these documents, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

COUNCILLOR JOHN COTTON
Labour Councillor for Shard End Ward (including Tile Cross, Kitts Green, Lea Village & the Glebe)
Chair – Health, Wellbeing and the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Birmingham City Council

Keep up to date with the work I’m doing at www.johncotton.org. Follow me on Twitter: @CllrJohnCotton.

The information contained within this e-mail (and any attachment) sent by Birmingham City Council is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended only for the named recipient or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient please accept our apologies and notify the sender immediately. Unauthorised access, use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted and may be unlawful. Any e-mail including its content may be monitored and used by Birmingham City Council for reasons of security and for monitoring internal compliance with the office policy on staff use. E-mail blocking software may also be used. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the originator and do not necessarily represent those of Birmingham City Council. We cannot guarantee that this message or any
attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted and amended.

**********************************************************************
Our Ref: 1606/LGBCE

20 June 2016

The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir or Madam

Re: Proposed Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Ward

We refer to the proposed boundaries for the new Glebe Farm and Tile Cross Ward, as set out in the revised plans published by the Commission on 10 May 2016. The majority of the area incorporated within this proposed ward currently falls with our respective wards of Shard End and Washwood Heath. As the incumbent Councillors, we wish to raise a number of issues on behalf of our constituents.

There is a broad consensus amongst residents that the current Shard End Ward is an arbitrary construct that does not represent natural community boundaries. We accept the case that the River Cole is a far clearer boundary between the neighbourhood of Shard End and the communities of Tile Cross, Kitts Green and Glebe Farm to the south. Indeed, this would reinstate the far more sensible boundary that existed prior to the 1982 reorganisation and this aspect of the proposal is widely supported by residents.

Residents also support the proposals to reunite the Glebe Farm community within a single ward. This will rectify the problems caused by the decision in 2004 to split this community along its principal shopping area between two different wards. Bringing Glebe Farm into a single ward is clearly a sensible solution.

Cont.../
Equally, there is consensus that the three neighbourhoods of Glebe Farm, Kitts Green and Tile Cross should be brought together within a single ward. Whilst each of these neighbourhoods is a distinct entity, they are strongly connected by transport links, shared shopping areas and community facilities. They have a continuity and connectivity that is recognised by local residents.

On this note, we would suggest that the cohesive nature of the ward would be further strengthened by the inclusion of the Kitts Green neighbourhood in the name of the ward. Whilst we are aware that the Commission is reluctant to adopt convoluted names for wards, we do note that the revised proposals include a Longbridge and Rubery Rednal Ward in the south west of the city, in order to address concerns over the lack of recognition for the Longbridge community. We would suggest that the same arguments should be applied to extend recognition to Kitts Green.

However, there is one aspect of the proposals that we and our constituents do not support, namely, the inclusion of an area to the west of the River Cole, enclosed by Burney Lane, Alum Rock Road and Belchers Lane. There are no community, neighbourhood or physical links between this area and the rest of the proposed ward. It is separated from the Glebe Farm area by the River Cole, a main traffic interchange and a large industrial estate. It cannot be directly accessed from the rest of the proposed ward, without taking a journey around the very edge of the boundary.

Local residents are strongly opposed to this element of the plan, as the number of signatures on the enclosed petitions clearly demonstrates. It does not reflect local community identity, as residents living on Trefaord Lane, Bankdale Road, Cotterills Lane and adjoining roads very clearly identify themselves as residents of 'Ward End'.

The community residing on these roads has stronger community links with those who live across the other side of Alum Rock Road on roads such as Chetwynd Road, Thornton Road and St Agathas Road. The residents who live in the area west of the River Cole have strong affiliations with local neighbourhood services which will be based in the new 'Ward End ward' and they would be much better placed to be a part of that ward as opposed to Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Ward.

Residents who have signed the petition against the revised boundary proposals were surprised to hear that they could potentially be placed as living in Glebe Farm & Tile Cross as they felt there is no logical reason to link the two areas and they would want their roads to be included in the Ward End ward.

Incorporating the area into the proposed Glebe Farm and Tile Cross Ward, the Commission risks replicating the mistakes of previous boundary reviews and dividing, rather than uniting neighbourhoods.

Given this, we would propose that this area is instead included within Ward End and the River Cole is used as a boundary for both the north and western ends of the Glebe Farm

Cont.../
and Tile Cross Ward, joining with the railway line along the southern boundary. This would provide a geography that accurately reflects community connections and interests.

We are enclosing a substantial petition from residents supporting this alternative proposal. It is clear that this commands very wide support and we would urge you to listen carefully to the views of the people who live in the proposed ward before coming to any final decision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

COUNCILLOR MARJE BRIDLE
Shard End Ward

COUNCILLOR JOHN COTTON
Shard End Ward

COUNCILLOR MARIAM KHAN
Washwood Heath Ward
From: Councillor Ian Cruise
Sent: 09 June 2016 13:43
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Birmingham Ward Boundary review response
Importance: High

Please see the attached personal response to the Boundary Commission Birmingham further draft proposals

Kind regards

Councillor Ian Cruise
Independent - Longbridge Ward
Council House
Victoria Square
Birmingham
B1 1BB
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**********************************************************************
Councillor Ian Cruise – Longbridge Ward (Ind) - response to the Boundary Commission further draft recommendations, Birmingham City Council.

I would like the Boundary Commission to take into account the submission below, based on many years as a local resident, 6 years as a Ward Councillor, and my knowledge of the local areas/communities.

