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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Anthony Illingsworth
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

The current proposal will break up Moseley into Balsall Heath, Cannon Hill and Kings Heath. The wards, I recognise, are an election vehicle but they also reflect communities. Moving the Moseley Church out of Moseley seems odd to say the least as it should sit at the centre in Moseley Village which will now be in an area which has no natural formation. Why was the natural community not taken into account? Very odd indeed. Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill is not a natural community, Kings Heath has extended to encroach into Moseley so no longer makes sense and Moseley is too small an area is not centred in Moseley. Moseley should include it's centre and it's golf club for example otherwise call it something else!

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

4th February 2016

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my serious opposition to the proposed changes of the boundaries for the Moseley Ward.

It is my sincere belief that the changes will effectively result in the heart and soul of the area being lost. At present, Moseley is a vibrant, united community which frequently features in articles and lists of places that reflect the pride of the nation. We have a harmonious and beautiful spirit and I am extremely concerned that the proposed changes will have a serious and long-term negative effect on this well balanced ward.

Please reconsider this change, as it is clear from local residents that it is totally unwanted, whatever the administrative or political motivations may be.

Yours faithfully,

Taheer Ilyas
Dear Sir / Madam,

I have been informed that Sarehole Road is being considered as part of the boundary change review and will - if passed - come under the Tyseley Ward.

I have been living in my home and the area of Hall Green for the past 9 years the result of this change will cost me dearly in a number of ways. I live in Sarehole Rd Hall Green changes to the boundary can devalue my property, effect the school catchment for my youngest child, it will take away our identity and confuse the local geography. Hall Green especially the area in and around Sarehole Rd is synonymous with Tolkien and the history and geography associated with this writer and his work. Tolkien is a huge part of the history of Birmingham City as whole and and a positive one again chAnges can cause confusion and devalue such historical relevance.

I am not sure what the benefits are to these changes and who in particular will benefit from them because from what I can gather it is NOT to the benefit of the actual residents of Hall Green.

I would like to know what I can do as a resident of the local Hall Green community to prevent these changes, ensure my views are are heard and at the very least be informed as to the decision making process of such changes.

Yours faithfully,
Mrs Najma Iman
Dear Sir/Madam, As a longstanding Moseley resident (over 9 years) I am very dismayed to see the LGBC’s proposed boundaries for Moseley, and the creation of a new Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. Moseley village should stay in the Moseley ward; it contains many essential community buildings (churches, pubs, the Moseley Exchange community building etc.) that local people identify as being in Moseley, not Balsall Heath. I support Moseley Forum’s proposed boundary changes to include Moseley village as well as local parks (Moseley Park, Cannon Hill Park etc.) in Moseley. Moseley has a unique history and identity and should not be split in two. If necessary it should be a two councillor ward. Moseley is not the only part of Birmingham to be adversely affected by these proposals. Other historic areas of Birmingham (e.g. Jewellery Quarter) should also retain their names and local identity. Hundreds of people went to Moseley Forum’s meeting about this in January and their voices must be heard. Yours faithfully, Chloe Ingram

None Uploaded
"We ask the commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham to represent a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, two member Kingstanding Ward, two member Oscott Ward, a Perry Common Ward, Pype Hayes Ward and a Stockland Green Ward. With the Erdington Ward borders running from Court Lane in the West, Sutton in the North, Pype Hayes and Holly Lane in the East and Kingsbury Road/Wood End Road in the South"

Hi, would you mind explaining to me what this is all about because I looks like another grand waste of time project you mp's are so good at.

Thanks
Julie
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Dr A Inguva
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I’ve heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from Moseley forum. I live at [redacted] and I strongly object to being in the proposed balsallheath / cannon hill Ward and strongly object to the split of Moseley into different Wards. The proposed boundary would choose a word destroy so much that the Moseley community has built up over many decades. The proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines. Your current proposal would dismantle a very well established community of place and will wreck local governance (local decisions by local people). The loss that would affect me most is me n my kids not belonging to our beloved Moseley community. • A Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance; • The partnership between the Moseley Society and Moseley councillors which created two Moseley conservation areas would be broken, and the volunteers who monitor planning applications would have a totally unnecessary increase in their workload; • The work of many years on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in a Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the effort by volunteers and council officers, made to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening of Moseley mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package; • The centre of Moseley must be in Moseley Ward; • Moseley Parish Church must be in Moseley Ward; • St Columba’s Church must be in Moseley Ward; • Moseley Park must be in Moseley Ward; • The Moseley Exchange must be in Moseley Ward; • The incredible number of Moseley volunteers who work for the Moseley community to nurture and develop the place they live in and love must not have their workload increased by the need to liaise with different ward councillors and officers. The volunteers may well give up. I feel most strongly about unnecessary problems caused. We in my family including share something special with this Moseley . They want to see Moseley as Moseley as it is now whilst they are growing up in years to come . Why change when a change is unnecessary and detrimental to the emotions of people who live here .. N without any added advantages of bringing such a change either economical or otherwise. It doesn't make sense . Moseley Forum / Moseley in Lights / the Moseley Exchange / The Moseley Society / Moseley in Bloom / Moseley Park & Pool / Moseley Interfaith Group / Moseley Festival / Sustainable Moseley / Moseley Arts Market / Moseley Farmers Market / Moseley B13 Magazine.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to add my voice to those opposing the latest proposals of boundary changes.

Moseley has a very special and unusual character, a historical village which has become the most popular place to live in in Birmingham. The proposals would mean the whole centre, shopping and historical with the parish church, would no longer be in Moseley. There is a very special, supportive and unified atmosphere which, if divided, would mean 5 different parishes with different councillors unable to produce a unified stand.

I ask you to please reconsider.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
The boundary changes for the whole of Birmingham. Thank you.
Yours faithfully,

P.S. I would no longer be able to put "Moseley" in my address. It would be "Balsall Heath" Cannon Hill."
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: abdul iqbal  
E-mail:  
Postcode:  

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

we,v been at [redacted] for 18 years the price of our house would affect the change of the area,s name of change also our car and house insurances, the legal document of purchase of the house and the price that we have paid is according the area hallgreen, this means there would be a reduction and loss of house investment and money, by law legal documents and according to the deeds that the banks hold morrgages would be affected, compensation order will be put in to place of loss of damages which the magna cater states in 1215 loss of financial investment in article 61, i strongerly oppose and condem such action takink place and will be made known to every individual in hallgreen mr mohammed iqbal

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
I am extremely distressed at the news that the historical leafy suburb of Hall Green where I have been a resident for 10 years is being proposed to be divided into 3. Hall Green South, Hall Green North and the third old historical part of Hall Green joining on with Tysley- an industrial area.

This is an absolute nonsense, under the proposal the Hall Green Community Church which is over a 100 years old and holds many events to bring the residents of Hall Green together will fall into Tysley! Also Hall Green Railway station, Hall Green Secondary school, Hall Green Parade and historical sarehole Mill will fall into Tysley- a complete nonsense.

Hall Green has a very inclusive and independent community, we are very proud of our togetherness and have many independent Hall Green business's. There is absolutely nothing in common with Tysley-.

To divide Hall Green into 3 will inevitably divide the community and the areas historical standing.

Again, Tysley- is an industrial estate and has nothing in common with Hall Green. I urge you to reconsider your proposal as there is not a single resident in Hall Green that I have met that is in favour of this.

If Hall Green must be divided then at worse it should be Hall north and Hall South. Or Hall Green North, south and central. Old historical Hall Green sites cannot be included within Tysley-.

I hope you take my comments seriously and reconsider your proposal. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yasar
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

1. Erdington should not be broken up
2. Perry Common & Witton Lodge is one I live perry common, I shop at Witton Lodge, Erdington High Street.
   They are all one.
3. Kingstanding should stay how it is because its handy, my kids go to Hawthorn Rd church it's close to home, Gravelly Hill is in Erdington so why brake it apart it doesn't make any sense to do that.

Government should leave it alone I live here nearly 3yrs and I'm getting use to the place and my kids.

Yours Sincerely

Name: Samantha Irish

Address: [Redacted]

Postcode: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

Phone number: [Redacted]
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it’s draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

The Birmingham Mail has printed a number of articles on the disgraceful proposed breaking up of North Birmingham Communities. Just some of the things the commission are proposing are; Erdington Railway and Police Stations and Erdington Abbey are proposed to be taken out of Erdington. Gravelly Hill has been wiped off the map. Bandywood is being ripped away from it’s Oscott community links. The clearly defined Kingstanding community is proposed to be broken up. While the proposed Perry Common area doesn’t even include all of Witton Lodge Road, but does include part of Wyrley Birch.

We have until the consultation closes on Feb 8th to make our voices heard—take action now!

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: bethany Isgrove
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I feel like you have ripped Birmingham apart. This must of been done by someone with zero common sense and lack of local knowledge. To place Moseley village in Balsall heath area, and hall green station not in hall green amongst various other things, makes no common sense whatsoever. I hope and pray common sense will prevail.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hello,

We are furious and outraged at the proposal to change our address from Hall green to Tyseley. When purchasing our property one of the major factors in our decision to purchase was that we would be living in Hall green.

The LG proposal will take away our identity, equity and render all that I have put into my property a waste. This is absolutely ridiculous and we strongly oppose this.

Mr & Mrs Islam
Dear sirs,

I am writing to you to express my utter shock at your appalling proposal to change the current boundaries of Hall Green, a charming, beautiful area in Birmingham which attracts more and more people every year; it is vital that you comprehend the problems and high level of confusion which shall be present if you do proceed with your current propositions.

One of the main infuriating issues that the Hall Green community has with the boundary changes is the loss of our historical, educational and cultural identity. I am sure you know of how Sarehole Mill has been one of the cores of our community and attraction for centuries, holding an immense amount of value in importance, knowledge and leisure. Thus, ripping apart this essential part of our history which has been with us for over 250 years is just simply a ludicrous idea. Furthermore, the boundary changes also mean that the Hall Green Secondary School, the Community Church and the Hall Green Railway Station will also be new parts of Tyseley. With all due respect, you must be deluded to believe that moving these buildings won't affect the residents of the area dearly, causing a range of hassle in terms of changing names and locational information - surely, it would be easier for everyone, including yourself, to leave it be?

As well as these points, I would like to raise how converting sections of Hall Green to Tyseley will also mean a loss in the area's personality. Tyseley is a completely opposite place from Hall Green, differentiating in cultural and historical features. It's horrendous to think the right thing to do is to merge the two together! The councillors of Hall Green have put forward some sensible proposals, where the name Hall Green remains in all 3 wards. I urge you to accept these proposals and reverse your bizarre, non sensical proposal.

I hope you have taken into account my valid thoughts on my neighbourhood's behalf and choose to reconsider your actions.

Yours,

Aleena
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Abdul Jabbar
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I feel as a home owner in Moseley village you need to re-think your boundary plans Iam the current owner of [REDACTED] Which is currently in Moseley village, Moseley village is a identified place around the whole of the U.K. And recently mentioned in national tabloids/news For its prestigines and named best place to live beating city’s in London like Mayfair I do not want Moseley village to lose all its history over night My opinion as a home owner I feel a boundary chance will also effect feuture business and residential home values SO PLEASE LEAVE THRIVING LEAFY MOSELEY VILLAGE ALONE AND STILL ON THE UK MAP!!!

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear sirs,

I would like to express my utter shock, disappointment and disgust at the proposed tear up of Hall Green. Hall Green is an historical suburb in Birmingham with many historical tourist attractions and strong hall green community.
To divide hall green into 3 elements is an utter nonsense and furthermore to call a section of historical Hall Green, where the Hall Green Community Church, Hall Green Railway station, Hall Green Parade and Hall Green School into Tyseley is beyond belief. What are you smoking over there?

We have worked extremely hard to develop the community and put on many events at Sarehole Mill and Hall Community Church to bring the community together, which we have been extremely successful in doing so and you want to tear up all of our years of hard work by tearing us apart and calling us Tyesley?!
We have had great councillors here in Hall Green where there were 3 people to deal with issues, there is always someone here to deal with local issues effectively.
I urge you to accept the proposals put forward by the Birmingham Councillors, where the name Hall Green remains in the 2 or 3 ward proposal put forward by the councillors and the jewels of Hall Green stay in Hall Green.

Unbelievable!!

Mrs Jabeen
Dear Sirs

As leaders of well-established and active Birmingham community groups from the North, South and South-East of Birmingham we have all noted the very strong opposition to these plans within our local communities. We have all witnessed well-attended meetings with virtually everyone who has spoken speaking against the plans - regardless of any personal political persuasion. We have had had plenty of offers of help and seen a huge uptake in model letters, petition forms and use of on-line petitions and hits on blog posts etc.

Whilst we agree that a number of proposed new ward names in the current proposal are insensitive confusing, and need a reconsideration, we want to stress that, contrary to a suggestion on a recent BBC TV news item, our main concerns are not centred around application of ward names.

Instead, communities are being pulled apart from those with whom they naturally have shared interests and instead pushed into places with those whose interests are of a different kind: centred upon different local facilities and landmarks, for example. These divisions are very real because community activists like ourselves work with particular councillors and attend their local ward meetings and those councillors attend various other meetings we run. There are long-term shared dialogues, and shared foci. In some cases communities will be split so that half the community will be in no position to (for example) lobby councillors over a development within a facility they use because their new councillor will no longer represents that facility which will be in a different ward. In other words rather than increased 'accountability' as has been suggested, in some cases there will be zero accountability. However, warm working relationships between councillors and residents working together on projects will also be destroyed.

Above all we would urge you to look most closely at those revised schemes which have been submitted by community groups and representatives and local individuals. We are aware that there are political party interests being urged in some cases, where it is known that certain parts of the electorate are likely to have particular political persuasions. We would therefore suggest that you give least weight to proposals which are from political parties, or to standard letters proposing a scheme which precisely mirrors that presented by a particular political party.

Signed

Michaela Matthews
Chair North Birmingham Together Neighbourhood Forum
David Isgrove
Vice-Chair of Moseley Forum and Chair of the Moseley Community Boundary Working Group

David Treadwell
Chair Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum

Julia Larden
Chair Acocks Green Focus Group

Jonathan Jaffa
Chair, Kings Heath Residents' Forum
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: MASUMA JAFRI
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Keep Hall Green in Hall Green...Not Tyseley Sir, Hall Green is an area of historic interest. And is well known for its Sarehole Mill, Hall Green school & College, Hall Green Station, Hall Green Parade, Hall Green united community Centre, etc. Alas we have to give them new names, Sorry it is too harsh for us. Local Government Boundary Commission can draw the new boundaries of the Electoral wards without changing the name of the area by adding or subtracting the numbers of voters in the E-wards. Sir, I hope that you will humbly consider the concerns of the Hall Green inhabitants. Thank you/ Masuma

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: TAMKIN JAFRI
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Please keep Hall Green in Hall Green... Not Tyseley, Because Hall is an area of historic interest, has its own existing community identity. The proposal will reduce effective local government. Please try to reorganise the boundary in such a way that the history & interest of the community be considered. thanks./

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** Duncan James
- **E-mail:** [redacted]
- **Postcode:** [redacted]
- **Organisation Name:** [redacted]

**Comment text:**

I object to the proposed changes to the boundaries in Birmingham, especially for Moseley. It would damage the community feel and identity of the area and split the conservation area in half. I feel strongly that Moseley village and Park and Pool, and other special areas, should remain in the Moseley ward boundary. I object to the proposal of a Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. Either leave the boundary as it was or use the Moseley Community Groups’ proposal.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:

IMPRRACTICAL

(DON'T MAKE SENSE)

Yours Sincerely

Name: Mr. GB JAMES
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone number: [Redacted]
North Birmingham Community Together

A collection of Community Groups, Forums, Associations and Residents demanding the Boundary Commission keeps our local communities together.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it’s draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.
The Birmingham Mail has printed a number of articles on the disgraceful proposed breaking up of North Birmingham Communities. Just some of the things the commission are proposing are: Erdington Railway and Police Stations and Erdington Abbey are proposed to be taken out of Erdington. Gravelly Hill has been wiped off the map. Bandywood is being ripped away from it’s Oscott community link. The clearly defined Kingstanding community is proposed to be broken up. While the proposed Perry Common area doesn’t even include all of Witton Lodge Road, but does include part of Wyrley Birch.

