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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Denise Macdonald

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

Organisation Name: resident

**Comment text:**

I am a resident of Greenhill Road in Moseley. This road and the neighbouring ones are at the very heart of Moseley and residents have never considered themselves part of any other part of Birmingham. The proposed boundary changes would put us in Kings Heath and other parts of what is currently seen as Moseley in Balsall Heath. Moseley is a vibrant community with many active societies focussing firmly on Moseley and run by local people many of whom live in Greenhill Road. Organising annual events, liaising with local government agencies, accessing financial support and working with local businesses would all suffer if the area was divided between 3 wards each with their own agenda and focus. The proposed boundaries show no consideration to the communities within south Birmingham and appear to be drawn with only the population size in mind.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: John Macdonald
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The Longbridge Ward may be changed to Frankley Ward. A more appropriate rename may be Frankley Great Park Ward as this encompasses more of the ward

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

Having looked at your proposals in detail I feel that one community in Sutton Coldfield that is one represented is that of Whitehouse Common. This is a well established community with its own identity & own primary school (Whitehouse Common Primary School).

Creating a Whitehouse Common ward would still ensure Sutton Coldfield fulfils your ward creation criteria as your current proposals would mean on average, councillors in Sutton Coldfield should have over 600 more electors than in Birmingham. Indeed the proposals would mean that the smallest Birmingham ward might have only 60% of the electors per councillor that residents of Sutton Coldfield would have which is hardly fair. A fairer calculation, taking account of the population of Sutton, would suggest that there should be 11 councillors in Sutton Coldfield with the extra ward being one that takes into account the the community of Whitehouse Common.

In light of this, I am objecting to the current proposals and I am proposing that our population justifies 11 councillors based on the communities of Four Oaks, Mere Green, Town Centre, Wylde Green, Roughley, Whitehouse Common, Reddicap, Walmley, Minworth, Boldmere and Banners Gate.

Kind regards

Ewan Mackey
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to object to the reduction in the number of Councillors in Sutton Coldfield being reduced to 10 with proposed Boundary changes. This would mean that on average Sutton Coldfield Councillors would be serving as least 600 more residents than in the Birmingham wards and Sutton Coldfield residents will be under represented in Birmingham City Council. I feel strongly there should be 11 Councillors representing Sutton Coldfield.

Regards

Julia Mackey
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Margaret Macklin
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Great Barr boundary...proposed north oscott boundary....there heads to be a shift in the boundary that encompasses the Scott arms junction. at present the boundary run in the middle of one of the busiest junctions in Europe allowing no ownership by councils. the junction is a feeder for Birmingham from junction 7. at present it serves no users and constant traffic affects the local economy for both sandwell and north Birmingham.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: george macleod
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I have lived in Moseley, at three addresses for fifty years. It is a very identifiable community with a remarkable cohesion. The numerous organisations are deeply intertwined with much cross fertilisation. It contains a large Conservation Area with a second about to be confirmed. There has been a strong community spirit for generations. Birmingham Central Library archives have copies of the 'Moseley Society' monthly magazine from 1890 onwards. The central area, through which the proposed boundaries will cut, has for years been referred to as 'the Village' and incorporates a Green. The relationships between local Businesses and the public have always been positive and interdependent. Relationships between the community and local councillors have always been excellent. For years most councillors have lived within the community and have shown a deep awareness of the needs of the people. The proposed changes are absurd and and utterly destructive to the area. I have been deeply involved in community activities since 1966. The proposed boundary changes have produced incredulity and outrage the like of which I have never encountered. I urge you to reconsider. George Macleod

 Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I feel strongly that the proposals for Birmingham have been reached without taking adequate notice of local opinion and some, such as the proposals for Moseley where I live, appear truly ridiculous to anyone with local knowledge.

You received an excellent submission from a confederation of groups representing almost every aspect of local life before the proposals were drawn up but the proposals that emerged show no sign of having paid any attention to what they said. Consequently, I am not hopeful that your current 'consultation' has any reality and is merely an exercise for form's sake so I expect this message to be ignored too but I cannot acquiesce without entering my own protest.