**Longbridge, Rubery & Rednal/West Heath South Ward**

Firstly I firmly agree that the name of Longbridge must be encompassed in a ward title. However, as a local Councillor and a resident of Rednal, I disagree with the ward boundary you currently propose. Rubery and Rednal has its own distinct history and identity separate from Longbridge. Also the area of Longbridge is currently split into 2 Council Wards, Longbridge and Northfield. In your draft proposals the area (not ward) of Longbridge is again split, into the new named Longbridge, Rubery and Rednal Ward and West Heath South.

The residents to the west of the proposed boundary, who’s postal and city district area is in Longbridge, will not take lightly to being shunted into West Heath South. It is time to bring the new Longbridge Town Centre (former Austin works), the MG/SAIC car factory and the City district of Longbridge into the same ward. Also the new housing currently under construction in the vicinity of Longbridge Town Centre and the increase in population will not cause any undue strain on the workload of the sole Ward Councillor.

**With this in mind I propose the following amendments to your recommendations:**

1: Move the proposed Longbridge, Rubery & Rednal Devon Way/Cross City Railway Line boundary with West Heath South, south to Lowhill Lane.

Change the proposed ward names to; (a) Longbridge & West Heath South and; (b) Rubery and Rednal.

By following this proposal, the identity of Longbridge, together with its Town Centre, Car Production and historical district will remain intact and together for the first time in years. Lowhill Lane/Cofton Park will form a natural boundary. It will also keep the identity of Rubery and Rednal, areas listed in the Domesday Book intact. Rubery/Rednal is also synonymous with Lickey Hills and Cofton Park and needs to keep its own identity.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Ian Cruise
Can I thank you for listening to local residents on the issue of keeping the Yardley name for our ward. Residents are very pleased with your decision.
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From: Councillor Andrew Hardie
Sent: 19 June 2016 22:57
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Birmingham Review

Dear Boundaries Commission,

I have spent almost my entire life in South West Birmingham, and went to Birmingham University; I have therefore spent a great deal of time in the Selly Oak area.

I would like to support the Conservative proposals for separate single member Wards in Bournbrook and Selly Park as these, to a great extent, are entirely different communities; the former is very largely student occupation, with many HMOs, whereas the latter contains a significant amount of owner occupation and includes the Selly Park Conservation area. It would be like mixing chalk and cheese to have these two distinct communities put into a single, two member Ward, and I would urge that the acceptance of two, single member Wards:

Bournbrook, and Selly Park.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Dr Andrew Hardie
(Vesey Ward)
From: Councillor Andrew Hardie
Sent: 19 June 2016 23:14
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Birmingham Review

FAO Boundaries Commissioner,

I would like to support the Conservative proposals for an additional Ward in Sutton Coldfield, that of Whitehouse Common, which is a distinct area; there would appear to have been a misunderstanding of the figures, as the average number of electors, with an extra, 11th Sutton Councillor, would be 7,975. Thus, 813401 (residents in 2021) divided by 102 (Councillors) is 7,974.519 (ie 7,975), leading to a quota for Sutton Coldfield of 10.5, which should be rounded up under the Commission’s guidance to 11. The Council is already planning for additional extensive building, and these might well be built earlier on current trends, adding further to the need for an extra seat in Sutton Coldfield.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Dr. Andrew Hardie
(Vesey Ward)
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Roger Harmer
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I am one of the Councillors for the current Acocks Green ward, where I also live. I was critical of your initial proposals for Acocks Green and am very pleased to see that you have listened to the concerns of the community and adjusted your proposals accordingly. I am happy to support the current proposed boundaries for Acocks Green as a major improvement, which keep much more of Acocks Green together in a two member ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Kath Hartley
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Ladywood Ward Councillor

Comment text:

Cllr. Kath Hartley responding as: - Councillor for the current Ladywood Ward - A resident of the Summerfield neighbourhood currently within the Soho Ward at [redacted] I am writing to reiterate my views expressed in my two submissions back in February 2016. The new Ladywood Ward I am pleased to see that you have not changed your proposals for the boundaries of the new Ladywood Ward and have kept the current Central Ladywood, Attwood Green and core City Centre communities intact as the 3 communities within the ward. Particularly, you have retained the St. Mark's neighbourhood with Central Ladywood and Ladywood Ward. Summerfield Ward Though I am pleased that you have kept the boundaries for this proposed new 2-member ward, I am very disappointed that you have changed its proposed name to 'North Edgbaston'. The Summerfield title is a far better, historical name for this wider area, less confusing, more meaningful to the majority of the community. The Hagley Rd. is a sound boundary between the new Ward and Edgbaston next door. Although the Reservoir bears the title of 'Edgbaston Reservoir', it has been in Ladywood Ward for many years and used to be called Rotton Park Reservoir. The neighbourhoods clustered around the reservoir in the new ward are best described as a whole as 'Summerfield' with links to the large Summerfield Park. Please revert to your original suggestion of Summerfield for the name of the new Ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Boundary Commission

We the three Councillors of Lozells and East Handsworth Ward are in agreement that Lozells and East Handsworth Ward should be split into two Wards rather than three.

We strongly feel that Handsworth and Birchfield Wards should be One Ward with two Members and be named Handsworth and Birchfield Ward.

Combining the two wards to create a two-member ward that is built on the usage of the park and the community identity, would be a much better solution for residents.

Many of the residents living in both wards identify as if they live in Handsworth, particularly the residents who live on the west side of the proposed Birchfield Ward near Handsworth Park. They feel that the new proposed warding arrangements break their Community Identity.

Only the most Eastern part of the Ward identifies with Birchfield, which is one of the reasons we feel that the two wards should be brought together as then everyone has their community identity contained within the ward name.

The park itself also has Handsworth Leisure Centre within it, which brings The Community together, for recreational purposes.