We have until the consultation closes on Feb 8th to make our voices heard—take action now!

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: James James
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

1: Moseley Village?

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Moseley Village?

Annotation 2:

Annotation 3:

Comment text:
I suppose if this area falls under Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Park, should we change the award winning farmers market (Best Farmers' market in the UK multiple times) from "Moseley" farmers' market to "Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Park" farmers' market? What about Moseley Park? Maybe that should change it's name. Oh and the Moseley Festival. Or all the other Moseley things that happen in that area. That area is the heart of Moseley, let's keep it that way. I can see how the line follows the railway line - which is a clear line and clear boundaries make sense, but not at the expense of current events, tradition, or history. What is considered Moseley should belong in Moseley.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Robert James
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

We've heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from friends and neighbours, but unfortunately were unable to attend the meeting. We live in [REDACTED], Moseley and strongly object to the proposal of Moseley being divided between five different wards. One of the reasons we moved to the area was because we loved the community feel of Moseley, and have enjoyed living here greatly. The proposed new boundary would completely destroy the community that has been built up over many years and will also destroy local governance. The thought of our beautiful conservation areas being split in half, really does seem unbelievable. We cannot believe that this has actually been proposed, and urge you to listen to the people who live in and love Moseley. We are proud to be part of Moseley, and everything that local people have worked so hard to build up and maintain over the years. If the boundaries change, and different wards need to liaise with each other, for example over Moseley in Bloom and Arts Festival, it will cause so many unnecessary difficulties for all the local volunteers. We repeat, we urge you to listen to the people of Moseley who have been doing a wonderful job together for so many years. Please do not destroy a thriving, happy community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Review Officer

We are B28

I am dead against the Council changing the boundaries in Birmingham, particularly the boundary changes affecting Hall Green to become the new ward Tysley. These changes also affect Moseley and Edgbaston and I do not feel they are necessary.

I was unable to attend the Hall Green Ward meeting on 19 January, but would like this letter to count as my vote against these changes.

Yours faithfully

R K James
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Miss Sophia James  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]  
Organisation Name: [redacted]

**Comment text:**

I was unpleasantly surprised to see the proposals for Birmingham. They look like they've been drawn by a child with no understanding of the city. Firstly, one Councillor per ward is a lot of work for one person and doesn't necessarily equal better representation, I actually think it would be worse. Secondly communities will be broken up with very unnatural lines. The new ward system doesn't consider which areas people identify themselves as living in and will cause issues, with schools and planning for example and when residents try to get support on issues they may now be dealing with a number of different wards and Councillors. At a time when the council is facing major cuts from the government, causing this much instability is completely ludicrous. Don't make the changes.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: J A
E-mail: 
Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

2: Don’t like the ‘Monyhull’ ward - Maypole would be preferred - Combine with Higher’s Heath to call it “Higher’s Heath & Maypole"

Annotation 1: Split Bartley Green from biggest Ward into Woodgate Valley and Bartley Green

Annotation 2: Don’t like the ‘Monyhull’ ward - Maypole would be preferred - Combine with Higher’s Heath to call it ”Higher’s Heath & Maypole”

Annotation 3: Could Turves Green be used rather than Northfield East

Annotation 4: Remove the West and just call it Northfield

Annotation 6: Add into Kings Heath - lose Brandwood name

Comment text:

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: J A

E-mail: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Split Bartley Green from biggest Ward into Woodgate Valley and Bartley Green

Annotation 2: Don't like the 'Monyhell' ward - Maypole would be preferred - Combine with Highet's Heath to call it "Highet's Heath & Maypole"

Annotation 3: Could Turves Green be used rather than Northfield East

Annotation 4: Remove the West and just call it Northfield

Annotation 5: Add into Kings Heath - lose Brandwood name

Comment text:

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: J A
E-mail:
Postcode:

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

1: Split Bartley Green from biggest Ward into Woodgate Valley and Bartley Green

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Split Bartley Green from biggest Ward into Woodgate Valley and Bartley Green

Annotation 2: Don't like the 'Monyhill' ward - Maypole would be preferred - Combine with Highet's Heath to call it 'Highet's Heath & Maypole'

Annotation 3: Could Turves Green be used rather than Northfield East

Annotation 4: Remove the West and just call it Northfield

Annotation 6: Add into Kings Heath - lose Brandwood name

Comment text:

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

* Residents would lose their community identity.
* Be exposed to new building works as the population density would be manipulated.
* Residents would lose established boundaries.
* It will be expensive for shops, businesses and individuals to have signs and stationary altered to suit this misguided proposal.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted]

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ben Jeffrey
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:
I live on [redacted] in Acocks Green and would strongly oppose the area being renamed Yardley West. I don't live in Yardley. Thanks.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Dear Sir

I understand that you have submitted a proposal for there to be 10 councillors in Sutton Coldfield. I am concerned that this will leave Sutton under-represented on Birmingham City Council. The number of residents per councillor in Sutton Coldfield will be significantly higher than in other parts of the city. I feel that 11 councillors would be more appropriate.

Further, I feel that more attention should be given to the division of communities in the northern part of Sutton Coldfield, in particular the Whitehouse Common area, which should have its own ward.

Yours faithfully
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. The result of these proposals would mean that the smallest Birmingham ward may have only 60% of the electors that currently reside in Sutton Coldfield. A proportionate amount of councillors for Sutton Coldfield, would in fact, be 11. This will mean Sutton Coldfield is not fully represented on Birmingham City Council and may potentially affect future funding.

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.

Owen Jenkins
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Rosie Jenkins
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I am expressing my very deep concern about the boundary proposals for Moseley, Birmingham. I, and many others, know the outcome would be the fracturing of a strong community and its local governance. The criteria for redrawing local boundaries are about maintaining communities and ensuring effective local government. The proposals run totally counter to these principles; and it is utterly astonishing to think they were put forward in the first place. Moseley was named, last year, as the best urban living centre in the UK. That is not an easily won accolade. It is through the energy, creativity and concerns of its local people and their societies and organisations, together with coherent local government structures that made this award a possibility in the first place. Do not break up Moseley and offer ineffective proposals for its future, that are, in the event, against your own guidelines. Please look at this again.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam,

We have never heard of anything so ridiculous in all our lives, wasting good money on this silly proposal. Can't you think of better ways to spend council money on? If we had wanted to live in Tysley or any of the Districts put forward, we would have bought a house there. It's going to cost money including residents having to tell family & Friends we have got a different address. Just think about this Stupid Whim.
Erdington Ward should preserve the core of historic Erdington, including all of the areas covered by the proposed Erdington Residents Parking Scheme and Conservation Zone. This would keep significant local buildings within the Erdington Community, unlike the commissions published plan. Erdington Ward should keep Erdington Abbey, Erdington Train Station, Erdington Royal Mail depot, the old Erdington Cottages, Osborne School (former School for the Erdington Urban District Council) and keep the Yenton area of Erdington around Orphanage Road together in the ward. I ask the commission to amend the proposed Erdington Ward boundaries to be the border of Sutton Coldfield to the North, Court Lane to the West, ensuring Goosemoor Lane remains in Erdington, to the South the border with Gravelly Hill/Birches Green of Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road should be used. To the East the border of Erdington is the border with Pype Hayes and that should be done in this instance as well ensuring that Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive remain in Erdington, where they always have been.

Please note that my Great Grandparents are buried at the Church off Erdington High Street and my family have lived in Erdington for over one hundred years and I do not wish to see this ward be broken up or become part of Short Heath. I have lived in Erdington Ward since 1977.

Regards
Anne Jerome
We ask the commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham to represent a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, two member Kingstanding Ward, two member Oscott Ward, a Perry Common Ward, Pype Hayes Ward and a Stockland Green Ward. With the Erdington Ward borders running from Court Lane in the West, Sutton in the North, Pype Hayes and Holly Lane in the East and Kingsbury Road/Wood End Road in the South.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Gillian Jervis
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

Leave Yardley alone - to call it Stechford East is utterly stupid. Yardley Old Church dates back to before Domesday and is part of Yardley Conservation area. Birmingham city council need to get their act together and stop wasting time and money on trivial things. They would be better off spending money on cleaning the dirty filthy streets up! I have lived in Yardley for the last 30 years ( the last 19 in the conservation area). If this goes ahead - I will be moving. I am with Neil Eustace on this one! Mrs G Jervis [Redacted]

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Simon Jevon
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

1: Kings Park West and adjoining homes on Rednal Road

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Kings Park West and adjoining homes on Rednal Road

Comment text:

I would like to largely support the commission’s proposals for the Kings Norton area but would like to make a few observations. The road where I live - [Redacted], Kings Norton (a Kings Norton postcode) - does not appear on the map above yet is being moved into a proposed ward called West Heath. This road (together with a handful of houses on Rednal Road also built by Persimmon) were built in 2013. Residents would like the road to remain in Kings Norton. The current proposals would create a boundary along a very narrow alleyway, which is a source of crime and anti-social behaviour for both residents in Kings Park West, Nearhill Road and Heathleigh Road. A Neighbourhood Watch group exists for Kings Park West. Residents work with the police and myself to tackle the issue and I fear that the source of the problem is split into two wards, it will be more difficult to tackle. My worry is that due to access difficulties, the proposal could create a forgotten road if Kings Park West were to move from Kings Norton into West Heath. There is a long gap between houses to the west of West Heath Hospital to the Rednal Road part of the Kings Park West development. The only other access is from the alleyway to Nearhill Road (which would be in a different ward). It would make common sense to keep Kings Norton with the nearest group of houses – Nearhill Road and Heathleigh Road. Residents in the road look towards Kings Norton and not West Heath. When houses were sold by Persimmon, it was made clear that Kings Park West was in Kings Norton and we would not like that to change. Thank you for reading.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Joseph Jin  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

My name is Joseph Jin, living at [Redacted] EDGBASTON, [Redacted]. EDGBASTON is the area our family have been living for many, many years. My three daughters are all going or have completed our local school in this EDGBASTON area. The local community and local church are all EDGBASTON. This is a historical name with a lot of memories for both the adults and the children and we want to keep it. I just can't wake up one day, knowing that we are not in EDGBASTON anymore. Therefore I am very against the idea of changing the ward name from EDGBASTON. I hope your committee could consider my voice when making a decision.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Paresh Jobanputra
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

i live on [redacted] in Moseley (B13). I write to object to the proposed boundary changes. I believe this will have a detrimental effect on our neighbourhood which has a strong sense of community and civic duty. A number of volunteer organisations operate in what is now Moseley. Having to deal with an increasing number of political representatives in our locality will be harmful. Bizarrely the centre of Moseley will no longer be in Moseley Ward. A policy focussing solely on numbers of people served by individual councillors seems odd given the widely varying needs of people.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Alison Johnson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

To whom it may concern I attended the meeting in Moseley on January 18th entitled 'Your Moseley - fight for it NOW' and expressed my objection to the proposed changes for Moseley then. I am sending this email to further register my objection. I have lived in Moseley since 1968 and strongly object to the splitting of the area into different wards. I feel it would do great harm to and devalue all that has been done by many people over a number of decades to develop a a very strong community. I feel strongly that the following should be in Moseley Ward: The centre of Moseley Moseley Parish Church St Columba's Church Moseley Park Moseley Exchange A large number of volunteers work very hard to make Moseley the place it is, their workload would be increased enormously by these changes as they would need to liaise with different councillors in different wards. It is likely that many may feel they can no longer do the job. Particularly affected would be: The Moseley Forum The Moseley Society Moseley in Bloom Moseley Park & Pool Moseley Interfaith Group Moseley Festival Moseley Farmers' Marke Moseley B13 Magazine. Further to this we in Moseley are not the only part of Birmingham to be affected this way, At the meeting it was voted that the boundary review should be rejected with I agree. I hope my objections will be noted.

 Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

\[
\text{We just cannot see any benefit to the alterations.}
\]

\[
\text{A complete waste of time and money.}
\]

\[
\text{In some areas, it will lower property values.}
\]

Yours Sincerely

Name:- 
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Edward Johnson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Annotation 1: Moseley Golf Club
Annotation 2: Moseley Park
Annotation 3: Moseley Village
Annotation 4:
Annotation 5:

Comment text:

It is not clear to me why Birmingham’s ward boundaries are being redrawn. The current Moseley & Kings Heath ward functions effectively, with three councillors providing a suitable level of representation for the area. If for some reason the boundaries must change, I object strongly to the proposal for Moseley ward. My home is outside the boundary of the proposed Moseley ward, and yet I identify strongly with living in Moseley, as do all the neighbours with whom I have discussed this proposal. The Boundary Commission’s proposals for Moseley are absurd and seem to have been drawn up with little to no knowledge of the area.

Under the proposed Moseley Village - the very centre of Moseley, Moseley Park and Moseley Golf Club would no longer be in Moseley. Half of the proposed Moseley ward would cover what is recognised today as Balsall Heath, while a large part of what is recognised as Moseley would be shifted into either King’s Heath or Balsall Heath/Cannon Hill. Moseley is a very distinct area with a strong identity that has been built over decades. It is recognised as one of the most attractive areas to live in the country and home to a vibrant, diverse and cohesive community with a number of community groups that have developed to support Moseley and its residents. The proposed new boundary would split the residents of Moseley across multiple wards, fragmenting the community and damaging social cohesion.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name:                Janet May Johnson
E-mail:              
Postcode:            
Organisation Name:   

Comment text:

I do not want my property to be included in the Summerfield Ward and prefer to stay in the Harborne Ward. I live in [redacted], and would prefer the boundary line of Summerfield Ward to run up Portland Road and down City Road to Sandon Road, keeping us in the Harborne Ward. Also I do not like the name Summerfield and would prefer an alternative (I know Deer’s Leap has been suggested). I will be asking my neighbours what they think about the new name. I do not believe I have seen any previous requests from the council for input from local residents, and feel that this is the first opportunity I have had to air my feelings. Which seems a bit late.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Janet May Johnson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Alternative name suggestion for Summerfield Ward is Lordswood.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Martyn JOHNSON

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

**Comment text:**

Given that Moseley has one of the strongest identities of any area of Birmingham, it seems perverse to break it up. Moseley Village is a genuine urban village in character and it makes no sense to divide it down the middle. This is not a political point; it is a social and cultural point. Moseley is nationally known as a desirable place in which to live and socialise, with a strong sense of identity. This should be supported, nurtured and welcomed as a benefit to Birmingham's reputation.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
From: Pauline Johnson
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 5:29 PM
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary

Re Boundary Review

I am writing from Yardley an historic area mention in the doomsday book as Ghyrdley. Why of Why do we have to be now Stechford East.....do you think that it is the right thing to do to get rid of 100 years of history in wave of the pen. The church was started in 972AD all this history will now be lost. We need you to think again as we in this area feel let down by Government.

Not only are we unhappy ,to say the least that our Name of Yardley should be lost , residents will now have to pay more for insurance as the postcode for Stechford is much higher. This is very unfair. I have lived in Yardley all my life some 78 years and if I had wanted to live in Stechford I would have moved.

PLEASE RE THINK THIS TERRIBLE DECISION. THANK YOU.