It appears that the only criterion to have been applied was that of equalizing ward sizes. Those of respecting existing communities and facilitating local government have been grossly violated. The proposed 'Moseley' ward does not even include what all local residents consider to be the centre of Moseley. The area considered to be 'Moseley', and attracting members into The Moseley Society will be represented by six councillors, for most of whom Moseley will be a minority responsibility. This will make it far more difficult than at present to elicit, agree and act on issues that relate to Moseley.

Please reconsider the submission already made to you and produce proposals that reflect its arguments.

Alexander MacRae
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:-
From: MIchael Madden
Sent: 03 February 2016 12:49
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Boundary Changes north Birmingham area

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you to request that you change your proposals for the north Birmingham area to a Pype Hayes Ward including Birches Green, a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a Perry Common Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, a two member Kingsstanding Ward, a Stockland Green ward and a two member Oscott ward. With an Erdington Ward which boundaries are the the border of Sutton Coldfield to the North, Court Lane to the West, to the south the traditional border with Gravelly Hill/Birches Green of Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road is used. To the east the border of Pype Hayes, enabling Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive to remain in Erdington.

Thank you

Michael Madden
Patricia Madden
I am contacting you in regards to the boundary changes in Hall Green. I want to be added to the petition.

I have lived in Hall Green for 17 years and prior to this I lived in Hall Green as a child.

Mrs Maureen Maguire
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Arfan Mahmood
E-mail:
Postcode:
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

The boundary commission has done a good job in making the new Tyseley Ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
To whom it may concern,

The Boundary Commission’s proposals for Hall Green ward is to split it up into three wards – Hall Green North, Hall Green South and Tyseley.

As residents of Hall Green, we did not want boundary changes imposed on us and we feel that the Boundary Commission had not consulted widely or fairly. We are concerned about the splitting of the Hall Green community, which is an example of a very diverse and cohesive community. One of the Boundary Commission’s main objectives with the new proposals is to reflect community identity. We feel overwhelmingly that the proposed changes split the area apart. It feels like the Boundary Commission are more concerned with equalising the number of electors each councillor represents than promoting community cohesion.

Recently Hall Green has undergone great demographic changes. For many years, community organisations have been working to forge good community links between the different faiths in the community and the different generations. The number of young people in the ward has grown considerably in the last ten years. We write to ask that you stop the proposed changes to the Hall Green ward or at least to come to a decision that causes least damage to our community.

If changes need to be made then we support the submissions from our Labour Councillors.

Kind regards,
Mr Adil Mahmood
To whom it may concern,

The Boundary Commission's proposals for Hall Green ward is to split it up into three wards – Hall Green North, Hall Green South and Tyseley.

As residents of Hall Green, we did not want boundary changes imposed on us and we feel that the Boundary Commission had not consulted widely or fairly. We are concerned about the splitting of the Hall Green community, which is an example of a very diverse and cohesive community. One of the Boundary Commission’s main objectives with the new proposals is to reflect community identity. We feel overwhelmingly that the proposed changes split the area apart. It feels like the Boundary Commission are more concerned with equalising the number of electors each councillor represents than promoting community cohesion.

Recently Hall Green has undergone great demographic changes. For many years, community organisations have been working to forge good community links between the different faiths in the community and the different generations. The number of young people in the ward has grown considerably in the last ten years. We write to ask that you stop the proposed changes to the Hall Green ward or at least to come to a decision that causes least damage to our community.

If changes need to be made then we support the submissions from our Labour Councillors.

Kind regards,
Mr Khalid Mahmood
From: Sadia Mahmood
Sent: 05 February 2016 20:51
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Hall Green ward change

To sir or madam,

The Boundary Commission's proposals for Hall Green ward is to split it up into three wards – Hall Green North, Hall Green South and Tyseley.

As residents of Hall Green, we did not want boundary changes imposed on us and we feel that the Boundary Commission had not consulted widely or fairly. We are concerned about the splitting of the Hall Green community, which is an example of a very diverse and cohesive community. One of the Boundary Commission’s main objectives with the new proposals is to reflect community identity. We feel overwhelmingly that the proposed changes split the area apart. It feels like the Boundary Commission are more concerned with equalising the number of electors each councillor represents than promoting community cohesion.