These Communities are also joined by their shopping habits centred on the Grove Lane Shopping Area, the Laurel Road Community Centre and also where people choose to pray and worship.

We hope that you will keep this Community together.

Yours sincerely

Cllrs Mahmood Hussain, Hendrina Quinnen & Waseem Zaffar

***********************************************************************
***********************************************************************
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: cllr Shabrana Hussain
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: cllr Birmingham city council

Comment text:

Cllr Hussain from Springfield ward. My constitution are not pleased with having Green road Grace well rd,Keel drive and Burke avenue being divided into two. This will lead to split representation at council level. Half of Green road and Gracewell road will be in Moseley Ward and the other half of Green Road and Burke Avenue and Keel drive will be in Sparkhill ward. Half of Green road that will be in Moseley has already benefited from the work of Sareholer residents in achieving what all households in the area said they would preferred it to be PART OF MOSELEY. The proposal is to split the community of 42 houses into different wards,around what is a virtually a country land and is not acceptable Those assigned to Sparkhill do not have direct access to Sparkhill, their access is through Moseley. We all have historical and cultural links to Moseley village. We have a similar links to Moseley Bog and Joy's Wood in our neighborhood. They have connections to Moseley school, St Bernard's Roman Catholic school and Moseley church of England school and have no connections to Sparkhill. The two sides of Green road, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive hold community events at times of national celebration. They closed the road and celebrated the HM Queens jubilee and are planning to hold a street party for the 90th birthday party. If the street was to be divided then the residents would be as if they there divided too. The residents would be ever so gratefull if you could have Green road, Gracewell road, Keel road and Burke avenue all on Moseley.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: timothy huxtable
Sent: 20 June 2016 23:00
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Birmingham

I wish to support the proposals to

1. Locate the "Kings Heath triangle" (i.e. Cartland Road nos 1-39, Priory Road, Bloomsbury Grove and Vicarage Road (even nos between the railway line and Cartland Road) all of which are currently in Bournville Ward within the new proposed Kings Heath Ward instead of the new proposed Stirchley Ward.

All the above roads have both B14 Kings Heath postcode (as opposed to the B30 postcode for the rest of Stirchley Ward) and are east of the Camp Hill Railway line, which is a strong boundary (as opposed to the rest of Stirchley Ward which is west of the railway line).

2. Keep all of Victoria Common and the roads immediately surrounding Victoria Common as well as St Laurence Primary School within the proposed Northfield Ward.

This area has historic links with Northfield and common sense dictates that all of Victoria Common (Northfield Park), the Royal Orthopaedic Hospital (ROH) and the parade of shops along the Bristol Road South between the ROH and Victoria Common should form part of the proposed Northfield Ward.

Yours faithfully

Timothy Huxtable

Councillor Timothy Huxtable
Bournville Ward
Birmingham City Council

Sent from my Windows Phone
Further to my email of 4th Feb earlier this year and the publication of your revised proposals, I regret that you continue to fail to make proper arrangements for the representation of electors in Sutton Coldfield.

Despite our original submissions, the Boundary Commission did not accept the two most important points concerning Sutton Coldfield, namely that your proposed boundaries do not make sense in the context of the actual communities and also that with only 10 councillors proposed in Sutton, we are left badly under represented compared to other parts of Birmingham.

The situation is exacerbated by the housing developments that we can expect to see in Sutton over the coming years, which you have only partly accounted for. In addition, there will no doubt be further smaller developments not yet contemplated. If the Boundary Commission were to add just 450 housing units to your assumptions, then we would automatically qualify for an additional ward.

Could I please ask you to once again reconsider your position.

For ease of reference, I have summarised below our proposals for the ward allocation in Sutton Coldfield which would better reflect the communities and, through the addition of a Whitehouse Common ward, provide fairer representation for the electors.

Cllr Meirion Jenkins
Sutton Four Oaks Ward : Birmingham City Council
Shadow cabinet member for value for money and efficiency

Council House Victoria Square
Birmingham B1 1BB

twitter: @meirionj
Sutton Mere Green:

We propose only a small change for this ward with Little Sutton moving into the Sutton Roughley Ward. This area, which runs off Dower Road and encompasses roads such as Ley Hill Road and Trinity Road, is only connected to Mere Green by one small road, Jordan Close and therefore is a much better fit with the Sutton Roughley Ward. This means that the busy Little Sutton Lane is no longer split between two wards. It also ensures that the boundary runs to the busy roundabout at Four Oaks Station, which forms an excellent natural boundary.

Sutton Four Oaks:

Here again we propose only a very small change which sees the busy A5127 Lichfield Road used as the boundary between the Tamworth Road (A453) junction and Four Oaks train station, with both acting as natural boundaries. This also moves the community of Doe Bank (around Norfolk Road and Rocklands Drive) into the Roughley Ward where it belongs.

Sutton Roughley:

This ward needs major changes with the proposed ward being two completely different communities. The proposals have a Roughley Ward with the communities of Roughley, Harvest Fields and Moor Hall and the wholly separate and barely connected areas of half of Whitehouse Common and half of the Defence Estates. These two completely separate and distinct areas of the ward as proposed are in fact only connected by one road, Weeford Road, which runs between a golf course and green belt land. Also these two areas are separated by the busy A453. Clearly this proposal divides communities.

The proposed ward does not include Little Sutton with which it shares a clear link.

We propose that the southern boundary should run along the Tamworth Road (A453) which, as an arterial road, is an ideal boundary. The boundary should use the Lichfield Road (A5127) as the boundary to the west up to Four Oaks station which runs off a roundabout. On one side of the Lichfield Road are a small run of houses and the relatively small estate of Doe Bank. On the other side is the private Four Oaks Estate (also known as Four Oaks Park) and thus the Lichfield Road seems a suitable place to run the boundary, finishing at the junction of the A5127 and the A453.