From a unhappy resident
Mrs Pauline Johnson
Dear Sir/Madam,
The Boundary Commission has recently published draft recommendations for new ward boundaries.

The new boundaries will affect Moseley considerably to its detriment. Moseley has great community spirit and we have been well represented by 3 councillors. We shall now be spread across five wards and have six councillors. What a ludicrous situation. Moseley itself gets split into different wards and we will lose our cohesion.

We are an active community and have a lot of keen members trying to ensure that Moseley remains a desirable environment and place to live. To have to deal with six councillors when we have issues is not sensible.

Your boundary recommendations do not enhance Moseley as a central centre - please re-consider your actions.

Yours faithfully
Sue Johnson
Dear Sir / Madame

We ask the commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham to represent a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, two member Kingstanding Ward, two member Oscott Ward, a Perry Common Ward, Pype Hayes Ward and a Stockland Green Ward. With the Erdington Ward borders running from Court Lane in the West, Sutton in the North, Pype Hayes and Holly Lane in the East and Kingsbury Road/Wood End Road in the South.

If the wards were changed to reflect this then that would ensure all of historic Erdington is retained within the Erdington Ward.

Yours Sincerely

T R Joicey (Mr)
Dear Sir/Madam, If wonder whether public officials ever really consult or listen to the public in any meaningful way before they go making unwanted and unpopular changes that affect our local communities? Please therefore take note of my objections to your proposals to change the boundaries of the community in which I live: Moseley, Birmingham. Your proposals will see communities uprooted, divided or disappeared altogether. Your proposals are unnecessary and unwanted. A Moseley Ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and local governance. Moseley is not the only part of Birmingham where the proposals appear to be crazy. The recent local meeting on 16th Jan (400-500 Moseley people) also voted that the boundary review for the whole of Birmingham should be rejected. If you must insist in robbing us of some of our local elected representatives, then why not just keep the electoral boundaries as they are and reduce the number of councillors to one for all wards? Nobody is happy with these proposed changes. I strongly urge you to listen to community feeling and abandon this plan! I have a number of specific objections, which are outlined in my letter (Please see attached document).

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Dear Sir/Madam,

If wonder whether public officials ever really consult or listen to the public in any meaningful way before they go making unwanted and unpopular changes that affect our local communities? These officials are supposed to be public servants, aren't they? In a democracy we are expected to dutifully and slavishly elect so-called parliamentary 'representatives' to make up our government (which we're constantly told is a 'democracy') and those we elect are supposed to 'serve' and 'represent' the interests of the constituencies and communities who elected them to power. They wield that power on our behalf, supposedly.

Please therefore take note of my objections to your proposals to change the boundaries of the community in which I live: Moseley, Birmingham.

Your proposals will see communities uprooted, divided or disappeared altogether. Moseley is one of the few communities in Britain's second largest metropolis to have a strong sense of local identity and 'place'. Moseley is well known to have its own character and does indeed feel like an 'urban village'. There is a very strong sense of local civic pride and community engagement and participation from large numbers of residents who care about what happens to where they live. Please don't start meddling and harming our community from your London office. You are proposing that the famous and much-loved Moseley Village should no longer be 'in Moseley'. Instead it should become part of 'Balsall Heath & Canon Hill' ward. You either haven't thought this through or you simply don't care (you don't live here, after all).

Your proposals are unnecessary and unwanted. They are also absurd. We are told these proposals are designed to 'save money'. This is ridiculous. Britain is paying £1 BILLION per week in INTEREST (to privately-owned banks!) on the national debt (currently at £1.6 TRILLION!). Local councillors are part-time workers who are paid a basic allowance of around £10K - £15K. I'm told that only Birmingham is having the number of Councillors reduced (by 19) in this Ward Boundary Review. How much money do you honestly think these ill-conceived proposals will actually save? Peanuts Mr Clark, PEANUTS! This is barely a drop in the ocean and is therefore a pointless exercise that will destroy established communities in order to save a few pennies.
I have a number of specific objections, namely:

A Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and local governance.

The partnership between the Moseley Society and Moseley councillors which created two Moseley conservation areas would be broken, and the volunteers who monitor planning applications would have a totally unnecessary increase in their workload;

The work of many years on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in a Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the effort by volunteers and council officers, made to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening of Moseley mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package;

   The centre of Moseley must be in Moseley Ward;
   Moseley Parish Church must be in Moseley Ward;
   St Columba’s Church must be in Moseley Ward;
   Moseley Park must be in Moseley Ward;

The incredible number of Moseley volunteers who work for the Moseley community to nurture and develop the place they live in and love must not have their workload increased by the need to liaise with different ward councillors and officers. The volunteers may well give up. I feel most strongly about unnecessary problems caused for Moseley Forum, the Moseley Exchange, The Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Park & Pool, the Moseley Festival, Moseley Farmers Market, Moseley B13 Magazine and many other local community groups.

Moseley is not the only part of Birmingham where the proposals appear to be crazy. The recent local meeting on 16th Jan (400-500 Moseley people) also voted that the boundary review for the whole of Birmingham should be rejected.

If you must insist in robbing us of some of our local elected representatives then why not just keep the electoral boundaries as they are and reduce the number of councillors to one for all wards?

Nobody is happy with these proposed changes (the local, ordinary, real people who do all the voting, working, paying, living and dying around here).

I strongly urge you to listen to community feeling and abandon this plan!

I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours despairingly,

Mr S Jolly.
Dear Sir,

I feel compelled to write to you asking Why you are proposing to change the boundaries in our local area ?. I have been a resident in Erdington since 1967 Why am I being relocated ? I am asking you to adopt an Erdington Ward with boundaries of Court Lane to the West, Wood End Road / Kingsbury Road to the South, Pype Hayes Park, rear of Woodcote Road to the East and the Sutton border to the North. This would keep the Erdington Community together and as the same Erdington Community as the North Birmingham Community Together Campaign is proposing for the Erdington area.

"A H Jones"
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP
By email only

Dear Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council Wards

I write to comment on the proposed ward of Bournbrook and Selly Park. I request you consider that an alternative proposal of a ward for Bournbrook and a separate ward for Selly Park, each with one Councillor, would better serve the interests of both groups of residents. This would be achieved by a split of the proposed larger ward – no impact on other ward proposals.

Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas as set out below:

**Bournbrook**

- Population: Mainly students (local residents having been driven out over last 15 years) who live in poorly maintained accommodation with little regard to the neighbourhood in which they temporarily reside.
- Housing: Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.
- Conservation Areas: None.
- Commuting Habits: Most walk to the university. Travel to City Centre is using Bristol Road via car and bus routes 61, 63, 64, or by train.

**Selly Park**

- Population: Mainly settled families and couples.
- Housing: Mainly detached and larger terraced.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Selly Park Property Owners' Association, Selly Park Residents Community Association, Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum, Selly Wick Residents.
- Conservation Areas: Selly Park Conservation Area, Selly Park Avenues Conservation Area.
- Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Pershore Road via car and bus routes 45, 47.
There have been comments (e.g. BirminghamLabourGroup-Birmingham-2015-09-28) that these 2 areas share a common bond of interest in housing and environmental issues; based on the geographies of the areas this may be true but it is not true in the way that the two communities respect the area in which they live. The student community of Bournbrook is driven by living as close to the University as possible, the mess and rubbish which characterises the streets demonstrates a scant regard to others. A significant part of Selly Park shares common threads back to the 1800s thanks to covenants imposed at that time regarding use of the land. In recent years Selly Park has suffered by lack of representation and by lack of regard to the quiet and mature residential area recognised by the Local Authority when Conservation Area status was approved. As recently as last week a development was approved in Selly Park which will introduce significant new student accommodation into a quiet residential street. Selly Park needs its own voice and representation.

In summary, the proposal for two wards will result in better, more localised representation for the people of Bournbrook and Selly Park and will have no effect on the proposals for the rest of Birmingham.

I hope that you will give my proposals serious consideration and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

Adrian Jones
I understand there is a proposal to make boundary changes and make the Yardley Ward Stetchford East. I am against changing the name of this Ward it is very historic. Please register my vote against the name change.
Bryan Jones
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Claire Jones
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Leave the existing Birmingham boundaries alone. These proposals will break up communities and is for political gain only.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

**Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.**

The Birmingham Mail has printed a number of articles on the disgraceful proposed breaking up of North Birmingham Communities. Just some of the things the commission are proposing are; Erdington Railway and Police Stations and Erdington Abbey are proposed to be taken out of Erdington. Gravelly Hill has been wiped off the map. Bandywood is being ripped away from it's Oscott community links. The clearly defined Kingstanding community is proposed to be broken up. While the proposed Perry Common area doesn't even include all of Witton Lodge Road, but does include part of Wyrley Birch.

We have until the consultation closes on Feb 8th to make our voices heard—take action now!

**Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!**
29th January 2016

The Review Officer,
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
London SW1P 4PQ

Dear Sir,

Boundary Changes – Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands

I would like to comment on the proposed changes to the Sutton Coldfield area.

1. It seems rather odd that Melrose Avenue should be moved into Boldmere, rather than retained in Parkside. It reduces the residents numbers in Parkside, and unnecessarily increases the number in Boldmere. Its housing stock is in a higher rating band those of Boldmere generally, and are generally associated with Monmouth Drive.

2. Likewise Monmouth Drive should be in Parkside, rather than part in Boldmere. Again, this is a long straight road which produces a natural dividing line.

3. Could consideration be given to retaining the ward names Vesey and Banners Gate, rather than the rather conventional Parkside. Vesey has a particularly historic association with Sutton Coldfield, as it was Archbishop Vesey who was associated with Henry VIII, who gave Sutton Park to the people of Sutton Coldfield in perpetuity.

4. A main concern of many residents is the proposal for areas of Sutton Park currently in Boldmere Ward to be moved to Four Oaks Ward. All residents who live on the periphery of Sutton Park are very protective of the areas of the park within their immediate residential area. Those living near Boldmere Gate and that part of the park which includes Boldmere Golf Club, the Miller & Carter restaurant, and the Sea Scout, Venture Scout and Sea Cadet groups take a keen interest in the activities of all those organisations, and local businesses support their activities. If action or amenities are required at the Boldmere Gate side of Sutton Park, it is local residents who respond, and it is unlikely that anyone in Four Oaks would even be aware of any actions required. Consequently any funding required is unlikely to be forthcoming from Four Oaks Ward. In the past strong action has forced Birmingham City Council to replace fencing alongside Monmouth Drive through local residents and the local neighbourhood forum. This is unlikely to happen if in the Four Oaks Ward, since residents would not be travelling along this side of the Park.

5. Sutton Park is a Site of Special Scientific Interest and it is imperative that it is protected. It is only with local observation and local action that this will occur. Four Oaks Ward does not involve itself in any way with the residents in the areas of Boldmere and Vesey North Wards, and is unlikely to do so in future, and we as residents will have no redress.
In order to enhance the facilities in the Boldmere area, Boldmere Futures Partnership has been formed to produce a neighbourhood plan. This has been completed and submitted, but has been rejected, due to the proposed Boundary Commission changes, as the proposal included a children's playground at the Boldmere Gate side of the Park. The Neighbourhood Plan will only be considered if Four Oaks councillors, residents and businesses, join Boldmere Partnership. This is nonsense and will never happen. Consequently it is unlikely Boldmere residents will have a children's playground in the Park, and the wider plan has currently been rejected out of hand. This indicates the strong links the Park generates with its local residents and businesses.

Sutton Park provides a definite boundary of Rosemary Hill Road on one side (Four Oaks), and Monmouth Drive (Boldmere/Parkside) on the other. The two are currently different Wards, and will always be regarded as such.

It is necessary that further consideration is given to boundary changes being proposed, particularly given the Parish Council/Town Council status that has been conferred on Sutton Coldfield on 22nd December 2015 by Birmingham City Council, which secures the boundaries as shown on that date.

Yours sincerely,
Having reviewed the LGBC's proposals, I find that I do not agree with the decision to split Moseley between the proposed 'Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill' and 'Moseley' wards. For example, Moseley high street (The Alcester Road) will now lie in the Balsall Heath area whilst much of the housing in Moseley will belong to an entirely different ward. Furthermore, Moseley Park, the Moseley Exchange and Moseley Hall Hospital will all now fall within this new ward. In your own guidance you refer to the following 'main rules': "Reflecting the interests and identities of local communities – this means establishing electoral arrangements which, as far as possible, maintain local ties and where boundaries are easily identifiable". Sadly, the current recommendations for Moseley would not match this 'rule' in any meaningful way. Although I appreciate that sometimes these 'rules' cannot be adhered to, Moseley is an area which is nationally recognised for its festivals and 'village feel'. Moseley is a melting pot of different ethnicities and cultures, with levels of integration rarely seen in other areas of Birmingham. Birmingham is one of the most diverse cities in the UK, yet so much of Birmingham is split by communities along ethnic lines. In Moseley this is not the case and Moseley has a unique, multi-ethnic, community spirit and to split such a community would be a very great shame. To lose the high street with its independent shops, restaurants and markets will cut the heart out of the community. Surely it would make more sense to extend the Moseley boundary (let's be honest it won't be a huge distance) to incorporate the high street and properties along the Alcester Road? At least this way Moseley will remain Moseley. I am happy to take part in any further consultation (focus groups, public meetings etc) if such opportunities are available.
The Review Officer (Birmingham),
Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
14th Floor Millbank Tower,
Millbank,
London,
SW1P 4QP.

Dear Sir,

Re:- Boundary Commission Proposals for Moseley, Birmingham.

I oppose your proposals for Moseley.

Moseley has recently been called “the best suburb in Britain”
It is a popular local centre and has a great Community identity and spirit.

Your proposal for a single ward "Lesser Moseley" with but one Councillor out of 101 - less than 1% of the Council, is destructive of that Community identity.

Your proposed "Lesser Moseley" includes Moseley Church of England School and most of St Agnes Moseley Conservation Area, but excludes -
Moseley Village with all shops, pubs and post office,
Moseley Parish Church,
Moseley Hall and Park,
Moseley Railway Station, soon to be re-opened.
Moseley Conservation Area,
Moseley Swimming Baths, former Library, Art School and Moseley Grammar School,
Moseley Golf Club,
Moseley Bog, (where Moseley’s most famous son J.R.Tolkien first saw the Hobbit).

The Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom and other organisations will have to deal with Local Government Officers and Councillors in five other wards with differing identities - this will be ineffective and inconvenient for all concerned.

Yours faithfully,

M. Jones (Mrs).
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Jones
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]
Comment text:

I wish to object to the current proposals as they apply to Moseley, where I live.
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None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

For years the Kingstanding Area and the surrounding Areas have always been a very close Community to start breaking up the Area is surely going to affect our standing in future voting and say for our strong future.

Yours Sincerely

Name: Peter Jones

[Handwritten date: 05/07/2013]
North Birmingham Community Together

A collection of Community Groups, Forums, Associations and Residents demanding the Boundary Commission keeps our local communities together.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it’s draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

The Birmingham Mail has printed a number of articles on the disgraceful proposed breaking up of North Birmingham Communities. Just some of the things the commission are proposing are; Erdington Railway and Police Stations and Erdington Abbey are proposed to be taken out of Erdington. Gravelly Hill has been wiped off the map. Bandywood is being ripped away from it’s Oscott community links. The clearly defined Kingstanding community is proposed to be broken up. While the proposed Perry Common area doesn’t even include all of Witton Lodge Road, but does include part of Wyrley Birch.

We have until the consultation closes on Feb 8th to make our voices heard—take action now!

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
Dear Sir

My wife and I would like to add our voices to those of other residents of Selly Park in Birmingham with regard to the proposal to merge Selly Park and Bournbrook into a single council ward.