Recently Hall Green has undergone great demographic changes. For many years, community organisations have been working to forge good community links between the different faiths in the community and the different generations. The number of young people in the ward has grown considerably in the last ten years.

We write to ask that you stop the proposed changes to the Hall Green ward or at least to come to a decision that causes least damage to our community.

If changes need to be made then we support the submissions from our Labour Councillors.

Kind regards,
Mrs Mahmood
To whom it may concern,

The Boundary Commission’s proposals for Hall Green ward is to split it up into three wards – Hall Green North, Hall Green South and Tyseley.

As residents of Hall Green, we did not want boundary changes imposed on us and we feel that the Boundary Commission had not consulted widely or fairly. We are concerned about the splitting of the Hall Green community, which is an example of a very diverse and cohesive community. One of the Boundary Commission’s main objectives with the new proposals is to reflect community identity. We feel overwhelmingly that the proposed changes split the area apart. It feels like the Boundary Commission are more concerned with equalising the number of electors each councillor represents than promoting community cohesion.

Recently Hall Green has undergone great demographic changes. For many years, community organisations have been working to forge good community links between the different faiths in the community and the different generations. The number of young people in the ward has grown considerably in the last ten years. We write to ask that you stop the proposed changes to the Hall Green ward or at least to come to a decision that causes least damage to our community.

If changes need to be made then we support the submissions from our Labour Councillors.

Kind regards,

Mrs Tasneem Mahmood
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:-

Yours Sincerely

Name: MRS. A. MAHON
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 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!
I am writing to express my concern over the proposed boundary changes to Hall Green. I feel being under Tyseley ward will have a detrimental effect on the value of my property in Green Road as well as taking away our local identity. I do not feel that all the implications of these changes have been thought through, and hope that you will take into consideration the views of the residents who will be affected.

Yours,
Mr Daniel Mahon
I am writing to express my grave concerns over the proposed boundary changes to Hall Green. The proposed change will confuse the local geography and take away our local identity. Will there be two Tyseley railway stations if the proposals go through? Will Hall Green school be renamed? I am also extremely concerned about the detrimental effect on the value of my property in Green Road if we are to come under Tyseley. I do not think these proposals have been properly thought through, and hope that you will take note of the concerns of the residents of Hall Green.

Yours,

Mrs Maureen Mahon.
Dear Sirs My family have lived in Hall Green since 1976 and it has been a source of pride that the ward of Hall Green has always had a very strong sense of community identity. The Boundary Commission's proposal will mean that our home will no longer be in the ward but in a newly created ward of Tyseley as indeed will Hall Green Railway Station, Hall Green School, Hall Green Parade and Hall Green Community Church. In my opinion the proposed boundaries are illogical and absurd, damaging the community spirit and will inevitably result in the loss of Hall Green’s strong identity which is the complete opposite of what the Boundary Commission aims to achieve which is to "ensure that the pattern of wards reflects interests and identities of local communities." It is difficult to see how the creation of 3 new wards will prove effective for residents, to say nothing of the cost of implementing such changes. In the 40 years that our family have lived in Hall Green the local councillors of all political parties have always worked hard and shown great commitment for the constituents they represent. The 3 councillors work as a team and support each other in their work and provide cover for absence. To divide Hall Green into 3 separate wards each with an individual councillor can only reduce their effectiveness and ability to act on behalf of Hall Green residents. I am writing to protest most strongly against the proposed Hall Green ward boundaries, and demand that they remain unchanged in the interests of the whole community and to allow for effective representation in local government. Yours faithfully Nicole Mainwaring

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Rob Mainwaring
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