By making these adjustments, we would create a new ward of Whitehouse Common.

From: Meirion Jenkins
Sent: 04 February 2016 12:18
To: 'reviews@lgbce.org.uk' <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Objections to the Boundary Commission proposals for Sutton Coldfield

I wish to object to the Boundary Commission proposals for Sutton Coldfield.

The Boundary Commission have proposed that, on average, Birmingham city councillors in Sutton Coldfield should have over 600 more electors than in Birmingham generally. Indeed the proposals would mean that the smallest Birmingham ward might have only 60% of the electors per councillor that we would have to accept in Sutton. A fairer calculation, taking account of the population of Sutton, would suggest that there should be 11 councillors in Sutton Coldfield.

Having just 10 councillors will mean that Sutton Coldfield is under-represented on Birmingham City Council and it may affect Sutton’s future funding. I can report that I have received strong support from residents in my existing Four Oaks ward.
Further, the Conservative group on Birmingham City Council have submitted alternative plans which better reflect the local communities in the north of the area bounded by the Sutton Coldfield Parliamentary constituency, particularly around the Whitehouse Common area, this having been largely ignored by the Commission’s proposals. I support the Conservative group’s proposals.

Cllr Meirion Jenkins
Sutton Four Oaks Ward : Birmingham City Council
Shadow cabinet member for skills, learning & culture

Council House Victoria Square
Birmingham B1 1BB

twitter: @meirionj
Further to my email below of 4th June, it has been pointed out to me that there appears to be error in the calculation of the quota for Sutton Coldfield. The latest report from the Commission states that the 2021 electorate for Sutton Coldfield is 83,765. When divided by the average electors of 8,053, we arrive at a quota of 10.4. However, if Sutton were to have 11 councillors, then the average electors becomes 7,975. (813,401/102, i.e. number of residents in 2021 divided by number of councillors). The Sutton quota then becomes 10.5 which, under the guidelines, must be rounded to 11. Accordingly, Sutton Coldfield should have 11 councillors, thereby allowing a Whitehouse Common Ward to be created.

This important consideration should also be seen in light of the large number of houses being planned. Some may be built earlier than projected and there may be new permissions to be completed before 2021. For example, just this week, officers sent me information about plans to provide accommodation for an additional 65 residents to be constructed on the site of the former BMW dealership on the Lichfield Rd.

Cllr Meirion Jenkins
Sutton Four Oaks Ward : Birmingham City Council
Shadow cabinet member for value for money and efficiency

Council House Victoria Square
Birmingham B1 1BB
Further to my email of 4th Feb earlier this year and the publication of your revised proposals, I regret that you continue to fail to make proper arrangements for the representation of electors in Sutton Coldfield.

Despite our original submissions, the Boundary Commission did not accept the two most important points concerning Sutton Coldfield, namely that your proposed boundaries do not make sense in the context of the actual communities and also that with only 10 councillors proposed in Sutton, we are left badly under represented compared to other parts of Birmingham.

The situation is exacerbated by the housing developments that we can expect to see in Sutton over the coming years, which you have only partly accounted for. In addition, there will no doubt be further smaller developments not yet contemplated. If the Boundary Commission were to add just 450 housing units to your assumptions, then we would automatically qualify for an additional ward.

Could I please ask you to once again reconsider your position.

For ease of reference, I have summarised below our proposals for the ward allocation in Sutton Coldfield which would better reflect the communities and, through the addition of a Whitehouse Common ward, provide fairer representation for the electors.

Cllr Meirion Jenkins
Sutton Four Oaks Ward : Birmingham City Council
Shadow cabinet member for value for money and efficiency

Council House Victoria Square
Birmingham B1 1BB

Sutton Mere Green:

We propose only a small change for this ward with Little Sutton moving into the Sutton Roughley Ward. This area, which runs off Dower Road and encompasses roads such as Ley Hill Road and Trinity Road, is only connected to Mere Green by one small road, Jordan Close and therefore is a much better fit with the Sutton Roughley Ward. This means that the busy Little Sutton Lane is no longer split between two wards. It also ensures that the boundary runs to the busy roundabout at Four Oaks Station, which forms an excellent natural boundary.

Sutton Four Oaks:

Here again we propose only a very small change which sees the busy A5127 Lichfield Road used as the boundary between the Tamworth Road (A453) junction and Four Oaks train station, with both acting as natural boundaries. This also moves the community of Doe Bank (around Norfolk Road and Rocklands Drive) into the Roughley Ward where it belongs.

Sutton Roughley:
This ward needs major changes with the proposed ward being two completely different communities. The proposals have a Roughley Ward with the communities of Roughley, Harvest Fields and Moor Hall and the wholly separate and barely connected areas of half of Whitehouse Common and half of the Defence Estates. These two completely separate and distinct areas of the ward as proposed are in fact only connected by one road, Weeford Road, which runs between a golf course and green belt land. Also these two areas are separated by the busy A453. Clearly this proposal divides communities.

The proposed ward does not include Little Sutton with which it shares a clear link.

We propose that the southern boundary should run along the Tamworth Road (A453) which, as an arterial road, is an ideal boundary. The boundary should use the Lichfield Road (A5127) as the boundary to the west up to Four Oaks station which runs off a roundabout. On one side of the Lichfield Road are a small run of houses and the relatively small estate of Doe Bank. On the other is the private Four Oaks Estate (also known as Four Oaks Park) and thus the Lichfield Road seems a suitable place to run the boundary, finishing at the junction of the A5127 and the A453.