We feel that the two areas are very different, and that one ward for Bournbrook and another (separate) for Selly park, each with one councillor, would better serve the interests of both groups of residents.

Please give this proposal your serious consideration.

Yours faithfully

Derek and Linda Jones
From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 18 January 2016 15:42
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO RENAMING YARDLEY

From: ronald jones
Sent: 18 January 2016 15:34
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: OBJECTION TO RENAMING YARDLEY

I strongly object to the renaming of our area as "Stechford East", as a strong supporter of Yardley, having lived in the area all of my life, and having planned, managed, and supervised two successful building projects for Yardley Conservation Area Improvements schemes, the Yardley Ward is worth saving for the historic value alone, Yardley is mentioned in the Domesday book. The original church was built in 972 having celebrated the millennium in 1972. The present church goes back to the 12th century. The Conservation Society was formed in the 1960's, and is still in force to-day.

It would be very sad, and pointless to loose the Yardley Ward, as many families have lived in the Yardley area for generations.

R. C. Jones
FCIOB FASI FGIS
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Valerie Jones

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

**Comment text:**

I am a resident of Tile Cross and object to the Boundary changes for Tile Cross and Glebe Farm as the proposed boundary changes has now got parts of Stechford & Yardley N, Ward End & Alum Rock. These areas have never been part of Tile Cross or Glebe Farm and I consider these areas would be better shared with Saltley, Ward End & Alum Rock Wards. The natural boundary is the River Cole/Kingfisher project, realistically it should be Stechford Retail Park. There are also plans to build 250-300 homes on the old sewage site - has this been taken into account when assessing the number of residents for each ward? A two member ward of Tile Cross & Glebe Farm would provide an acceptable level of electoral equality while allowing for effective and convenient local government. I am very concerned with the lack of literature through residents' doors from the Boundary Commission explaining the proposed changes and the lack of consultation with Ward Councillors with their electorate. Is this due to the assumption that people can access this information via the Internet? I hope my views will be considered when you make your decisions, Thank you

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

I would like to comment on the proposed two-Councillor ward of Bournbrook and Selly Park.

It is my strong view that an alternative proposal of a ward for Bournbrook and a separate ward for Selly Park, each with one Councillor, would better serve the interests of both groups of residents.

Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas and are distinguished from each other by different demographics, housing stocks, community groups, conservation areas and commuting habits. These can be summarised as follows:
• Population: Mainly transient students.
• Housing: Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
• Community and Residents' Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.
• Conservation Areas: None.
• Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Bristol Road (aka Bournbrook High Street; Bournbrook's main road) via car and bus routes 61, 63, 64, 144, X64. Additionally, extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38 and 76).

Selly Park

• Population: Mainly settled families and couples.
• Housing: Mainly detached and larger terraced.
• Community and Residents' Groups: Selly Park Residents Community Association, Selly Park Property Owners' Association, Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum, Selly Wick Residents.
• Conservation Areas: Selly Park Conservation Area, Selly Park Avenues Conservation Area.
• Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Pershore Road (Selly Park's main road) via car and bus routes 45, 47, 106. No bus routes or stops on local roads.

In terms of defining each ward, I suggest introducing an ‘internal’ boundary within the proposed two-Councillor ward, thus creating two one-Councillor wards with no wider impact.

In summary, the proposal I am making will result in better, more localised representation for the people of Bournbrook and Selly Park and will have no effect on the proposals for the rest of Birmingham.

I do hope that you will give my proposals serious consideration and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Rajive Jose

L'essentiel est invisible pour les yeux.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: James William Jowett
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The Review Officer (Birmingham), Local Government Boundary Commission for England, 14th Floor, Millbank Tower, Millbank, London SW1P 4QP. Boundary Review Proposals for City of Birmingham & Moseley B13 I have carefully considered the LGBCE proposals for The City of Birmingham and having attended various public meetings both across the City and in my local community I am left to question if change is really needed? Ward boundary changes will distract Birmingham City Council from the real task of drawing our city together and tackling some of the big challenges we face with strengthening social cohesion, offering high quality education, keeping children safe and ensuring this important city is economically vibrant into the future. If change is not essential then let us leave our boundaries as they are and get on with the real work. It will not be efficient or effective to have so many small wards all raising the same concerns to be dealt with by their individual councillor and consequently effective and convenient local government will be damaged by these proposals. Having drawn this conclusion it follows that the answer is simple – leave things as they are. However If change is deemed essential by others remote from the City then at least let us do this in a careful and considered manner that reflects the needs and wishes of the people of Birmingham and the various local communities that are its’ constituent parts. Representing people is not simply a numbers game yet the LBDCE proposals seem to reflect just that. It is hard not to think that the LGBG has just taken a set of coloured pencils and a calculator and simply drawn its proposed ward boundaries from the map of the local polling districts, such is the closeness of the match. This simplistic approach may address the LGBCE criteria of:- i) Improving electoral equality by equalizing the number of electors each councilor represents. But it will certainly not satisfy the other main considerations namely:- ii) Reflect community identity iii) Provide for effective and convenient local government I have been a resident of Moseley for forty years and seen many changes during that time but these boundary proposals are unnecessary, uninformed, ill considered and simply plain crazy. The current proposals will dismantle a very well established community of place - it is not for nothing that it is known as "Moseley Village" with all the social, economic and community cohesion that description in itself implies. It is impossible to see how the LGBC has considered community Identity in its proposals. The boundary changes will wreck local governance (local decisions by local people) and all the work that the local community has done over many years to create community cohesion, and community identity. Other specific concerns and important matters (in no particular order of priority) include:- • A Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley Conservation Areas would be broken, and the volunteers who monitor planning applications would have a totally unnecessary increase in their workload; • The 5 years of time and effort put into developing the Moseley Supplementary Planning document (SPD) will have been wasted. The Moseley Regeneration Group is now guided by this document. We also have our own local regeneration strategy 'Making Moseley.' Any ward called Moseley must have the centre of Moseley within it and take account of the boundaries for the SPD so that we can respond to future developments and initiatives • The many years of work on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in the Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the effort by volunteers and council officers, made to improve
economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening of Moseley mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package; • The vibrant centre of Moseley containing shops, businesses, pubs restaurants and extensive community facilities would not be in Moseley Ward! • Moseley Parish Church would not be in Moseley Ward. • Moseley Park would not be in Moseley Ward; • The Moseley Exchange would not in Moseley Ward. • The incredible number of Moseley volunteers who work for the Moseley community to nurture and develop the place they live in and love will need to liaise with different ward councillors and officers covering 3 different wards. • The various volunteer groups will become fragmented and may well give up and thus cause unnecessary problems and unintended consequences for:- i) Moseley Forum ii) Moseley in Lights II) Moseley Exchange III) The Moseley Society IV) Moseley in Bloom V) Moseley Park & Pool VI) Moseley Interfaith Group VII) Moseley Festival VIII) Sustainable Moseley IX) Moseley Arts Market X) Moseley Farmers Market / XI) Moseley B13 Magazine. XII) And many, many other important Moseley groups and initiatives The current Moseley and Kings Heath ward has 3 councillors. This ensures that at least one is always available; for example cover is maintained if one councillor is ill or on holiday. It allows for wider representation within the council. Our current councillors have different interests and areas of expertise; this means we benefit from wider knowledge and representation. It will not be efficient or effective to have so many small wards all raising the same concerns to be dealt with by their individual councillor. The proposal to have elections for all Councillors every 4 years will mean that all work across a ward stops around election time as all councillors will be focusing on their election campaign. Should there be significant changes in councillors then much knowledge about local issues and current activities will be lost, all in one go. Having a phased election system is much more effective for continuity of business. Notwithstanding, politicians will come and go. Local people need structures that keep us together and make it easy for us to work together; we need to remain as Moseley, whichever part of it we live or work in We understand that councillors, like all of us, need a manageable workload. However, the benefits of working together in larger groups of councillors have not been taken into account. Fragmenting the people of Moseley across so many wards will make it much more difficult for consultation and engagement in local democracy. Lobbying, campaigning and fighting for grants will be so much more of a challenge for Moseley. The proposal has not recognised in any way the importance of the name Moseley to those who live here, nor the social, economic and political ties that bind the people of Moseley. If implemented it will tear apart well-established community links, reducing our sense of belonging and social cohesion that are such a focus for the Government and society currently. As budgets tighten we become more reliant on the work of voluntary organisations. Splitting Moseley amongst several wards will make for more complex and fragmented bidding and grant allocation. The business area of Moseley according to the proposals will be in a different ward making fundraising much more challenging. The proposal divides many very active Residents’ Associations between 3 different wards and 4 councillors. All of these Associations identify with Moseley. Residents work there, shop there, and drink there, catch buses there, attend meetings, take part in a wide range of local events all in Moseley Village. None of these and other activities take place in Stirchley, Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill. In summary the proposed boundary changes would decimate so much that the Moseley community has built up over many decades. The proposed changes fly in the face of the LGBCE policy guidelines so please think again both in the context of Birmingham overall and Moseley in particular. James W Jowett

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded


**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Martyn Johnson

E-mail: [Redacted]

Postcode: [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

To whom it may concern. With respect to the proposed local government boundary changes, I am not in a position to comment on the reasons why such a reorganisation is deemed necessary but I feel strongly that the proposals appear to have taken no notice whatsoever of the local history, the views of local residents or indeed their needs - to the extent that the proposals are mistaken and in some respects absurd. Whilst the disappearance of Longbridge from the map of Birmingham and the destruction of the identity of Hall Green are bad enough, I am particularly exercised - and judging by the attendance at a recent public meeting about the issue, I am not alone - by the effect the proposed changes will have on Moseley Village. Of all the local areas of Birmingham, Moseley can lay claim to being the most aptly described as an urban village and the area with the widest national recognition. People care about Moseley - they volunteer, they organise and they work to make it a cohesive community with an unique identity. The number of organisations/events with Moseley in their name should be in indication of the strength of this identity - award-winning Moseley Farmers' Market, Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley Jazz Festival, Moseley Folk Festival, Moseley Community Development Trust, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Bog, Moseley Conservation Area, Moseley Exchange, Moseley Forum, Moseley Arts Market. There is much more but surely the point is made. All of this is based in Moseley - Moseley Village - centred on the crossroads. This is what city living should be about. This is what the Government professes to support. There is precious little evidence of such support in these proposals. Even the parish church would cease to be in Moseley! I urge you, please, to scrap these absurd proposals.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
"We ask the commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham to represent a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, two member Kingstanding Ward, two member Oscott Ward, a Perry Common Ward, Pype Hayes Ward and a Stockland Green Ward. With the Erdington Ward borders running from Court Lane in the West, Sutton in the North, Pype Hayes and Holly Lane in the East and Kingsbury Road/Wood End Road in the South"

Jolita Juodgudyte
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Shankar Kamath
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I am deeply unhappy to hear of the proposals to redraw Moseley's boundaries. I live off [redacted] and my family (and indeed our community) identifies strongly with Moseley. We moved here a few years ago and the passionate sense of community here has been heartening. Being a psychiatrist by profession, I am very aware of the positive effect of a cohesive identity on the well being of people. These plans are divisive, and threaten to destroy that identity. Please do not let these plans proceed. It may be a political solution, but it will fuel human problems.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** Kate Kane
- **E-mail:** [Redacted]
- **Postcode:** [Redacted]
- **Organisation Name:** [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

I am very unhappy about the suggested change for [Redacted] to be changed to Edgbaston ward. It is not appropriate to move half the road into a different ward as this makes it difficult with different councillors. We have a successful residents group which has good relationship with our local councillors and I would be unhappy to lose this. I am also unhappy that we have not been actively consulted- were it not for the residents association I would have been unaware of the proposed change. I note that the south side of StMarys road is left in Harborne and that this small section of Abbey Road is the only area expunged to Edgbaston. Please leave us in our current ward with the rest of our road.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Sir / Madam,

I am opposing hall green B28 boundary changes. What concerns me most is the key landmarks such as Hall Green station, Sharehole Mill, Hall Green Schools and college have names that relates to Hall Green and I actually bought the property due to landmark features. I don't see how this fits into Tyseley.

The current boundary does not make sense and person who made this decision has given no consideration or understand the key landmarks.

Example :- Sharehole Mill is a major tourist attraction because of its great location and history which has always been in Hall Green ward.

Also bear in mind it does not make sense to be part of Tyseley which is a industrial area and Hall Green is residential area.

Regards Jetha karavadra
Hi Mark,
I support the attached proposal put together by labour Group.

Regards Jetha
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Anaar Kassam  
E-mail: [..]  
Postcode: [..]  
Organisation Name: [..]

**Comment text:**

OPPOSING THE PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARY CHANGES MOSELEY BIRMINGHAM  
Very concerned about the proposed boundary changes and request that our boundaries be left as they are. Grateful if you consider the following points. Moseley – culture and economy will be compromised. Moseley, a civic legacy, an active community will be destroyed. Moseley is not just its buildings, its parks and its streets. It is its people and what they do, how they shape themselves around the physical space. Citizens organise themselves around the shared locality of Moseley in myriad ways, to nurture and develop the place they live in and love: Moseley Forum (inc. Moseley in Lights), Moseley Community Development Trust, The Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Park & Pool, Moseley. There is a strong shared sense of what the place is, a huge amount of passion and activity around that place – be it cultural, environmental, economic or social – and these proposals parcel that space up in a way that is at best bewildering, and at worst, active sabotage of a place that genuinely works very well. Effective and convenient local government will be damaged by these proposals. Representing people is not a numbers game. It is hard not to think that the LGBC has taken its proposed ward boundaries from the map of the local polling districts, such is the closeness of the match. We understand that councillors, like all of us, need a manageable workload. However, the benefits of working together in larger groups of councillors have not been taken into account. We are currently part of Moseley and Kings Heath ward with 3 councillors. This ensures that at least one is always available; for example cover is maintained if one councilor is ill or on holiday. It allows for wider representation within the council. Our current councillors have different interests and areas of expertise; this means we benefit from wider knowledge and representation. It will not be efficient or effective to have so many small wards all raising the same concerns to be dealt with by their individual councillor. Fragmenting the people of Moseley across so many wards will make it much more difficult to consult with us and engage us in local democracy. Lobbying, campaigning and fighting for grants will be so much more of a challenge for our Moseley. The integrity of our local groups such as Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Forum and the many others will be compromised. The proposal to have elections for all councillors every 4 years will mean that all work across a ward stops around election time as all councillors will be focusing on their election campaign. Should there be significant changes in councillors then much knowledge about local issues and current activities will be lost, all in one go. Having a phased election system is much more effective for continuity of business. Notwithstanding, politicians will come and go. Local people need structures that keep us together and make it easy for us to work together; we need to remain as Moseley, whichever part of it we live or work in. It is hard to see how the LGBC has considered community Identity in its proposals. We are concerned that the proposal divides our active Moor Green West Residents’ Association area between Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill and Stirchley. This would have us working with 3 different wards and 4 councillors. All of Moor Green Lane and Elizabeth Road identify with Moseley. We shop there, we catch our buses there, we attend meetings, we take part in a wide range of local events in Moseley Village, we support the Farmers’ market, Moseley in Bloom, and the various local community groups such as Mosley Forum and The Mosley Society. We do very few of these things in Stirchley. The residents of Elizabeth Road and the western end of Moor Green Lane are part of Moseley and wish this to be represented in the ward we belong to and the name of that ward. We want the LGBC to reconsider its proposal.
and recommend a Moseley ward that reflects the proposal from the Moseley Community Groups. Thank you.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
From: Maggie Crosby [mailto:Maggie.Crosby@communities.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 24 February 2016 13:44
To: Mark Paterson
Subject: 160225 2154371 Evangelos Katifeoglou - Boundary Changes Moseley, Birmingham

Thank you for your email below to the Secretary of State about the reorganisation of ward boundaries in Birmingham being considered by the Local Government Boundary Commission. I have been asked to reply.