We have lived in Hall Green since 1976. The ward of Hall Green has a very strong sense of community identity and residents are proud of the name. The Boundary Commission's proposal will mean that our home will no longer be in the ward but in the newly created ward of Tyseley as indeed will Hall Green Railway Station, Hall Green School, Hall Green Parade and Hall Green Community Church which is absurd. This proposal will damage the community spirit and result in the loss of the strong identity of Hall Green which is the complete opposite of what the Boundary Commission aims to achieve which is to "ensure that the pattern of wards reflects interests and identities of local communities." Furthermore I believe that creating 3 new wards will actually prove to be less effective for residents. In the 40 years that we have lived in Hall Green our local councillors have, irrespective of their political party, always worked hard and with great commitment for the constituents they represent. Our 3 councillors work as a team and support each other in their work and provide cover for absence. To divide Hall Green into 3 separate wards each with an individual councillor will dramatically reduce their effectiveness and ability to act on behalf of Hall Green residents. I therefore request that the Hall Green ward boundaries are left as they are in the interests of the whole community and effective representation in local government. At the very least, if the final decision is to create 3 wards then at least name them Hall Green North, Hall Green Central and Hall Green South which will at least be logical and reflect the heritage of the local community in the names. Yours sincerely Rob Mainwaring

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hi

My name is Haleem Majahid of [REDACTED], Birmingham, [REDACTED]. I am a very active local community activist and voice many concerns for young people in the Lozells and East Handsworth ward. After looking at the new proposed boundary changes I and many other people in this area were unhappy with them.

As we believe that combining the Handsworth and Birchfield wards in your plan together is much better boundary for a new ward rather than having it split into two. One of the main reasons is that Handsworth Park brings both communities together and the current plan uses the park to split the communities rather than bringing them together. This will cause many problems in the area and will divide communities even further. The council should not be doing this and they should be helping communities thrive and build community cohesion instead of destroying it.

I have got many residents in the area to sign the petition and they are attached to this email.

Kind Regards
Haleem Majahid
Birchfield and Handsworth

We the undersigned feel that combining the Handsworth and Birchfield Wards in your plan together is a much better boundary for a new ward than having it split in two. One of the main reasons for this is that Handsworth Park brings both communities together and the current plan uses the park to split communities rather than bring them together.
Birchfield and Handsworth

We the undersigned feel that combining the Handsworth and Birchfield Wards in your plan together is a much better boundary for a new ward than having it split in two. One of the main reasons for this is that Handsworth Park brings both communities together and the current plan uses the park to split communities rather than bring them together.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Birchfield and Handsworth

We the undersigned feel that combining the Handsworth and Birchfield Wards in your plan together is a much better boundary for a new ward than having it split in two. One of the main reasons for this is that Handsworth Park brings both communities together and the current plan uses the park to split communities rather than bring them together.
Birchfield and Handsworth

We the undersigned feel that combining the Handsworth and Birchfield Wards in your plan together is a much better boundary for a new ward than having it split in two. One of the main reasons for this is that Handsworth Park brings both communities together and the current plan uses the park to split communities rather than bring them together.
Birchfield and Handsworth

We the undersigned feel that combining the Handsworth and Birchfield Wards in your plan together is a much better boundary for a new ward than having it split in two. One of the main reasons for this is that Handsworth Park brings both communities together and the current plan uses the park to split communities rather than bring them together.
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:-

- Our communities will be broken up and the heart of Victorian Erdington will be removed.
- We need an Erdington Ward with boundaries of Courtnell to the west, Wood End Road / Kingsbury of Courtnell to the south, Pyne Hayes Park, near of Woodcote Road to the south, Pyne Hayes Park, near of Woodcote Road to the east and Sutton border to the north.
- We need to keep our Erdington Community together as it has been for a great number of years.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Address]

[Postcode]

[Email]

[Phone number]
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!
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Adnan Malik
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: Resident of [Redacted]

Comment text:

I am a resident of [Redacted] Moseley, Birmingham, [Redacted]. I understand your attentions are to put us into Sparkbrook South and want to stress I completely disagree with this and would like to return to our 2001 position of being in the Moseley Ward. Many of the residents of the street feel exactly the same and im sure you will be hearing from them soon.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Naveed Malik
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 2: Hall Green North

Comment text:
I think as I marked on the map that area should be in Hall Green North because it has historical links with hall green and is green suburban area. Tyseley is an industrial area and it should not be included in the marked area.

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 of Erdington are proud of our historical heritage. Our listed building - Erdington Abbey - has been sited in Erdington since 1847. It is nonsense to think it could be known as Erdington Abbey, Stockland Green. The same applies to Erdington Station, Erdington Police Station. They are part of Erdington's heart - Stockland Green is nowhere close to warrant the removal of this present boundary.