By making these adjustments, we would create a new ward of Whitehouse Common.

From: Meirion Jenkins
Sent: 04 February 2016 12:18
To: 'reviews@lgbce.org.uk' <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Objections to the Boundary Commission proposals for Sutton Coldfield

I wish to object to the Boundary Commission proposals for Sutton Coldfield.

The Boundary Commission have proposed that, on average, Birmingham city councillors in Sutton Coldfield should have over 600 more electors than in Birmingham generally. Indeed the proposals would mean that the smallest Birmingham ward might have only 60% of the electors per councillor that we would have to accept in Sutton. A fairer calculation, taking account of the population of Sutton, would suggest that there should be 11 councillors in Sutton Coldfield.

Having just 10 councillors will mean that Sutton Coldfield is under-represented on Birmingham City Council and it may affect Sutton’s future funding. I can report that I have received strong support from residents in my existing Four Oaks ward.

Further, the Conservative group on Birmingham City Council have submitted alternative plans which better reflect the local communities in the north of the area bounded by the Sutton Coldfield Parliamentary constituency, particularly around the Whitehouse Common area, this having been largely ignored by the Commission’s proposals. I support the Conservative group’s proposals.

Cllr Meirion Jenkins
Sutton Four Oaks Ward : Birmingham City Council
Shadow cabinet member for skills, learning & culture

Council House Victoria Square
Birmingham B1 1BB
From: Owen Jenkins
Sent: 07 June 2016 18:10
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: TEST Boundary changes; further consultation

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to you in relation to the proposed boundary changes being made to Birmingham and, in particular, their potentially unfair impact on Sutton Coldfield and its residents. According to the original proposals councillors in Sutton Coldfield would average over 600 more electors than in Birmingham; the proposals meant that the smallest Birmingham ward might have only 60% of the electors per councillor that we would have to accept in Sutton. Based on the population of our communities (Four Oaks, Mere Green, Town Centre, Wylde Green, Roughley, Whitehouse Common, Reddicap, Walmley, Minworth, Boldmere and Banners Gate) the proper representation would be 11 councillors.

Myself and the residents of Sutton Coldfield feel the Boundary Commission has not given proper consideration to the fact that with only 10 councillors proposed in Sutton, we would be badly underrepresented compared to the rest of Birmingham and we would also receive an inadequate level of funding and resources. This situation will be exasperated by planned housing developments in Sutton, if the Boundary Commission were to add just 450 housing units to its assumptions, then we would automatically qualify for an additional ward.

We feel that the Boundary Commission should give proper consideration to Sutton’s communities and ensure we are given the fair and proper amount of councillors to represent our ward, 11 rather than 10, and our proposals are as follows:

Sutton Mere Green:

We propose only a small change for this ward with the area known as Little Sutton moving into the Sutton Roughley Ward. This area which runs off Dower Road and encompasses roads such as Ley Hill Road and Trinity Road is only connected to Mere Green bar one small road – Jordan Close—and thus is a much better fit with the Sutton Roughley Ward. This also means that the busy Little Sutton Lane is no longer split between two wards. It also ensures that the boundary runs to the busy roundabout by Four Oaks Station which forms an excellent natural boundary.

Sutton Four Oaks:

Here again we propose only a very small change which sees the busy Lichfield Road, A5127 used as the boundary between the Tamworth Road (A453) junction and Four Oaks Train station, with both acting as very suitable natural boundaries. This also moves the community of Doe Bank (around Norfolk Road and Rocklands Drive) into the Roughley Ward where it belongs.

Sutton Roughley:

This ward needs major changes with the proposed ward being two completely different communities bolted together that are barely even connected. Your proposals have a Roughley Ward that comprised the communities of Roughley, Harvest Fields and Moor Hall with the wholly separate and barely connected areas of half (but not all) of Whitehouse Common and half (but not all) of the Defence Estates.

This proposed ward does not however include Little Sutton with which it shares a clear link. The two completely separate and distinct areas of the ward as proposed are in fact only connect by one solitary road – Weeford Road. On either side of Weeford Road are a golf course and a stretch of Green Belt land. It also saw these two areas separated by the busy A453. Clearly this proposal divided communities. The map below demonstrates this:

We propose that the Southern boundary run along the Tamworth Road (A453) which as an arterial road is a clear place to run a boundary. The boundary should use the Lichfield Road (the A5127) as the boundary to the West running up to Four
Oaks station which runs off a roundabout. On one side of the Lichfield Road are a small run of houses and a relatively small estate known as Doe Bank. On the other is the prestigious private Four Oaks Estate (also known as Four Oaks Park) and thus the Lichfield Road seems a suitable place to run the boundary, finishing at the junction of the A5127 and the A453.

Weeford Road is the only road connecting the part (but not all) of Whitehouse Common and the part (but not all) of the Defence Estates with Roughley and runs in between a Golf Course and Green Belt Land Moor Hall Golf Course.

By making these small adjustments, we would create a new ward of Whitehouse Common.

Cllr Owen Jenkins
Sutton Four Oaks Ward
Sutton Coldfield Town Council
Dear Sir

I fully support the submission made by Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents’ Group, in particular the support for the division of Sutton Park ward boundaries.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Paul Long (Independent)
Sutton Coldfield Town Council

www.ifsutton.org
Dear Sirs,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment once more on the proposed boundaries that aim to represent the communities of Royal Sutton Coldfield. I feel your proposals still result in Sutton Coldfield under represented on Birmingham City Council especially when you consider it is the second largest Constituency in Birmingham Council area by electorate, and by far the largest by area. The proposals still reduce the number of Councillors in Birmingham to ten despite the City Council planning to build over six thousand additional properties in our Town, the area deserves and warrants eleven Councillors instead of ten.