I should first explain that the Government has no powers to intervene in electoral reviews undertaken by the Boundary Commission. Under the relevant legislation there is no role for central government in the determination or implementation of local government electoral arrangements, including warding arrangements. All such matters are the responsibility of the Boundary Commission, a Parliamentary body that is entirely independent of central government and which is instead directly responsible to Parliament for its work and for its recommendations on local government electoral matters.

The recommendations at present are only draft and can be changed. I understand that the Boundary Commission will take into account all the representations they receive before arriving at their final recommendations. It is therefore important that your views are made known to the Boundary Commission.

I understand that the formal consultation period on the draft recommendations has ended. However, given the delay in considering your email here I have arranged for it to be sent to the Boundary Commission today so that they are aware of your views.

Yours sincerely

Maggie Crosby | Democracy Team | Department for Communities and Local Government

From: Evangelos K.
Sent: 08 February 2016 22:26
To: CLARK, Greg
Subject: Thoughts about the Draft Ward Recommendations for Moseley, Birmingham
Dear Mr Clark,

I am a 36yo professional born in Athens Greece that moved to Moseley in 2012, after the recommendations I received from friends that had lived here before. They were describing the area as a very vibrant place to live, that through the years has attracted people interested in arts and music from all over the world.

This is what I found out as well from the 4 years that I have been living in Moseley. Unlike other areas in Birmingham the pubs and the coffee shops are open to everyone, not only for the 'local boys'. There are open minded people and the British culture is evident everywhere. In the parks people will greet each other, even though they are strangers, new friendships will start in the social events, either in a gig of local groups, a record fair, or at the farmers market.

Unfortunately I believe that all these will be affected if the center of Moseley will merge with Balsall Heath. Culturally, there is nothing in common between the two areas. I am sad to see that the residents of Balsall Heath are not integrated in the modern society. It can be seen at the shops there and at the dominance of ethnic and religious groups. On the other hand we have Moseley, an open minded place, that welcomes everyone, that retains its 'Village' feeling and it is very clean day or night.

Historically, Moseley pre-existed by a couple of centuries of Balsall Heath. As it can be seen in the pictures that I have attached from the book of Norman Hewston 'A History of Moseley Village, Volume One', it can be seen that the center of our area is still pretty much the same as it was 400 years ago. Moseley Bog, Moseley Park, Cannon Hill Park, The Bulls Head, The fighting Cocks, Saint Mary, were and still are the heart of Moseley. If you haven't read the book I would suggest you have a look as it has much useful information about the neighboring areas as well.

With the new proposal only a small residential area will retain this historic name. It is a pity because if Birmingham wants to attract visitors, can't count only in Bullring and other constructions, it has to promote its heritage and character. Moseley is one of the very few areas outside the city center that retains its character and fame because of its social and cultural events through the years. It is this character that is now under threat.

Thank you for your time to read my letter and I hope Moseley will remain as one piece.

Kind Regards

UK Parliament Disclaimer: This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage
caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and
should not be used for sensitive data.
This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in
partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call
your organisations IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

***********************************************************************************
The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service
supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email
has been certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: mo kaur
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

As one of the residents who will be affected by the boundary of acocks green changing to Yardley west I do not see the point apart from making it easier for the conservatives to win at the next election it will not benefit the voters. If I wanted to live Yardley I would have bought a house there leave the boundaries where they are and stop wasting money on tinkering with things that are not important.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sharon Kaur
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

The new proposed changes are ridiculous. I will no longer be part of Yardley where I've lived my whole life but Stechford.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Saiqa Kauser
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Tyseley is good

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Shakila Kauser
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am horrified you want to abolish Moseley to form balsall Heath, what about the impact of houses prices, if I wanted to live in balsall Heath, I would have brought a house they, who are you decide on such an important decision, we have done a lot of work to put Moseley village on the map, go and deal with the real issues that effect people, we want Moseley

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

18th January 2016

Dear Sir

Plans for Moseley

I have lived in Moseley since my school years and attended Moseley School. I am treasurer of the fionaMoor Green Lane Residents Association and also a member of a number of Moseley Community groups, including the Moseley Society and I am co-chair of the Moseley Muslim Volunteers Group.

I am particularly proud to be part of such a diverse and vibrant community. Indeed, as you are no doubt aware Moseley has won a number of awards including the Sunday Times award last year of “best place to live” An extract from the article is shown below:

“The 600-year-old suburb topped the list of Britain’s top 50 urban districts and comes just days after a report ranked Birmingham alongside Rome in a global index rating the quality of life for city dwellers. Moseley was praised by judges for its "village community." The panel based its results on a number of factors including schools, crime rates, house prices and transport links, as well as "the expertise and knowledge of Sunday Times writers."

We had a meeting on 16th January at the local secondary school and I would estimate that some 500 or so Mosleyites were there. This indicates the strength of community we have and the general consensus was for us to remain as one. Please see attached photographs from the meeting.
Your guide states that Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act sets out the statutory criteria to which you are required to have regard in conducting electoral reviews. In broad terms, in making recommendations, you are required to have regard to:

• the need to secure equality of representation;
• the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
• the need to secure effective and convenient local government.

**Equality of representation**

I believe we need to maintain the population of voters per elected councillor within the ±10% margin, while fixing the number of councillors at 101.

My understanding is that the population of Moseley as currently constituted is slightly more than twice the proposed average size of 7215, but well within the ±10% margin.

Rather than combine Moseley (rebranded ‘Cannon Hill’) with Balsall Heath, it is clearly possible to set up a two-councillor ward that leaves Moseley, with its coherent identity, sensibly intact. If necessary, adjustments at the margins will allow you to incorporate the requisite number of voters within the Moseley double ward and (for example) the Balsall Heath single ward.

I have been in regular contact with Mr. Tim Bowden, Review Officer at the LGBCE. He has been extremely helpful and provided guidance to me on a number of occasions.

I have tried to provide an alternative that has as little “knock-on” effects on the adjoining wards as proposed in the draft proposals.
I am attaching therefore, a map of what a 2 councillor ward Moseley ward could look like.

In numerical terms, using data provided on the LGBCE website, this would (using my rough calculations lead to a ratio of about 6517 for Balsall Heath and 6768 for Moseley. Both would be comfortably within the current tolerance. In 2021, using the LGBCE projections this would increase to 7619 for Balsall Heath (-5%) and 7612 for the 2 councillor ward Moseley (-6%). So both will have equality of representation.

This also preserves the neighbouring proposed wards and the geographic size of my proposed Moseley ward is roughly the same as near by 2 councillor wards such as Billesley and Bournbrook and Selly Park.

**The need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities**

Moseley is a unique community. I believe my alternative will retain most of this as virtually all of these will remain firmly anchored in Moseley.

There are numerous community groups and residents associations.

These include the Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom and Moseley Inter-faith group, Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley festival, Moseley Arts Market. The list is endless. Each of these, i made up of people who care passionately about Moseley giving up precious time to help the community.

The logistics of having to deal with multiple councillors and funding bodies for an area we love is going to make our lives extremely difficult.
We always see an amazing range of people at the monthly Moseley farmers market or watching Citizen Khan actor (Adil Ray) turn on the the rather small number of Moseley Christmas lights last year. Our shared community spirit is surely worth preserving. So without doubt, this is not an exclusive community, All are made to feel welcome here and get involved.

Personally, the one thing I love about Moseley is that everyone is welcome here as we all strive to make Moseley better. “Moseley is a little oasis with a great sense of community, but it isn’t exclusionist, it’s not as if everyone is a middle class Land Rover driver” as the article in the Sunday Times said.

Indeed, I also believe Balsall Heath would also be better served as a single councillor ward. Looking at recent studies into deprivation, Balsall Heath is improving but has very different economic needs compared to Moseley and Kings Heath.

The need to secure effective and convenient local government

I don’t think I can argue that my proposals are any better than the draft LGBCE ones in this area.

In summary
There is no need for the Boundary Commission to destroy Moseley in order to fulfil its statutory duty, and I ask as a proud Mosleyite, part of a diverse and happy Moseley community that you reconsider these proposals.

Yours faithfully

Mr. Akif Ehsan Kazi
Dear Sir,

Re: Yardley, Birmingham

Please find attached Cllr. Neil Eustace's heartfelt plea re "Brutal" (my word) changes to existing boundaries. "Stechford" bears no relation - ship to "Yardley", they are two totally different districts.

Such changes can have only detrimental effects, as a resident of over half a century, I would ask you to please consider the Councillor's justified "call to arms," which I myself heartily and sensibly support.

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs.) Joan Kearby
Focus
Neil Eustace local resident & Councillor

Boundary Commission Wants to Scrap Yardley

Following a damning government report into how badly Labour run Birmingham all ward boundaries are being reviewed. The resulting wards will be much smaller. The commission is proposing to call where you live Stechford East.

This will mean St Edburgha's Church and the Conservation area will not be in Yardley.

I strongly oppose this suggestion.

Overleaf is a map of the commission's proposals and contact details. I ask you to support my campaign to save the historic name of Yardley.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Neil Eustace

Neil Eustace Your Councillor for 30 Years
Your help needed to save historic Yardley

Yardley dates back to before the Domesday book. Its Church is almost 1,000 years old. Yardley Conservation Area was Birmingham’s first. Yardley was independent until 1911.

Contact the Boundary Commission at:
reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Or

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

Please act fast as the consultation period ends February 4th.

If you need any further information then contact Cllr Neil Eustace on:

Email: neil.eustace@birmingham.gov.uk
Phone: 0121 303 4204

Liberal Democrats
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Richard Keddie  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

'Ladywood' is an outdated name for the city centre core of Birmingham. Surely, with all the redevelopment with the city, this area should be renamed 'Birmingham Central' or 'Birmingham City'? I'm referring to the areas starting from the Children's Hospital to the Barclaycard Arena, Holloway Circus, Masshouse and Five Ways. Ladywood would more refer to the areas south of Barclaycard Arena and beyond! I suggest this as it would be a more appealing ward name than the deprived area it is currently tagged with, which is too big a ward as it is at present.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: margaret keeble
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

To the reviewing Officer. I am a resident of Moseley and cannot take on board the boundery changes proposed for this ward. Moseley has a unique village community that has worked hard to keep and maintain its identity. It has been featured in the Times and is seen as one of the best places to live in Birmingham. In a city that one can feel alienated ,Moseley residents work hard to keep and maintain its identity, Moseley in Bloom, open gardens, street parties, farmers market etc. We donot want to be absorbed into the Balsall Haeth and Cannon Hill Wards. Why carve up a sucessful thriving community right in the heart of Birmingham. Those in London donot understand our iniqueness .

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam,

I have been made aware by my local Councillor that the Boundary Commission are proposing change the name of the Ward to Stechford East. I have tried looking on your website but find it difficult to navigate around your website and can not find the information there. I would be grateful if you send relevant information to stairs proposal.

If this is the case, a proposal to change the name to Stechford East, I find it an abhorrent suggestion and completely disrespectful to the very core of English Heritage. The area of Yardley is an important and historic area and the mere suggestion of removing the name from the Ward is as ludicrous as removing the name of Westminster from Parliament. How can the local residents here in the ancient and historic area of England be better informed of the proposal/s and voice our objection in the strongest of terms?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Nigel kee

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary change and renaming of Birmingham Yardley, particularly the historic centre of Yardley in what is now called Stechford & Yardley North.

Yardley has existed for over a thousand years whilst ‘Stechford’ (your latest proposal) is a creation of the railway builders.

In 1911 Yardley was bigger than Birmingham, and unlike the present city was in Worcestershire, not Warwickshire.

My family has lived in Yardley for generations and we do not wish to see the name disappear.

Do not confuse Yardley with ‘South Yardley’ which is another neologism, this time from the 1930s.

Yardley Manor House (moat), Yardley Parish Church, Old Yardley Park and Old Yardley Conservation Area are all within the section you wish to rename Stechford.

Yours Faithfully

Ian Kelcey
I strongly object to the proposed boundary changes.

I have proudly lived in Hall Green for 16 years. I previously lived in Tyseley for 10 years. Our direct neighbours were fabulous and could be called on at any time, but overall, we didn't have a good experience of living in Tyseley. During our time living in Tyseley we endured many neighbourhood disturbances and late night domestic arguments; the police would be called out late at night. We were also burgled three times during our last three years living on Cateswell Road. The road became increasingly difficult to negotiate parking outside our home, and driving out as it was very fast and dangerous. It was difficult to put our children into the car because of the speed of the traffic and lack of consideration by drivers. At times, Cateswell Road was used by boy racers late at night. With my children in the car I narrowly escaped being involved in a head on collision due to two cars race speeding (as I pulled in to check my daughter was strapped in) one of the drivers was killed in this incident. Neighbours ( two doors away) littered their garden with take away wrappers so we had a long term rat infestation which meant at the height of summer we couldn't let our children out to play in the garden. I remember the frustration and anger I felt that the problem was never tackled or resolved just ongoing. My time in Tyseley was a time of constant noise, nuisance and anxiety. We realised that living in the Tyesley was unsafe to raise our four young children.

When our house was finally sold I remember feeling great relief and excitement and couldn't wait to move to our new home in Hall Green. We have lived here very happily. Although we didn't move far (Southam Road) the environment is safer, cleaner and has a real sense of community. Our neighbours are our friends. If I need anything we just call on each other.

We feel our children's childhood greatly improved by making the move from Tyseley to Hall Green. We certainly made best use of all the local amenities, and church activities such as playgroup, and drama club and the Hall Green library homework club, My children had more freedom growing up in Hall Green. They were able to explore their area, and activities such as Brownies at Hall Green Baptist Chuch the Dingles Sarehole Mill, even just popping to the going to the shops. These are all things I couldn't allow when living in Tyseley because it wasn't safe to. We regularly used the homework club at Hall Green Library,

In Hall Green I have experienced friendly living. I did not have this experience living in Tyseley and with four young children I felt relief and a personal achievement to be able to move to the prestigious area of Hall Green. Hall Green is a safe environment where there is a strong community spirit. I am proud to work at Hall Green Secondary school and I feel that it would be very disruptive to change the boundary. I feel this change would have an adverse affect on the Hall Green community. Please do not go ahead with the boundary change our area works extremely well as it is and I can see no benefit to us as a community if this boundary change goes ahead.
I attended the meeting on January 29th at Hall Green United Church with my family and neighbours. The meeting was organised and funded by our neighbours Steve and Ali who also run WeAreB28. I logged my concerns previous to the meeting but having attended this meeting with 200 plus residents of Hall Green, I feel better informed to make my complaints to you. I am more fully informed and I would like to re log my concerns. I did not realise that this area would be under represented by councillors (who do a sterling job) Sam Burden our neighbour outlined your proposals at the meeting and how the changes will affect us if your proposal goes ahead. I strongly oppose to the area of Hall Green being under represented. By comparison to other areas such as Shirley we already have fewer councillors.

To change the name to Tyseley will be disruptive and is not representative to this area. It is imperative that 'Hall Green' remains in the renaming of this ward if the changes go ahead. I sincerely hope your proposals do not go ahead.

Hall Green has always been recognised as a prestigious area in which to live. Hall Green has many historical links that attract visitors to the area, such as Shire Park, Sarehole Mill, and the John Moore walk through the Dingles. According to your map Hall Green Station, Hall Green Baptist Church and Hall Green Library will not be in the Hall Green ward!