Yours sincerely,

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone num:-
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:-

IF I WISHED TO LIVE IN SHORT HEATH I WOULD HAVE PURCHASED A HOUSE THERE.

Yours Sincerely

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
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 consultation form ASAP!
The Review Officer (Birmingham)  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14th Floor Millbank tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP  

4th February 2016  

Dear Sir/Madam  

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham city Council  

I write with reference to the proposed two-councillor ward of Bournbrook and Selly Park.  

I feel very strongly 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 stock, community groups, conservation areas and commuting habits.  

It is clearly visible by walking through the area how different the areas are and consequently the needs of the residents will differ accordingly.  

Bournbrook - predominantly a student area - for neighbouring Birmingham University.  

Selly Park – a very leafy conservation area of beauty with long settled residents.  

Both communities have, for many years, resided without any conflict, and I believe this is due to the housing boundary with long term Selly Park residents understanding that students come and go.  

In terms of each ward I would recommend an 'internal' boundary within the proposed two Councillor ward, thus creating two – one Councillor wards with no wider impact. This suggestion would far better suit the needs of the residents being supported by its own Councillor.  

I would seek your consideration to the above and look forward to hearing from you.  

Yours faithfully,  

[Name redacted]  

Mrs B Mall
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sandra Mallon
E-mail: [protected]
Postcode: [protected]
Organisation Name: [protected]

Comment text:

I am objecting to the plans regarding the forthcoming boundary changes in Birmingham relating to Yardley and the thought of its name being changed to Stechford horrifies me! We are forever being told to get involved in our local community and having done that for the last 10 years in the 'Ancient Parish' of Yardley, it's like being slapped in the face!! It means that Yardley Old Church and village with its vast history would no longer come under Yardley!!! I have lived in the same house in Sedgemere Road for 33 years, got on well with all my neighbours. Formed and ran over 60’s group for 5 years (voluntary) On East Yardley Neighbourhood Forum Committee for the last 10 years (voluntary) Awaiting decision on my application to visit residents of Yardley Grange to talk about their family history /genealogy (voluntary) You say "We also aim to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities" It certainly looks like it!! We are encouraged to do voluntary work by Birmingham City Council which saves them lots of money but I feel so passionate about the name change that if this goes ahead I will not be doing any voluntary work in the future. Regards Sandra Mallon YARDLEY

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed changes to Hall Green, Birmingham B28 Ward.

I feel that the aims are **Not** met.
1) Moving part of Hall Green to the Tyseley area will not reflect the community identity. Hall Green is residential and has a green, rural feeling. Which is why we chose to make our family home here. Tyseley is industrial/residential. Therefore it would make more sense to combine B11/B12 into Tyseley.

2) How does fragmenting an area lead to effective governance. Hall Green has a long history as a designated area. It has several established Historical sites/buildings. Under your proposal some of these would no longer be in the Hall Green Ward.

We have long been served well by successive councillors for the Hall Green Ward and feel **very strongly** that this should continue.

I trust that the feelings and opinions of the residents will be taken into account before any alterations are made.

Yours faithfully,

Janet Mandir
PROPOSED BOUNDARY/WARD CHANGES TO PARTS OF HALL GREEN, B28.

Dear Sirs,

I have looked at the proposed changes and I feel that proposal needs further investigation.

Hall Green has, compared to the other Wards, a greater historic value.
eg. Sarehole Mill, Sarehole Road, Tolkien, Tony Hancock, one time Colebank Farm, area between Sarehole Road and Stratford Road
was once used for farm animals, the public walkway along the River Cole.
I am sure that there are many more landmarks.

To fragment parts of Hall Green is simply leading to another loss of the English Heritage.
How long will it be when the rural feeling of the area is absorbed into the surrounding concrete and bricks Wards?

Why not promote Hall Green as an Tourist Area.

To us it would seem more progressive to join the whole of Hall Green to Billesley and Warstock where there is still untouched green land.

We chose to purchase our property in Hall Green and have lived here for 40 years and some of our neighbours much longer.
We do not feel that it is acceptable for someone else to decide to move our designation.