In the previous submissions political parties, community groups and the Town Council referendum group all joined forces to ask for eleven Councillors, I hope the commission will concur with the residents & agree their wishes should be met. Otherwise our wards will be hundreds of residents each larger than the average for the rest of the City. It should also be noted that over 130 residents of Sutton Coldfield wrote in echoing this need for fair representation and eleven Councillors for the Royal Town.

There are a number of developments have been given planning permission that have not been included by the Council, in their figurers they are:

- Development from 235 to 239 rectory road, Lutteral housing, new cul-de-sac planned.
- Signal Hayes Road, 110 houses, planning permission already granted.
- 1 new 5 bedroom being built on Gresley Close Four Oaks.
- 1 - 3 bed house Jordan Close Four Oaks.
- 6 bed house Weeford Road Four Oaks.
- Large home Lutterworth Road Four Oaks
- I bungalow Ladywood Road Four Oaks.
- Two new care homes proposed one for 538 Lichfield Road and one for 63-65 Penns Lane will add a further 150 plus residents to the numbers in Sutton Coldfield.

However most fundamentally I believe there has been a miscalculation in the numbers leading the reduction in quota for Sutton Coldfield. The latest report from the Commission states that the 2021 electorate for Sutton Coldfield is 83765 (I have shown above how that is already going up by the month). This has been divided by the average electors of 8053 (average per Councillor for 102 Councillors) leading to a quota of 10.4. However, if Sutton was given its eleventh Councillor as requested the average electors would be 7975 as there would be one extra Councillor. This number is 813401 divided by 102 i.e. number of residents in 2021 divided by number of Councillors. Doing this shows that Sutton Coldfield has a quota of 10.5 and so should be rounded to eleven Councillors not ten under the commissions guidance. This combined with the fact that a large number of houses being planned by the Council which could easily be built earlier than claimed so far on current trends as well as new permission due to be completed before 2021 show Sutton Coldfield should have eleven Councillors allowing a Whitehouse Common Ward to be created.
The Commission did look at the omission of the Whitehouse Common Community from the proposals and how it was being split. Unfortunately, the new draft still splits part of the neighbourhood forum area and leaves the community without a ward named after them. It is clear this community is large enough for a Councillor of their own and I would ask the commission to make the required changes to provide the eleventh Councillor for the Whitehouse Common area.

The commission has listened to community groups in Acocks Green and Moseley in this latest stage I ask that they also listen to the views of residents from Sutton Coldfield who have made it clear they would like the changes outlined above.

Kind regards

Ewan Mackey
Councillor for Sutton Trinity Ward
Like to see what’s going on follow us on
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Majid Mahmood
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Birmingham City Council

Comment text:

I was born, and bred in the Hodge Hill constituency, and have lived in the Hodge Hill ward for approximately 12 years. Having been elected as one of the councillors for the ward twice since 2011 with the largest majority on both occasions i feel i have an excellent relationship with the population of the ward, and know the area pretty well. If an option was available to keep the current ward of Hodge Hill, and indeed the current city wards i would be very much in favour. I find it hard to comprehend that other consultations across the country, and the councils where no recent consultation has taken place such as Worcester will have councillors representing far less than the proposals for the city. Birmingham is a unique city in that it is one of the most diverse in the country, and all areas have different levels of income so it will always be a difficult task to determine wards, and fair representation. With the impending West Midlands Combined Authority, a prediction of a population increase of approximately 18% by 2039, and aspirations to build 60,000 houses within 15 years will mean that any calculation of the electors is likely to be inaccurate. Hence i imagine if the question was asked of the population by way of a referendum i am convinced that the people of Birmingham would like to continue with their current wards, and number of councillors. It was only 12 years ago that the current ward boundaries were implemented. If the Boundary Commission is intent on going forward with the changes i would like to comment on the Hodge Hill ward specifically on behalf of residents based on the conversations that i have had with a wide range of individuals, and groups in the ward over the year or so. My submission on the basis that change is required is as follows: Bromford is a housing estate built on the old Bromford racecourse that closed in 1965. The electorate is approximately 5500 therefore to small to constitute a single ward. It has natural boundary with the M6 and Hodge Hill itself which has a population of approximately 11000 which is too large for a single ward so given that the two distinct areas share a postcode, and a long boundary together with roads named after the Bromford including Bromford Road, and Bromford Lane it is a natural fit. The Bromford itself has a residents group aptly named Bromford & Firs Neighbours together, and a Big Local trust which has a pot of £1 million therefore it is not an area that can be split to join another ward. The two distinct areas of Bromford & Firs have been part of the Hodge Hill ward for a number of years even before the last boundary change in 2004 so work extremely well together. There is a Housing Liaison Board that brings together residents from across the Hodge Hill ward is very active but the members primarily from the Bromford and Hodge Hill (not Ward End). The Hodge Hill Community Centre was established by the newly emerging Muslim community in the Bromford on Shawsdale which acts as a Community Hub for residents across the Hodge Hill and Bromford. The community centre attracts around 500 residents from the Bromford & Hodge Hill on a Friday prayer, and is the only established place of worship for Muslims in the Bromford, and the proposed Bromford & Hodge Hill ward. There are 3 churches that serve the the proposed Bromford & Hodge Hill ward namely Hodge Hill United Reform Church, Bromford Bridge, and a Hodge Hill Gospel church on Bucklands End Lane. It would be difficult to split the proposed two member ward of Bromford and Hodge Hill ward into two single wards as it would cut across the Hodge Hill community that is based around the Hodge Hill Common and consists of similar type housing, income levels, and ethnicity with large related families living on either side of the Coleshill Road who use the local amenities, and children attend the local schools. A natural boundary on one side is the M6 Solihull, M6 Caste Vale, the River Cole, and Alum Rock\Ward End which is at the quadrants on the Coleshill Road, Stechford Lane, Bromford Lane, and Washwood Heath Road. Historically the Fox and Goose as always be seen to be part of the larger Ward End estate, and not within the Hodge Hill boundary and the quadrant seen as the border between different communities. It makes real sense to create a single new ward of Ward End which would reunite the people of Ward End from across both sides of the Washwood Heath Road. This would involved bringing Ward End Library, Ward End park, Wardend Road, Ward End Primary school and Wardend Park Road within a single ward. The housing is primarily former council housing which is largely now privately owned with a largely Asian Muslim population much of whom is related across the current two wards. The area shares 7 mosques, and a number of churches with the congregations made up of residents in Ward End. The area was established by William Ward where the name of Ward derived from who also owned the Treaford estates where Treaford Lane is now situated. There is an active NWIP residents group which operates along the roads situated in the Ward End part of Hodge Hill but its members also form part of the Friends of Ward End park group with members from the Ward.
End part of the current Washwood Heath ward. The park is extremely important as it is used by both communities but decisions only made by the Washwood Heath councillors. The park has held a Ward End Mega Mela for the last 2 years that attracts approximately 15000 from both of the current ward but largely residents who would form part of the newly created Ward End ward. The area would also become very important with the HS2 rail link as it would be situated wholly within the Ward End ward so more could be done for the people of Ward End who would have to bear the majority of the impact of the rail line. The constituents of the Ward End ward would all share the same postcode of B8. The area at the bottom of Ward End ie Cotterills Lane is more suited with the newly created ward of Glebe Farm and Kitts Green has the population is made up of primarily council housing including two tower blocks with a catholic school which attracts pupils from the current Shard End ward. Not really sure why an objection was lodged from residents, and an elected member The areas share similar ethnic groups, housing, and income levels. The churches in the GB & KT are used by the residents around Cotterills Lane, and is a natural fit with the railway line. In conclusion I would prefer a status quo but if not possible the current proposals for a single member Ward End ward, and a two member ward of Bromford & Hodge Hill are welcomed based also on the submission of the Labour party. The submissions by both the Liberal Democrat, and Conservative would split the thriving community of Hodge Hill & Bromford both of which are very tight knit communities in their own way. For example i know of a number of extended families living across the Hodge Hill ward mainly of an Asian descent. Similarly in the Bromford & Firs we have a number of extended families mainly of an Irish, Somalian or English descent living across the Bromford. I have spoken to literally hundreds of residents who feel the same, and have encouraged them submit responses.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter McDonald
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I am the councillor for Rubery North (Peter McDonald) which is part of Bromsgrove District Council in the county of Worcestershire. My concern is that you are to name the ward next to the one I represent: Longbridge and Rubery Rednal. However, there are two wards in the district of Bromsgrove called Rubery South and Rubery North, in addition Rubery is in the district of Bromsgrove and naming wards as covering Rubery that are in Birmingham is going to cause some confusion. Therefore it would make sense not to use Rubery in the title of wards in Birmingham.
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None Uploaded
Dear Commissioner

I would firstly like to thank the LGBCE for amending its proposals in light of the overwhelming evidence provided by the people of Erdington in respect of the previous proposals for two single member wards for Erdington. I am pleased that the Commission has listened and has joined the two single member wards together into a two member ward and put Erdington’s historic centre, including Erdington Abbey, train station, Royal Mail Sorting Office and Erdington Police Station, back into the new proposed Erdington Ward.

However, I remain concerned that the Commission has overlooked the importance of Erdington north of the Chester Road, which it continues to suggest it should be put into Pype Hayes Ward. As many of the representations received from this area last time indicated, they identify themselves as part of Erdington, and this area has always been historically part of Erdington as it falls within the Erdington Parish boundary. I note that the Commission have stated it would not be possible to do this as it would leave the Pype Hayes Ward with too few electors, but a slight rejig of the polling districts could achieve this.

I would argue that to compensate for the moving of north of the Chester Road back into Erdington Ward, Birches Green should be added to the Pype Hayes Ward, as both areas are closely connected and have always been together under the previous Kingsbury Ward and current Tyburn Ward. Gravelly Hill is currently split by the Commission’s proposals into a single member Tyburn Ward and a two member Stockland Green Ward. Gravelly Hill can be united by adding the area to the east of the railway line into Tyburn Ward which would cover for Birches Green and keep a single member Tyburn Ward. Wyrley Birch and Brookvale Village can then be added to the new Stockland Green ward to keep it a two member ward, and this area is already part of the current Stockland Green Ward. Court Farm can then be added to the Perry Common Ward to compensate for the loss there, as Court Farm has much stronger ties to Perry Common than it does to Erdington Ward, as highlighted in the previous representations made.

The above changes would create a ward structure which is more reflective of the various communities within north Birmingham, especially Erdington and would also create a more sensible arrangement for Pype Hayes Ward and Erdington Ward. It is important that the part of Erdington north of the Chester Road is kept in Erdington Ward and I have put forward a sensible and feasible way of achieving this.

Cheers

Gareth

COUNCILLOR GARETH MOORE
Serving Abbey Fields, Erdington Village, Pitts Farm, Short Heath & Wylde Green - Working for ERDINGTON all year round!!!
Shadow Lead Member - Licensing & Public Protection Committee | Conservative Group Treasurer
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Dear Sir

I write again disappointed at the outcome of events.