Residents in Hall Green are proud to live here and we work well as a community we are very fortunate to have many local churches in this area. In the last 15 years living here and raising my four children here, I have always felt very lucky to be able to use the many services and church run clubs here, playgroup, brownies, drama and dance clubs. We always made full use of our local library using g homework club when our children were you g. All I all as a community our area is unique and we want to remain as Hall Green.
Following the meeting I attended on Friday 29th at Hall Green United Church (attended by over 200 residents of Hall Green) I feel it necessary to contact you to confirm my concerns if your proposal goes ahead.

Firstly I object to you reducing the number of councillors that represent this area they do an excellent job serving this area. I do not accept that we should be under represented. Your proposal will be confusing i.e., Hall Green Station, library and church will not be seen as situated in the Hall Green. This is confusing and disruptive to visitors to the Hall Green area. There are strong historical links that make the name and area of Hall Green the prestigious area it is. I strongly disagree to this area being renamed 'Tyseley'. The residents in this area are close knit and I have lived here for 15 years. Raising a large family we have benefitted from using the many local amenities and church clubs (playgroups, brownies, drama, and dancing).

Our neighbours Steve and Ali funded and organised the meeting held at Hall Green United Community Church. The Reverend gave his full support and wants his Church to remain in and name and area 'Hall Green. Steve and Ali organise 'WeAreB28' and work relentlessly keeping us all in touch working together as a community.

I strongly oppose to any changes. It will be detrimental to this area. Please acknowledge my concerns.
I wish to register my displeasure at the proposed boundary changes to Hall Green. I am horrified the changes affect the original historic part of the suburb that includes the railway station which opened in 1908 and the shopping parade inaugurated in 1913 and most of all, I understand, Sarehole Mill- disgraceful. Are you intending to rewrite the history books- J.R.R Tolkien of Tyseley? The area, whilst it may have had a small industrial past, is long associated with a leafy green residential suburb and the reason I chose originally to live here. If I had wanted to live in the more industrialized Tyseley I would not have bought a house in Hall Green, consequently I am concerned that this will affect the sale ability and value of my property. I will be very interested to hear your comments on my concerns.
Yours faithfully
Susan Kelly
21 January 2016

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

Dear Sir,

I write to express my dismay and anger at the proposal that has been put forward for the changes to the Ward of Moseley and Kings Heath to the proposed segmentation of the Ward.

There appears to be no consideration of the 2nd and 3rd Considerations of the three requirements that the commission has been given as its terms of reference.

Moseley is a cohesive area of this suburb of Birmingham and to have the centre of Moseley not to be in the centre of the ward goes totally against Consideration 2.

The suggestion that new wards should be limited to a maximum of 2 councillors also destroys existing cohesiveness where communities already work in larger units thus going specifically against Consideration 3.

Moseley has a thriving café culture, nightlife and award winning Farmers Market. It attracts festivals of national significance to Moseley Park and Pool and contains venues that are recognised across the city. It also is a desirable location to have a business having two city famous music instrument sellers one of which includes the workshop that repairs and maintains most of the string instruments in the BSO Birmingham Symphony Orchestra.

Moseley has a considerable number of active local groups that act collectively together, making a considerable effect of the ‘effectiveness of local government’. This is certainly at present a ‘convenient’ way of getting local people to act locally. (Consideration 3)

I hope this gives the commission pause for thought before going ahead with such an unfortunate scheme that has been drawn up in the present proposal.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

John Kempson
From: Lawrence Kempster
Sent: 25 January 2016 18:46
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: boundary changes

Dear sir/madam

We have just been informed that my address is being proposed to be moving to weoly, when we moved to this address in the early seventies we were in Harborne, which if councillors check we are still according to the Harborne sign which is situated in Northfield rd, and Harborne is where all residents in Wentworth way, st Andrews close and vale close wish to stay, the boundary according to your plans is Harborne golf course which is at the bottom of my garden!!!!

I think a rethink is in order

Regards Lawrence.s. kempster
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: ruth kendall
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

is in Edgbaston and must stay that way.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Gerald Kennedy
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Member of the community

Comment text:

I live in [redacted] my submission is that the new ward name should be: FRANKLEY GREAT PARK, which would be more representative of the area.
Thank you Mr G Kennedy

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Allan kenning
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

my postcode is [REDACTED] which is in Yardley. I do not want to live, or be associated with Stechford. Also, my property value would drop by 10%. A.M.Kenning

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 08 February 2016 14:23
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: 24 hours left to Keep Erdington Abbey in Erdington!

From: Angela Kesterton
Sent: 08 February 2016 00:12
To: reviews@lgbcu.org.uk
Subject: Fwd: 24 hours left to Keep Erdington Abbey in Erdington!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Angela Kesterton
Date: 8 February 2016 at 00:10:11 GMT
To: reviews@lgbcu.org.uk
Subject: Fwd: 24 hours left to Keep Erdington Abbey in Erdington!

Sent from my iPhone

Only 24 hours to go to help keep Erdington together!
Help save Erdington today!

"We ask the commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham to represent a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, two member Kingstanding Ward, two member Oscott Ward, a Perry Common Ward, Pype Hayes Ward and a Stockland Green Ward. With the Erdington Ward borders running from Court Lane in the West, Sutton in the North, Pype Hayes and Holly Lane in the East and Kingsbury Road/Wood End Road in the South"

If the wards were changed to reflect this then that would ensure all of historic Erdington is retained within the Erdington Ward.

Please act now to help save our historic community

Yours sincerely
Robert
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

They will be partitioning a community with historical links to famous names and places.

Josiah Mason - Pells Lane - just two names, but also

Rockley House & Park have historical connections.

The Slade - the old Wak House - now built on admittely

but a famous EDMONTON landmark, as is the Abbey.

EDMONTON STATION!! How stupid would it be to put its
name on something else?

Please rethink your ideas.

Yours,

Name

Address

Postcode

Email

Phone
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Robert Kewley
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Local Government Boundary Commission for England 08/02/2016
Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Ward Boundary Draft Recommendation for Moseley, Birmingham

I am writing to strongly object to the draft recommendations published to alter the boundaries of the current Moseley and King’s Heath Ward that would effectively split the area of Moseley as I understand to five separate wards with six councillors. In my view your draft recommendations would carve up a community that has established itself over time to be a cohesive entity with a strong local identity. I believe that what you have recommended is nothing less than a reckless exercise that would severely harm local governance. It would also go against your own recommendations set out in legislature. Bafflingly, your proposals indicate that Moseley Village including Moseley Park, the local Parish Church, Moseley Hospital would find itself within new Cannon Hill and Balsall Heath Ward. Whilst these areas have always bordered on my understanding of what constitutes Moseley, we have very separate identities that have been established over decades. As a Committee Member on the Moseley Forum which represents the views of the Moseley Community, I was fortunate to be involved in the organisation of a public meeting into these recommendations and saw an incredible audience of 500 members of the community show their strength of feeling. During a public vote, the audience overwhelmingly rejected your recommendations. Videos of these votes are within the appendices submitted by body representing the Moseley community groups. By splitting Moseley as we know it into five separate wards this will make Moseley Forum’s business to nurture and improve the area much harder as we will be required to liaise with twice the number of councillors we currently have to work with. Moseley was voted last year as the Best Urban Place to Live by The Sunday Times. As a result the area has see a surge in interest by prospective businesses and people seeking to live here. This will also bring about challenges that the Moseley Forum will be wording hard to address. By breaking up Moseley as we know it, achieving improvements through liaison with the local Councillors will become far more onerous a task and may see the Forum lose its support from residents and volunteers. I would strongly ask you to look at the submission made by Moseley Forum and other local community groups proposing a two councillor Moseley Ward (see appendix 1 attached to the Moseley Community Group submission for a map of the proposed ward). The working group responsible for this submission has worked tirelessly to painstakingly detail the rationale behind it, taking into account the views of the community and duly considering the factors dictated by the Boundary Commission. I do hope that you will see sense and redraw the ward to better reflect the desires of the local community in Moseley. Yours faithfully, Robert Kewley.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hello

I know I am a day late but I would like to have my say on the Sparkbrook ward boundaries. I asked ashfaq to support the Sparkbrook boundaries and so did lots of people on behalf of the sparkbrook forum but he didn't speak to anyone and I don't know if he put anything in. Here is mine.

I fully support the Sparkbrook ward boundaries and happy that it is a 2 member ward. The area is highly deprived and parts of the ward have the highest levels of unemployment and inequalities in the country. There is a need for 2 councillors to challenge for more effective services. I hope you stick to the Sparkbrook planned boundaries as the communities are the same. If you look at the ethnicity, housing layout and design/structures, they are the same.

My name is Ilias Khan and I live on

thanks
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: majid khan
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 3: kings health
Comment text:
we all like to be in kings heath boundary thx

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name:  sajda Khan
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Why is part of my ward being named Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill whereas it was Edgbaston? The history of Balsall Heath means there are serious negative connotations and so surely just Cannon Hill would suffice? I paid a premium rate for my property as it fell into Edgbaston and so why should i now lose out due to the new changes? If it must change then Cannon Hill and not Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam,

Today I have visited your website and noticed a shocking proposal to change my post code area from Hall Green to Tyseley. The proposed changes are being made without giving any consideration to local geography and sociology. Looks like Local Boundary Commission is highly obsessed with rivers and railway tracks and was not bothered to give any consideration to the aspiration and bounding. The commission should have bothered to visit these areas, consider local demographic, cultural and historic status of the area, instead of establishing new wards between railway tracks and rivers.

I will there for strongly oppose the proposed attachment of Hall Green with Tyseley. Moreover, I would like to suggest that instead of attaching Hall Green with Tyseley, the commission may consider one of the followings;

- Just like several other areas in the city, make a bigger ward with 2 Councillors
- instead of attaching with Tyseley, Hall Green May be divided into 3 Wards

Please note that the proposed attachment of a part of Hall Green with Tyseley will result in a significant devaluation of our property, which is highly unacceptable to us.

*Is the commission considering to financially compensate residents of Hall Green to mitigate the impact this boundary change?*

Kindest Regards
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sachkartar Khera
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I have been living in the Handworth area all my life and after seeing the new Boundary proposals I was really surprised a large part of Handsworth Park will now be classed as Birchfield. This is a wrong decision as all of Handsworth Park should stay in Handsworth, this park is historic to the area with having over 200 years old St Mary church on site. Dividing up this park will will be a devasting move. Birchfield is not near the park so I do not understand how this ward be classed as far out as proposed. The triangle area from Villa road to Hamstead Road/Soho Hill should be classed as Handsworth as this is technically not part of Lozells. Why is Handsworth being given less space and less importance as each change is imposed?, please note this is the historic part of North Birmingham where the Matthew Boulton and James Watt started the industrial revolution within the city and it's not being given the recognition it deserves. This is the centre of the whole area and includes Soho Road which has much historical importance. The name of the Soho consituency should not of been changed to part Winson Green and part Ladywood and this area has it's own establised Identity. I believe with the proposed changes this area will now be referred to Newtown for consituency purposes, to me and many residents is a great insult as this should either referred to Handsworth or Soho due to having much more historical significance going back 100's of years compared to Newtown which is a 1960's development. Please can this be re-thinked as this decision will have signicant consquences in the future.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam,

It is with great dismay that I read about current proposals to change the ward boundaries in Moseley, reflecting the densities of population in the areas proposed and the attempt to allocate one councillor per number of population, to total 101 councillors across Birmingham.

In your document inviting residents to 'have your say' you state that that the council has concluded that the proposed model will 'address the failings of the past'. My first comment on this, without reading any further, would be to ask about the leadership of the organisation. Any failings will relate to this and to how the councilors have been trained and advised. It will also relate to how councilors in neighbouring wards communicate with each other, share the work of similar issues and how they communicate with residents. I recognise that the work of the councilor is not easy, however, it would be significantly easier if the councilors had a higher profile in the areas, and if they communicated with residents, perhaps through the electoral roll process and therefore via email.

I live in Moseley. Or to be precise, on the outskirts of Moseley, in [redacted]. I am thankful that where I live is a relatively large area, and that in fact I could just have easily found myself in Kings Heath or Stirchley, given my location, but that my ward is Moseley. I have nothing against these two areas, but I do align more to Moseley. I shop there, attend the market every month, go to St Marys church, and my children attended Moseley C of E School. Moseley is my identity.

Reading through the proposed ward boundaries, I find that Moseley village itself would not be aligned with Moseley ward and that the entire ward is to be split, using population density as the only criterion for demarkation. I find this illogical, ill thought out and frankly half hearted. It speaks of little thought and consideration for residents. Moseley is a large ward, with a diverse population of people who live side by side extremely harmoniously. This is largely due to the hard work and dedication of people from such groups as Moseley Forum, Moseley Community Development Trust, The Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley Interfaith Group, Moseley Festival, Sustainable Moseley, Moseley Arts Market, Moseley Market, B13 Magazine, and many more groups and societies. Why change something that works so well, simply to comply with a numbers exercise that has not been proven to work any better than the current system?

Moseley is an historical village with a heart. Groups have fought in the past to preserve its heritage, most recently that of Highbury Hall. We are extremely fortunate. As a village with wide boundaries, we would want to support our councillors in their activities, provided it is in keeping with the overall views and ideas for Moseley. It is an extraordinary place, with goodwill in extra measure and a huge voluntary community who strive to maintain the village atmosphere and to keep it looking great all through the year. We have
opened our garden for Moseley in Bloom and enjoy being part of Moseley life. It has a range of eclectic shops and eateries, which attract people to its heart. Moseley ward needs to be part of its heart, beating.

My recommendation is this: Have a representative number of councillors in a wider area, with good communication between areas. Or change the ward system altogether. What have other cities done? Don't mend something that isn't broken but that could be devastated by such a change. I'd like to see some really imaginative governance, especially in this time of increasing multiculturalism and with a growing and very real fear of terrorist activity on our streets.

If our councillors are worth their position, I'd like to see them stand up for their positions, tell us how they earn their salaries and how they go about representing us as citizens. And I'd like their leaders to do the same.

Julia Kilby
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

1. These L.G.B.C. proposals may not reflect equal voting representation of the new boundaries proposed.
2. We like Erdington the way it is. As it is not broken then don't fix it.

Yours Sincerely,

Name: __________________________
Address: ________________________
Postcode: ________________________
Email: __________________________
Phone: __________________________
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Kimberlee
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

31st January 2016 Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Proposed boundary changes in Birmingham and Swanshurst Lane

We have just become cognizant of your proposed boundary changes for electoral wards in Birmingham. Your suggested proposals do not actually reflect what local people desire regarding the community they identify with and the streets in which they live. Prior to the last boundary change undertaken by your Commission our road (Swanshurst Lane) was happily inside Moseley ward. The sign for the border of Moseley village (which still stands today) indicates that our street is clearly inside Moseley village.