I strongly believe that Hall Green should be left intact.

Whilst I appreciate the need to reduce the number of Councillors, may I suggest that you consider amalgamating
Sparkhill, Sparkbrook and Camp Hill.
Or may be Sparkill and Tyseley.
Or even the all of them under one umbrella. This is more logical than dividing Hall Green B28.
I hope you will consider our views.

Yours faithfully,

K. Mandir
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: paulinr manfield
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The ward plans for Sutto Coldfield, have no regard for present community relationships,. with only one concillor for each ward, there will be less access to get help and information

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Kevin Manning
E-mail: [hidden]
Postcode: [hidden]
Organisation Name: [hidden]
Comment text:

 unacceptable

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Anna Manns
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

As a resident living in Sutton Coldfield, I am directly impacted by the proposed amendments to ward boundary lines. I am writing to request an immediate cessation of the Electoral Review for Birmingham District on the grounds that consultation has not been conducted in accordance with the consultation criteria listed within HM Governments Code of Practice on Consultation. Specifically, Criterion 2: Duration of consultation exercises. The Code of Practice states "Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible". I understand the deadline for appeal is 08 February 2016. I have received no formal notification of the proposals via any medium from Birmingham City Council. I became aware of this consultation process this morning (25.01.16) by chance and as a result of an unofficial mail drop. The Code of Practice clearly states under Criterion 4 that “Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach”. There are a number of residents in and around Sutton Coldfield who remain unaware of the proposals and therefore have been illegally prevented from exercising their rights to appeal. Having failed to provide accessibility within the minimum timescales the Council is in breach of Government practice. Criterion 5 stipulates that "Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees’ buy-in to the process is to be obtained". Having been excluded from the consultation process by Birmingham City Council, due to the restrictive time period I and my fellow residents have remaining to digest and comment on proposals I consider the burden of this consultation is overwhelming and therefore that this criterion has also been breached. To reiterate I believe, having failed to adhere to Government Codes of Practice Birmingham City Council has failed to conduct a fair consultation and therefore the entire process is both illegal and invalid. I request a formal acknowledgement of this letter from Birmingham City Council with a full response as to how each of my complaints will be addressed.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I am writing to protest about the boundary changes in Cateswell Road. Who is going to benefit by these changes? Certainly not us our motor and house insurance will rocket and our houses will devalue please reconsider these changes yours faithfully Valerie Mann (mrs)
I hope that Moseley remains entire instead of being divided into several entities. Moseley has such a sense of identity and village atmosphere it really would be best left as it is. We'd all feel happier. It's not broke, so don't try to fix it please.
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:

**Bournbrook**
- 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,
K Maqsood
I have lived in Hall Green for over fifty years. Hall Green has gone through many changes in that time but has always remained as a community. Hall Green has always been in some ways like a village. It is important we keep that community. I am against any changes that would split it into different parts. I strongly urge you to think again and keep Hall Green exactly as it is.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Roger Markwell
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Some of the proposals are really absurd, on a local level. The two I feel most strongly against are Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. If this proposal goes ahead, Edgbaston Cricket Ground will not be in Edgbaston and Moseley Village will not be in Moseley! These proposals need a sensible re-think please. Thank you. Roger Markwell

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

Proposals for Boundary Changes:

I write to register my strong disapproval of the suggestion that the ancient Yardley area should be renamed Stechford East.

Yardley has a thousand years of historical interest - how can you take away its name?

I hope your committee will rule out this awful idea.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sir / Madam,

Re: Proposed boundary changes - Acocks Green Ward, Birmingham.

We write to express our grave concern at the proposed boundary changes for the Acocks Green ward, and in particular to the Northern boundary, which is currently the "Grand Union Canal." The proposed change will have the Chiltern Railway line as the new boundary.

There are valid and undisputable reasons why this change is unacceptable to the residents of the current Acocks Green Ward.