The proposal still leaves the current whitehouse common area split. I have noticed bedford road is in one ward but whitehouse common school and surrounding estate in another effectively splitting a community. The Whitehouse common shops are part of the area of whitehouse common and should be in the same area as whitehouse common road and whitehouse common school and estate.

The estimate number for 2021 of 83765 I believe will be an under estimation given the number of planning applications cropping up, houses turned into care home back garden developments, back garden garage sites being converted into schools surplus council assets being sold for housing flats, and not the mention the development on the greenbelt of proposed 5000 to 6000 houses. So the estimate of 10.4 councillors will be over 10.5 which I believe under the rules should be rounded up to 11.

This would enable whitehouse common ward to be created.

Thanks

David

**********************************************************************
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***********************************************************************
From: Councillor Rob Pocock
Sent: 20 June 2016 10:14
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: FW: LGBCE

Ref Mark Cooper

Please find attached my comments on your latest consultation.

Could you please acknowledge receipt?

Rob

Councillor Rob Pocock
Community Campaigner, Sutton Vesey Ward – follow me on twitter @RobPocock1

***********************************************************************
***********************************************************************
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Monday, 20 June 2016

Dear Sirs

LGBCE Review: Sutton Coldfield – Vesey Ward proposals

In relation to your current proposals, I would like to support the proposals for Sutton Coldfield, with just one very minor modification relating to the North Eastern boundary of the Sutton Vesey Ward, which I represent on both the Birmingham City Council and the new Sutton Town Council.

The school sports area in the park at the very eastern end of Monmouth Drive as it reaches Somerville Road, is assigned in your proposals, to Trinity Ward. This small wedge of green recreation space, between Monmouth Drive and the wooded nature conservation land, should fall into Vesey, as its use is associated with various site management and car parking problems that have taken place affecting our Ward residents adjoining that site over the years.

For example the current Vesey Ward councillors have had to engage with the user groups for that site and discuss site modifications there, and the existing Sutton Vesey Ward Community Chest was used to fund the parking bays, and we might need to attend more to that in future.

So I am proposing that the LGBCE switch this small wedge of land from Trinity to Vesey, with the boundary now extending northwards by around 100m, to follow the small stream than runs through the wildlife area eastwards towards Wyndley Pool. No houses are involved so this should be uncontroversial.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Rob Pocock
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Victoria Quinn
E-mail: [obfuscated]
Postcode: [obfuscated]
Organisation Name: Birmingham City Council

Comment text:

The proposed Balsall Heath one Member Ward effectively splits an important and homogenous neighbourhood of Balsall Heath into two separate areas with the boundary line along Moseley Road. This community has been self identified for decades establishing important neighbourhood groups which have built cohesion in an area which has known significant shifts of newly arrived populations. The neighbourhood has at its centre a library and public baths which were created by the Balsall Heath school board. Most recently in October 2015 the area became one of the first in the country to hold a referendum establishing a Neighbourhood Development Plan area. All of these considerable community achievements will effectively be ruptured by the proposed boundary line which would place “half” of the Balsall Heath community (East of Moseley Road to Stoney Lane) into Sparkbrook Ward. A potential remedy to ensure that the community is kept as one, may be to extend the proposed Balsall Heath Ward Eastwards to encompass the population up to Stratford Road, from Camp Hill to Wilton Road. This would create a population geography for a Two Member Balsall Heath Ward and render the new Sparkbrook Ward as a One Member Ward, without any notable effects upon the Sparkbrook neighbourhood community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Commission, I am writing to you as a Kingstanding ward Councillor since 2014. I am supporting local residents and community groups who have contacted me concerning the proposed boundary changes. I agree with them that swapping two polling districts would be more better for community links. I believe that Bandywood area should go back into Oscott Ward where it has always been, (Council polling districts CVA and CVB) and move the Kingstanding area (Council polling districts CVG and CVH) around Hawthorn Road shopping centre and Kingstanding Road back into Kingstanding Ward where it has community connections. These changes fit within the electoral equality criteria and best reflect local links, it would help the Hawthorn Road Traders Association who are an important local group working to improve our local shopping area. Yours sincerely, Cllr Ron Storer
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: alex yip
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: BCC

Comment text:

Commission, As a Councillor representative of Sutton New Hall, I would like to again raise the point of Sutton Coldfield as a whole being under-represented by having only ten councillors reduced from twelve. I believe this will be very damaging to the representation to the area and deprive residents of a truly representative voice in the Birmingham City Council chamber. I would also seek to emphasise the importance of future proofing any boundary changes and to look to the future so that new boundaries are set as closely to community and historical ties, as well as looking forwards to planned developments. With the possibility of some 6000 houses being built in Sutton Coldfield representing some- if it is in the region of three per unit- possible 20,000 residents over the life time of the plan, I believe it to be paramount for the boundaries to reflect this imminent plan so that it does not become irrelevant before it has been bedded in. Fulfilling duties and looking at past changes across the history of the reviews, there is a sense of repetition where wards are reduced to single member, and then return to dual or tri-member wards. As a newly elected member I would certainly feel that my duties, effectiveness and ability is best severed by being in a ward supported by at least one other. I appreciate the importance of having one representative of one community and if this is clearly the case then there is a clear argument for this to remain. May I ask you to bear in mind where this is not necessarily the case for dual member wards to be supported as in the wider democratic good. I am glad to see the proposals are keeping the sutton constituency boundary intact. Of course I would hope to see this continued. thank you for your time in reading this, and best wishes and luck with your deliberations. Cllr Alex Yip JP Sutton New Hall ward
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