Unfortunately you decided to dump our Lane and its citizens into a new artificially constructed ward of Springfield. A ward which you are now proposing to scrap! It clearly didn't work as a place of identity for the local community. Our experience of local politics since this time has been dispiriting. We have felt that local Springfield councillors did not represent our interests and that the centre of gravity for this ward was very removed from our lives in the Lane. This has meant that people from the Lane have felt unrepresented and have therefore disengaged from local politics because the artificial ward boundaries did not reflect the actual community that people identified with; leaving to their withdrawal from active citizenship in the Springfield ward. Under your new proposals Swanshurst Lane is going to be dumped in another ward that is apparently going to be called: Sparkhill South. We stress again that the residents of the Lane do not identify with the streets and venues delineated on your map. To force us again into another ward against our wishes would mean that local citizens in the Lane will continue to be disenfranchised with local politics and its institutions. As Swanshurst Lane residents we only identify with Moseley village. We never identified with your Springfield ward and we will never identify with your so called Sparkhill South ward. Like other residents in the Lane our life revolves around Moseley village. We shop on Moseley High Street. We regularly pray at St Anne’s church in Moseley. At weekends we walk in Moseley Bog which is actually at the bottom of our garden. We have supported numerous community campaigns in Moseley village including Moseley churches night shelter for the homeless people of Birmingham, Moseley in Bloom, the save the Moseley Bog campaign etc. We are regular attenders of the Moseley Arts and Farmers Markets and enjoy the jazz and folk festivals that happen in Moseley Park every year. We thoroughly endorse the suggested proposal for a Moseley ward, specified by Moseley people and articulated by Moseley Community Groups. It includes Swanshurst Lane but also all the venues and causes that we love and have identified and supported over many years. We urge you to listen to local people’s voices and reinstate the old ward boundaries of Moseley as specified in the Moseley Community Groups plan. It is to this community that the residents of Swanshurst Lane identify. We ask you not to dump our Lane into Sparkhill South, a place that would have no meaning or identity for us. Instead we urge you to think again. Please accept the Moseley Community Groups plan and draw boundaries to reflect our identity. In doing this we believe that we can then continue to support the vibrant civic culture that has developed over time leading to a more effective and convenient local government based around our desires as citizens; because only this will actively encourage us to support these local institutions and initiatives.

Yours sincerely, Dr R H Kimberlee and Ms Jane Harvey

Uploaded Documents:

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7036

27/01/2016
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

Erdington is centred on Erdington High Street. So logically Erdington area should radiate out from that High Street. This Gravelly Hill and Sutton New Road which includes Abbey School and Erdington Police Station, are very close to High Street (within 50 yards) and must remain part of Erdington.

As a Birmingham born and bred person I must dispute the Council agenda with the Boundary Commission wanting to change Erdington boundaries. Traditionally, for all my 66 years, boundaries of Erdington have always included the present area. Naming Perry Common and Stockland Green should remain the same.

Yours sincerely
Name: FRED KING
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone number: [Redacted]

F.R. KING

RECEIVED
04 FEB 2016
North Birmingham Community Together

A collection of Community Groups, Forums, Associations and Residents demanding the Boundary Commission keeps our local communities together.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

The Birmingham Mail has printed a number of articles on the disgraceful proposed breaking up of North Birmingham Communities. Just some of the things the commission are proposing are; Erdington Railway and Police Stations and Erdington Abbey are proposed to be taken out of Erdington. Gravelly Hill has been wiped off the map. Bandywood is being ripped away from it's Oscott community links. The clearly defined Kingstanding community is proposed to be broken up. While the proposed Perry Common area doesn't even include all of Witton Lodge Road, but does include part of Wyrley Birch.

We have until the consultation closes on Feb 8th to make our voices heard—take action now!

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield, to match the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We support these changes as they focus on our local communities, which residents would recognise; Castle Vale, Erdington, Gravelly Hill, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Common, Pype Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:-

I think it would cause total confusion especially for the older generation and young people growing up will also be confused. How can you tell them their address is changed and they haven't even moved. It's ridiculous surely we have enough problems to deal with, e.g. anti-social behaviour, rubbish being dumped etc, if it ain't broke why try to fix it? ???

Yours,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
North Birmingham Community Together

A collection of Community Groups, Forums, Associations and Residents demanding the Boundary Commission keeps our local communities together.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced its draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

The Birmingham Mail has printed a number of articles on the disgraceful proposed breaking up of North Birmingham Communities. Just some of the things the commission are proposing are; Erdington Railway and Police Stations and Erdington Abbey are proposed to be taken out of Erdington. Gravelly Hill has been wiped off the map. Bandywood is being ripped away from it’s Oscott community links. The clearly defined Kingstanding community is proposed to be broken up. While the proposed Perry Common area doesn’t even include all of Witton Lodge Road, but does include part of Wyrley Birch.

We have until the consultation closes on Feb 8th to make our voices heard—take action now!

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
Dear Sir

I am writing to express my concern and dismay about the proposed new boundaries for wards in the Moseley area as they will adversely affect how we are represented, how our local services are shaped and how our economic developments work.

I strongly feel there has been no grasp of the strong identity and sense of community that exists in Moseley.

Moseley is a historical village with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance. The two conservation areas - Moseley Conservation Area and St Agnes Moseley Conservation areas both face the same issues in preserving the character and architecture of the suburb and it makes no sense that these two areas should be pulled apart into separate wards.

Moseley Village is the popular focal point of the whole Moseley area and is key to creating a unique sense of identity - rich in diverse culture, entertainment and services. It makes no sense that the centre of a community should no continue to be at the heart of all areas of the community.

Economic development initiatives have been put in place and these proposals threaten to undermine all the above.

We are also an active community with numerous groups ranging from Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Tennis Club, Moseley Rugby Club, Moseley Folk and Jazz Festivals etc etc. Each group adds something wonderful and vital to the area. Other evidence of the Moseley sense of identity is the campaign to save Moseley Baths, to re-open the station and to raise money for the Christmas lights.

Moseley is a very special place - identified by the Times and Sunday Times as the best urban place to live in in the whole of Britain. This has been totally ignored or not grasped - those who have drawn up the boundary changes are akin to European imperialists who determined the carve up of Africa in the 19th century based on lines of latitude and longitude (in Birmingham's case arterial roads) rather than consideration of ethnicity and tradition with such devastating long lasting results. It is evident that those who drew up the new boundaries did so using a map in some room in Whitehall.

I therefore urge you to listen to the local residents and their valid objection and think again.

Yours faithfully

Jane King
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Roger King
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: None

Comment text:

I think the name of Frankley Ward, bearing in mind that Frankley is to one end of the proposed new ward, should be renamed Frankley Great Park.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
18th January 2016

Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Glastonbury Boundary Area.

Dear Sir,

Although I am a year old, and understand the necessity for progress and change, I am quite opposed to the possibility and thought of change in our little boundary. Why destroy our stable and unique society?

Yours faithfully,
[Signature]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Elizabeth Kite
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

The number of councillors for Most parts of Sutton Coldfield are disproportionate. The idea of redrawing the boundaries is to bring communities together. Why would you split the Defence Estate in half and have them in different wards. Likewise with Whitehouse Common. Why can't it be represented as one ward. It looks like someone has sat with a map and just drawn lines at random without too much thought for the people living there. One estate, one hedge as a boundary but two different wards. My neighbour and I will be represented by two different people. Surely the needs of a small estate as one community are important and best represented by one councillor.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Saadia Kiyani
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Saadia Kiyani Photography

Comment text:

I strongly object to parts of Balsall Heath being split up and a part of it being Sparkbrook. I grew up in Sparkbrook but went to school in Balsall Heath. All my life Balsall Heath has had a unique history and identity to do with what goes on there. While doing my degree in photography, I made a project in Balsall Heath about the local places where I had been to as a child. At the moment I am doing a photographic project called Legends of Balsall Heath, where I went and found people who had been in the area for over twenty years and had contributed to the community around them in some way. These people have been there for way more than twenty years in most cases. My mother is a dinner lady at Clifton Junior School which is a big part of the Balsall Heath identity. If these plans go ahead, the area where the school is will be counted as Sparkbrook, effectively erasing a big part of the history of Balsall Heath. The Balsall Heath Neighbourhood forum and St Pauls Trust are also in the part of Balsall Heath which will be redrawn as Sparkbrook, the amount of work these organisations have done for the surrounding area is immense and again a big part of the community of Balsall Heath. Great things have gone on in the past and many great things are to come in the future with what the people and these organisations have achieved. To erase the whole identity of part of the area is nothing less than a travesty. The sense of identity of Balsall Heathens should not be fractured in any way as it has taken decades and lots of hard work to get Balsall Heath where it is at the moment. It has been proposed that Highgate be joined with Balsall Heath which would be a better idea than parts of Balsall Heath being turned into Sparkbrook. If the parts of Balsall Heath which are there currently are turned into Sparkbrook, a giant chunk of history and identity of the area will be lost. I support the plans put forward by the Balsall Heath Neighbourhood forum. You can check my project photographs and text at https://www.flickr.com/photos/118135738@N03/albums/72157659858572974 Legends of Balsall Heath

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Graham Knight
E-mail: [masked]
Postcode: [masked]
Organisation Name: [masked]

Comment text:

I fully support the establishment of a ward for WEST HEATH. But the proposed boundaries of the ward are ridiculous since the new ward of West Heath would not include West Heath village itself including its post office and shops, West Heath library, West Heath Community centre (Hampstead House), West Heath doctor's surgery, St. Anne's Church (West Heath parish church) and the bus terminus for the 45 and 49. Did the person who drew up this map actually know anything about West Heath at all? The proposed new ward boundaries need to be reconsidered to include all of the above which is the very heart of West Heath and if the ward is then too big then I suggest reducing the distance that the ward spreads along Rednal Road in the direction of Kings Norton and including it in the Kings Norton ward. The current proposal is just plain daft - how can you have a West Heath ward which does not include West Heath itself?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Graham Knight
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I have already commented how West Heath village, West Heath library, community centre, post office, shopping area, medical centre and parish church will not actually be in West Heath ward but in "Northfield East" which is ridiculous. If these ward boundaries are accepted then at least rename "Northfield East" as "West Heath North" and call the proposed "West Heath" "West Heath South". Names are very important and "Northfield East" occupies areas which have almost all been identified as being in West Heath in the past and present. But if nothing else ensure that West Heath is in a ward with West Heath in its name.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Loren Knight
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Spark brook North and South seems too much for such a small area- looks like a way of concentrating funds to one area which seems unfair to other densely populated areas. Is it true moseley high street is not in the moseley boundaries? If it is true that should be rectified.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

Response to the LGBCE Proposals for Boundary Changes affecting Moseley

Moseley has a strong identity within and beyond Birmingham as a thriving and historic village centre, expressed by initiatives such as Moseley Society, Moseley Community Development Trust, Moseley Exchange, Moseley Farmers' Market, Moseley Festival and Moseley in Bloom. There are two conservation areas: Moseley Conservation Area and St Agnes Moseley Conservation Area, as well as the grade II listed Highbury Hall in its parkland setting. There has been a thoughtful and consistent approach to the economic development of this area over many years and this requires continuing active and understanding support of local councillor(s) dedicated to the interests of Moseley. Splitting representation of Moseley between several councillors with diverse interests is not a viable option. If there is a Ward called Moseley it is unthinkable that it does not contain the centre of Moseley with its village green, Parish Church and shopping area.

Yours faithfully,

John Knott
Diana Knott
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Isobel Knowles
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live in Moseley which is inside the current polling district 'CSG'. The LGBCE proposal has put the entire 'CSG' polling district inside a one Councillor Kings Heath ward. In reality the polling district of 'CSG', which is very large with 2745 voters overlaps two distinct communities, Kings Heath including the High Street in the south and the 'Moseley Triangle' in the north. Greenhill Road is not and has never been part of Kings Heath. It is in the area well known locally as 'The Moseley Triangle'. Its historical links are with Moseley, from the large Edwardian houses at the top of the road, to the row of terraced cottages opposite St Agnes Church hall. The house I live in is one of 12 semi-detached properties built in the grounds of a demolished larger house in Billesley Lane. Designed by a local Moseley architect and built by a local Moseley builder, they continue into Billesley Lane with another identical set of houses further into Moseley at Highfield Road. In 2009 our houses were adopted into the St Agnes Conservation area, one of two conservation areas in Moseley, and together with the rest of the Moseley triangle Greenhill Road is included in the Moseley Supplementary Planning Document, the first such community-led document in the city and upon which the joint community proposal for a two Councillor Moseley ward boundary has been based. The LGBCE proposal to include all of polling district 'CSG' in Kings Heath would lead not only to the Moseley Triangle being removed from Moseley but also the St Agnes conservation area would be split between two wards. http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/stagnesca To obtain community cohesion and effective local government it is clear to me that polling district ‘CSG’ must be divided between the two new wards of Moseley and Kings Heath. I am Chair of Moseley Forum. My husband is a past Captain of Moseley Golf club. I am a trustee of Moseley Community Development Trust and for the last three years I have headed the annual campaign to fundraise and organise Christmas lights for Moseley village. I was part of the Moseley Community Alcohol Partnership through which with our local Councillors we introduced an Alternative Giving scheme in Moseley to assist homeless rough sleepers and deter begging. I volunteer for Moseley Farmers Market. My children attended Moseley C of E Primary school. I am a key holder of Moseley private park and a member of both the Moseley Society and Moseley in Bloom. I take part in Moseley Time bank. Two of my near neighbours' have opened their gardens for Moseley in Bloom. We shop in Moseley, catch the bus to work from Moseley, eat in the restaurants and visit the park. To be so involved in a community where at the stroke of a keyboard I would no longer be in a position to vote for my local government representative would be quite upsetting. I spent time with other community representatives to prepare the initial joint proposal for a two Councillor ward based on the Moseley SPD, as well as feedback from various residents groups and from local knowledge. I was not alone in feeling totally let down and frustrated by the LGBCE proposal which not only ignored our community submission but also carved up our recognised community into a ludicrous & unworkable mish-mash of five separate wards . That Moseley village would not be in Moseley ward is absolutely crazy and would be a definite backwards step in effective local government for the residents and businesses in Moseley who have worked so hard to make it the identifiable and recognised centre it is today. Having spent much of my spare time over the past five years working with local Councillors and council departments in Moseley, as well as having experience in my work (as a neighbourhood police officer) with having to deal with the bureaucracy of cross ward boundaries, I understand only too well the negative impact there would be if all our community groups were trying to work with six
councillors over five areas, competing with other areas with their own issues and needs. Having been subsequently involved in the Moseley joint community group's recent review of our original submission, which included a huge consultation exercise, public meeting, engagement with surrounding neighbourhood representatives and politicians, I took heart with Professor Colin Mellors assurance on the Sunday Politics show, (for which I was interviewed), that the LGBCE does take account of the importance of community representations. I sincerely hope this assurance is put into practice. We have no other agenda than obtaining the very best local government for our neighbourhood. I therefore whole-heartedly reject the LGBCE proposals for the split of Moseley and Kings Heath ward and support the submission for a two Councillor Moseley ward made by the joint Moseley community groups who have widely consulted local residents, and which include representatives with years of local experience and knowledge.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Martin Knowles
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I live in [redacted] Moseley which is inside the current polling district 'CSG'. The LGBCE proposal has put the entire 'CSG' polling district inside a one Councillor Kings Heath ward. In reality the polling district of 'CSG', which is very large with 2745 voters overlaps two distinct communities, Kings Heath including the High Street in the south and the 'Moseley Triangle' in the north. Greenhill Road is not and has never been part of Kings Heath. It is in the area well known locally as 'The Moseley Triangle'. Its historical links are with Moseley, from the large Edwardian houses at the top of the road, to the row of terraced cottages opposite St Agnes Church hall. The house I live in is one of 12 semi-detached properties built in the grounds of a demolished larger house in Billesley Lane. Designed by a local Moseley architect and built by a local Moseley builder, they continue into Billesley Lane with another identical set of houses further into Moseley at Highfield Road. In 2009 our houses were adopted into the St Agnes Conservation area, one of two conservation areas in Moseley, and together with the rest of the Moseley triangle Greenhill Road is included in the Moseley Supplementary Planning Document, the first such community-led document in the city and upon which the joint community proposal for a two Councillor Moseley ward boundary has been based. The LGBCE proposal to include all of polling district 'CSG' in Kings Heath would lead not only to the Moseley Triangle being removed from Moseley but also the St Agnes conservation area would be split between two wards. http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/stagnesca To obtain community cohesion and effective local government it is clear to me that polling district 'CSG' must be divided between the two new wards of Moseley and Kings Heath. My wife is chair of Moseley Forum and my family is very involved in the Moseley community as are many of our neighbours. Our children attended Moseley C of E Primary school. We are key holders of Moseley private park and members of both the Moseley Society and Moseley in Bloom. We shop in Moseley, catch the bus to town from Moseley, eat in the restaurants and visit the park. To be so involved in a community where I would no longer be in a position to vote for my local government representative would be quite upsetting. That Moseley village would not be in Moseley ward is absolutely crazy and would be a definite backwards step in effective local government for the residents and businesses in Moseley who have worked so hard to make it the identifiable and recognised centre it is today. That the community I recognise as Moseley be cut up between five different wards does not make for effective working for local community groups working across the area, including Moseley in Bloom, The Moseley Society, Moseley Regeneration group or Moseley Forum I therefore whole-heartedly reject the LGBCE proposals for the split of Moseley and Kings Heath ward and support the submission for a two Councillor Moseley ward made by the joint Moseley community groups who have widely consulted local residents, and which include representatives with years of local experience and knowledge.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Michael Stuart Knox
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The short document attached I hope explains why it seems LGBCE has not set about the redrafting of Birmingham’s ward boundaries with the adventure and innovation Kerslake and the City Council envisaged. Had this not been so, the whole process may have passed me by unnoticed, and I would not have been seeking for the Review to be restarted, as I do now. The best return on investment in governance change lies firstly in minimising the effort and resource needed to make that change by the communities who will be required to accommodate it. So it is essential the plan for this fits around the already considerable investment Birmingham’s communities have made in organisational and physical infrastructure, and does not subtract from it. It may be LGBCE did not have, at short notice, the resource to adequately formulate such a plan, in which case it should seek this. Birmingham is too large an economic and social unit within the Midlands and the UK to get this wrong. Conversely, if well done, it may lift the electorate's interest in, and benefit from, local governance and leadership, and would almost certainly be used as a blueprint for change elsewhere.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
SUBMISSION ON LGBCE DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR BIRMINGHAM.