- Historically, Acocks Green Village has grown up and prospered with the railway station at its heart. Large, impressive houses were built and occupied by wealthy Birmingham families, moving away from the city centre with the advent of the railway. These clustered around Acocks Green station. Radiating out from these smaller, charming terraced houses later surrounded them. All of these remain today. A community has built up over the ensuing decades, which is cohesive, and has its own pride and identity in Acocks Green. The idea of using the railway line to divide this community has been greeted with dismay by local residents. Acocks Green's integrity must be preserved.

- The Boundary Commission may be unaware that local residents are currently working with Birmingham City Council to have part of Acocks Green - and in particular the area close to the railway station - designated as a conservation area. The proposed boundary change would put this conservation area into two wards, Acocks Green and West Yardley. Residents have
worked tirelessly, together with Acocks Green Councillor, to achieve this status. Boundary changes could delay or jeopardise a process which is dear to the residents of the Village.

- Certain anomalies would occur, due to the change in the northern boundary of Acocks Green, which must have been overlooked by the Boundary Commission.

(i) Westley Vale Millennium Green, proposed, planned and developed by trustees and volunteers living in Acocks Green would become part of West Yardley Ward.

(ii) Acocks Green "Village in Bloom" won a gold medal in 2015, for the first time. Local residents achieved this by planting greenery, wild flowers and orchard areas, together with magnificent street planters, tubs and hanging baskets throughout the village. With the proposed boundary changes, the loss of the millennium Green, and other innovative street displays will make it extremely difficult for Acocks Green to repeat this success.

(iii) Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum is a thriving local community group which holds regular meetings for residents to discuss local issues, and to keep in touch with each other. The new Northern boundary would bisect this community.

Acocks Green Focus Group works actively to protect the character of the whole of the Acocks Green Ward. It keeps abreast of proposed new plans and developments, and the impact of these on the street-scene. The change of boundary from the Grand Union Canal to the Chiltern Railway Line would leave the current North of the Ward vulnerable.

From our own personal point of view - and what is most important to us, is that our house is in the North of Acocks Green. The proposed new Northern boundary for Acocks Green Ward will move us and our close neighbours into West Yardley Ward. For many of our
adult year we have lived in Acocks Green. We are concerned with its welfare, use its facilities, and above all wish to have a say in its future.

We would ask the Boundary Commission to give serious consideration to the enclosed plan which we believe enables the area of Acocks Green Ward to retain its integrity.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

E. A. MARLOW
J. MARLOW
For consideration by the Boundary Commission
suggested alternative boundary change for Acocks Green Ward
2 Councillors with approximately 17,500 residents/electors.

? Move into Yardley West

? Move into Hall Green East

As proposed by [redacted]
30th January 2016
Dear Sir/Madam,

Electoral Review of Birmingham City Council

Introduction

We refer to the Commission’s publication of its Draft Recommendations on 15th December 2015, which we find immensely disappointing. We object strongly to the ward boundary proposals contained in the Draft Recommendations. We confirm our support for the alternative Community proposal for a 2-councillor Moseley ward. We also have a few remarks to make about certain technical aspects of the process.

Incidentally, we do agree with the proposition that the City Council would be more efficient and effective with fewer councillors than it has at present but we can find no particular reasoning for the recommended number being a round number like 100 +/- 1.

The Commission’s Proposals for the Moseley Area (see Map 1)

The Commission’s proposal for a ward called “Moseley” appears to be an arbitrarily drawn area, comprising mixed Victorian, Edwardian, inter- and post-war housing and very little else. The proposal is simply an amalgamation of two adjoining whole polling districts (CSI and CSK) with parts of two others (CSH and DDD) designed to satisfy the equal electorate criterion for a one-councillor ward, we assume.

The area has no centre and very few shops, clubs and meeting places. As a whole, it has no distinctive community identity. It is not a generally recognised geographical area with a name, certainly not “Moseley”, other than being one fragment of the latter. The area as a whole has no representative organisations so far as we are aware (we live there).

There is no evident nor stated rationale for a 1-councillor ward here, other than the fact that it would be what is left over should surrounding proposed wards be determined first.

Absurdly, the proposed Moseley ward does not include the centre of Moseley (see section on next page), nor other services and landmarks such as Moseley Hall and Hospital and Moseley Park that are essential parts of Moseley, as virtually all local people know it.