The way ‘Forward’ [1] for Birmingham’s local government arrangements was signalled, if not exactly made plain by the Kerslake Report which prompted the review by LGBCE.

Observation. The Report’s recommendation 4 picks out the priority in boundary selection ‘that reflects existing communities’ to assist in ‘effective and convenient local government’. In Chapter 1 on ‘Size and Structure’ item 29 contains the Department for Communities and Local Government’s map of projected population growth to 2031 in existing wards. The report goes on to identify that the wards with highest growth are a close fit with existing voter under-representation (the UK’s greatest), high unemployment and low incomes, low school education and skill levels, high social deprivation, and most likely contain the youngest of Birmingham’s very young population profile, and the highest of its rapid population churn. They are also the areas of the city where voluntary and pressure groups are least well developed, so councillor and council officer activity and council service provision is most required, while the City Council faces a reducing budget.

Conversely the LGBCE draft recommendations state their priority to be equalising ward voter numbers, with a nod to assisting effective Local Government in their aims which is not reflected in Table A1 of proposed wards, which exposes the review as a mathematical exercise in ‘fairness’.

The effect can be quite ridiculous. It removes ‘Moseley Village’ (colloquially) where I live, with its centre for commerce and social life and parish church, into a ward called Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill, while retaining the residential area with most of the activities’ patrons in a ward termed ‘Moseley’. Despite this medievally-based village-gone-suburb having a vast, vocal and effective array of well-established voluntary organisations, and so is perfectly capable of managing itself, both proposed wards into which it would be divided continue to be over-represented with (6%) sub-average electorates even until 2021. We had all hoped existing minor peculiarities would be resolved by LGBCE! I am aware, but do not have detailed knowledge, of many similar anomalies in draft wards.

LGBCE does not appear to have attempted to strategise the new ward boundaries itself, presumably to shorten the process, relying substantially on politically driven schemes which may have utilised local knowledge LGBCE does not have. Nevertheless it has already allowed Kerslake’s May 2017 timetable for elections on the revised basis to slip by a year. While cooperation between LGBCE and the City Council could free up electoral and parish boundaries [2] to assist, this seems only to have occurred at the Council’s instigation in relation to Sutton Coldfield. The ‘giveaway’ of the poor quality of the outcome lies in ‘Detail’ on the tables on pages 9-32 of LGBCE’s draft in the phrase, ‘balance between our statutory criteria’, and requests there for suggestions of ward names.

Conclusion. LGBCE’s draft recommendations substantially fail to fulfil the aim for single councillor wards which reduce losses of councillor time to political or opinion-based resolution, and do not assist with the pragmatic approach of Kerslake which Birmingham City urgently needs to apply. The Council’s most successful leadership attribute is in attracting inward investment, growing in scope to a ‘Greater Birmingham’, then to a ‘Midlands Powerhouse’ (which would generate an early and substantial return on HS2). Birmingham falls short on providing enough skilled people needed to secure returns on those investments so many people with those skills wastefully spend much time travelling in from the greater Midlands [3](and elsewhere) placing transport (infra)structures under stress. They often then spend out of Birmingham, while the City supports segments of its population unable to properly contribute or benefit.
Recommendations

**Birmingham.** The starting point of the Department of Communities and Local Government’s 2031 population projections would permit design of single-councillor ward boundaries which give reducing electorate over-representation in the (mostly central) areas where most Council support is needed urgently. More capable communities would then be temporarily under-represented but with the City Council only capable here of a ‘light touch’, these wards are then free to decide and procure local actions on a knowledgeable voluntary basis calling on council funding in the usual manner with some councillor leadership and governance and, as always, council committee scrutiny to ensure political, social, and financial integrity and compliance (with council officer support). Satisfaction of the 5 year legislative barrier would need to be reviewed [4].

**Moseley.** With such a substantial redrawing of boundaries it is very difficult to suggest an alternative redrawing locally as it impacts on surrounding wards and to varying levels across the city. So the request from LGCBE for suggested revisions to its proposals is tantamount to asking for LGBCE’s remit to be assumed by someone else, or just nibble at LGBCE’s draft wards. For Moseley however, its Forum’s submission is a robust starting position, subject to peripheral erosion to accommodate less under-representation as a single member ward. The difficulty in this is that many people locally wish to be considered part of Moseley (or Edgbaston which has the fewest electors per councillor in the city proposal now, and who remain equally unnecessarily over-represented at 2021 [5]).

**Overall.** Low turnout reflects the ‘What has this got to do with me?’ attitude many people feel about local government elections. Voting in a single recognisable leader of a relatively small area capable of making things happen where they live is the best chance there is of changing this so council representatives are relinked and relevant to the communities they serve. LGBCE’s current draft wards seem to me to be very unlikely to assist with political involvement or community achievement.

There may not be sufficient time to, in effect, start again drawing fresh boundaries and still meet the aspiration of May 2017 or 2018 elections on this basis. This is not a sound reason for rushing through poorly conceived proposals which would soon need reappraising [6]. Change consumes peoples’ effort in reorganisation which would otherwise be directed to improving business and associated employment and income, and social or council services which lift quality of life. So it is vital that electoral and administrative change fits existing community enterprises, and lasts.

Stuart Knox

Moseley, Birmingham

Notes

[2] LGBCE draft, Parish electoral arrangements para34, page 33
[5] There is a clear geographical boundary between west and east Edgbaston as single member wards, though the University facilities and Parish cross this. The world-famous Edgbaston Cricket ground could then fall within (east) Edgbaston, unlike LGBCE’s draft.
[6] LGBCE policy: avoid making alterations leading to short-lived ward or electoral boundaries.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Shaheen Koar
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: The highlighted area should still be classed under the sector of Hall Green, rather than that of Tyseley

Comment text:

It is an absolutely absurd notion to change this highlighted area to be classed under Tyseley. Under this shaded area lies Colebank Road, where one of the first houses in the area of Hall Green was built. Under this highlighted area lies Hall Green Secondary School, a school which has been established for over 50 years, Hall Green station and Sarehole Mill, a 250 year old Museum famous for its association with one of the greatest authors in history- J.R.R. Tolkien. To inconsiderately, and dispassionately draw these lines without careful thought of all of the above, including the considerable dropping of house prices, is a barbaric display of disloyalty to the culture and history of Hall Green as an area, and Birmingham as a town.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: shaheen kosar
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I think Hall green should be named as Hall green Central due to its historic Sarehole Mill and also its well known historical Tolkien. Hall green told by local residents who some have e lived on Colebank Road for 60 years and 80 years remember Hall green having beautiful fruit orchards and beautiful hills. It is an insult to us Hall green residents who have helped keep Hall green as it stands. You are enjoining Tyseley which is an industrial area with its factories and ugly warehouses with a magnificent peace of art as Sareholemill which you should be helping to preserve not degrade. Hallgreen secondary school has also worked very hard helping its students achieve an amazing 97 percent achievement in passes putting it into tyseley is ridiculous. You cannot just draw aline, you need to walk the streets and talk to residents and see what you are destroying, you have to help communities not slice them apart please reconsider. You are also degrading our property prices many residents have spent thousand of pounds on improving there homes by our houses coming under tyseley we are loosing thousands of pounds off our properties. If this proposal goes ahead we residents should get compensation from the council and government. Many of us will loose up to half the value off our properties.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Shaheen Kosar  
**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** mum

**Comment text:**

MY NAME IS SHAHEEN AND I HAVE BEEN LIVING IN HALL GREEN FOR OVER 10 YEARS I AM A MOTHER OF 4 AND A FRIEND OF MANY IN THIS MY LOCAL AREA AND COMMUNITY.YOU REALLY NEED TO COME DOWN AND TALK TO US FACE TO FACE.YOU CANNOT MAKE LIFE CHANGING DECISIONS WITHOUT OUR INPUT.PLEASE DO NOT BE TYRANT RULERS WE HAVE SEEN MANY IN THIS WORLD TODAY. EG ASSAD HAS DESTROYED SYRIA AND DISPLACED ITS PEOPLE, WE PEOPLE MAKE AND BUILD COMMUNITIES, WE HAVE TRIED ALL OF US IN HALL GREEN TO MAKE A BETTER PLACE FOR OUR FAMILIES HERE,WE LOOK OUT FOR EACH OTHER AND KNOCK ON NEIGHBORS DOORS TO ASK HOW THEY ARE WE WANT TO KEEP CRIME OFF THE STREETS AND KEEP TERRORISM DOWN THIS CAN ONLY BE DONE BY COMMUNITIES LIVING TOGETHER AND UNDERSTANDING EACH OTHER AS WE HAVE ACHIEVED THIS WITH MULTI FAITHS LIVING IN HALL GREEN SIDE BY SIDE .HELP US TO KEEP US AS HALL GREEN .LISTEN TO OUR VOICE AND BE OF THOSE WHO DID LISTEN AND TAKE THE STEP THAT WILL MAKE US THINK OF YOU WHO HELPED SAVE A COMMUNITY AND ITS NAME WHICH HAS BEEN AROUND SINCE THE 16TH CENTURY .PLEASE THINK AGAIN SOME OF THE ELDERLY HAVE LIVED HERE FOR MANY YEARS DOREEN MY NEIGHBOR IS GOING TO BE 96 THIS YEAR SHE WAS VERY SADDENED TO HERE THAT HALL GREEN IS GOING TO BE TORN TO PIECES , SHE TOLD ME ONCE THAT A LONG TIME AGO WHEN SHE WAS YOUNG ,THE DEAR QUEENS SISTER ,PRINCES MARGARET DROVE UP OUR ROAD HAVING COME BY THE GREAT SAREHOLE MILL . WE WANT OUR CHILDREN TO BE THE NEXT GENERATION TO LOVE AND LIVE AND LOOK AFTER HALL GREEN.THANKYOU FOR LISTENING .PLEASE KEEP OUR CHILDREN IN MIND, WHO LOVE AND CARE FOR THIS COMMUNITY AND ITS PEOPLE SHAHEEN KOSAR
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None Uploaded
The Review Officer (Birmingham),
Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
14th Floor Millbank Tower,
Millbank,
London,
SW1P 4QP.

Dear Sir,

Re:- Boundary Commission Proposals for Moseley, Birmingham.

I oppose your proposals for Moseley.

Moseley has recently been called "the best suburb in Britain"
It is a popular local centre and has a great Community identity and spirit.

Your proposal for a single ward "Lesser Moseley" with but one Councillor out of 101 - less than 1% of the Council, is destructive of that Community identity.

Your proposed "Lesser Moseley" includes Moseley Church of England School and most of St Agnes Moseley Conservation Area, but excludes:
- Moseley Village with all shops, pubs and post office,
- Moseley Parish Church,
- Moseley Hall and Park,
- Moseley Railway Station, soon to be re-opened.
- Moseley Conservation Area,
- Moseley Swimming Baths, former Library, Art School and Moseley Grammar School,
- Moseley Golf Club,
- Moseley Bog, (where Moseley's most famous son J.R.Tolkien first saw the Hobbit).

The Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom and other organisations will have to deal with Local Government Officers and Councillors in five other wards with differing identities - this will be ineffective and inconvenient for all concerned.

Yours faithfully,
To whom it may concern please can you take my views set out below as to the reasons why Hall Green should stay Hall green as a whole.

I can confirm that I have been a resident of the hall green area for more than 15 years. The shear panic and feeling of unease your proposals have caused to our tight knit community is devastating to say the very least. The fears of joining an industrial part of the city tysley has caused panic fears of house prices falling insurance reminiscing going up are probably what you have received to date but please look at my reasons set out below for hall green being left as it is known below.

The boundary proposal changes that you seek to implement are wholly unreasonable and unjustified. The proposals you seek are unfair and do not take into consideration the devastation and erosion of our tight community being split into three and eradicating a part of hall green and calling it tysley. If you were to come and visit the United hall green itself you will see that we as a whole area are different to tysley. We are a unified ward a proud ward which hosts and boasts people who all work hard to preserve the identity of it. We are all hardworking people from different walks of life many have aspired to move to this area and for you to now seek to destroy it by carving it up as a cake beggars belief. If I wished to buy a house in tysley I would have a decade ago but I did not I chose hall green for the good schools, local facilities and kind friendly neighbors and community members I have come to know and our local counsellors too.

Hall green has a proud heritage and community that dates back to 1592 , we are hall green together please do not take such a drastic step to make us lose our Idenity. The famous book and movie the Lord of the rings was founded by JR Tolkien in hall green not tysley, the famous comedian Hancock lived on the southam rd hallgreen and not tysley. The logic to rip us and parts of hallgreen away and to call it tysley is ludicrous to say the very least a community is only a community if we are one which we are.

Hall green United has an affluent culture and economy why does a commission siting in London who with all due respect does not live In hall green or other wards of Birmingham seek to eradicate the status quo it beggars belief and to save what a princely sum of £1.5 million all the confusion you are seeking to cause and the cost to implement the same changes will add up to more than this figure.

Why devestate us and destroy our community? Why try to fix something when it is not broke? Why split us we have done nothing wrong we are hard work it people who like me over the last 15 years see all of hall green as one I have never thought to dream to see a borough in London or where ever the chief decision maker sits or hails from to spilt up his community then why ravage ours and the proposals you have sought for Birmingham.

We are hall green we are Birmingham we are part of England and a proud UK we have been stronger together and we shall remain Great Britain so do not carve us up, we are proud and have a heritage a sense
of belief being a of homogeneous community we are hall green.

Please do not ignore my concerns and please change your views and allow us to remain in hall green a
United hall green

thank you Mr Sanjeev Kumar

P. I strongly oppose your proposals and hope you too will see sense and stop this madness that has gripped
all of hall green and other wards of my beloved Birmingham city thank you