We note that Ordnance Survey maps generally put the “Moseley” place name in this area but that is a cartographic device to avoid obscuring the centre of Moseley just to the west. We hope that the Commission have not been misled by this.
The Commission’s proposal for a ward called “Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill” again appears to be an arbitrarily drawn area, in this instance for a 2-councillor ward. It amalgamates whole polling districts CHK, DA, DDB, DDJ, CSA, CSB and CSJ and part of CHE, designed similarly to satisfy the equal electorate criterion for a two-councillor ward.

The area includes on the eastern extremity the historic Moseley village with its shops, post office, pubs, cafes, restaurants, professional offices, churches and community centres. Moseley village is the local centre serving the surrounding, largely residential catchment area extending 1-2 miles in every direction. It is recognised as such in the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the Draft Birmingham Development Plan. This is the place that all road sign directions and mileages are referring to, that all bus services marked “Moseley” are going to and all taxi drivers will take you to if you ask for “Moseley”.

Outside Moseley village centre, the proposed “Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill” ward consists of 2 parts. The first is the part south of Edgbaston Road that is covered by the current Moseley and Kings Heath ward. The housing is mostly large Victorian and Edwardian villas with modern ‘infill’ together with large open spaces such as Cannon Hill Park and Moseley Park and Pool. The other area to the north of Edgbaston Road is in the current Sparkbrook and Edgbaston wards and contains high density Victorian terraced housing and post-war Council estates with much higher levels of deprivation. The differences between the 2 areas are reflected clearly in the contrasting urban street pattern and ‘texture’ of development shown in the OS base mapping of the Commission’s proposals map.

The 2 areas in short are very different in character. The northern part has very few links and associations with Moseley organisations and services while, by contrast, the southern part has many. Indeed it is an integral part of Moseley. The 2 areas also have relatively few links with each other. They have different needs and priorities in social and economic terms.

We note furthermore that “Cannon Hill” is not a place name that would be recognised in this or any other area of Birmingham, other than in connection with Cannon Hill Park, one of Birmingham’s most important open spaces. It is one of a number of place name anomalies that appear on OS mapping.

Conclusion on Moseley and Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill Ward Proposals

So neither ward proposal fits the Commission’s community identity criterion. The proposed “Moseley” ward is too small while the proposed “Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill” ward combines 2 very different areas having little in common with Moseley or each other. In addition, the boundaries of both seem to be more constrained by the use of whole polling districts as building blocks than is necessary (more on this point a little further on).

In our opinion, the basic methodology should be to start by identifying the main local centres across the City before building ward proposals around each centre to put them at the middle of Council wards so far as possible. The centres are the focal points of local community identities.

We believe that it would be helpful for the Commission to visit the area again and take a closer look especially the village centre in relation to the areas described above.
Effective and Convenient Local Government

We do not believe that the Commission’s proposals will provide the basis for the most effective and convenient local government possible in the area. There would be at least 4 wards involved in the area that most local people regard as Moseley. This would mean that existing and very well established local community organisations such as the Moseley Society would have to deal with councillors representing several different wards rather than one. This would also apply to national and regional bodies, businesses and individuals. Equally those councillors together with officers supporting and advising them will have to waste time and energy liaising on matters that affect the whole of Moseley. It would be much more difficult to get a consistent and coordinated approach.

In our view, 1-councillor wards are not generally a good option. There would be no immediate cover for the councillor who takes on a major city-wide role or who dies or suffers ill health. There would be no choice of representative for constituents to seek advice or help. There would be no economies of scale in team working and shared back-office support. Likewise, the service delivery teams which tend to be organised on a ward basis would be more likely to suffer the same diseconomies of scale. Comparatively small 1-councillor wards would be more likely to encourage an overly parochial mind-set and artificial political divisions. For all these reasons, 2-councillor wards are preferable in our opinion to single member wards, not least in Moseley.

Finally the more small wards that are proposed, the more boundaries there will be to be disputed during the boundary review and subsequently. Conversely and advantageously, the more 2- or even 3- councillor wards, the fewer boundaries there will be.

Our Support for Community Alternative Proposals (see Map 2)

We support the Combined Community Group’s proposal for a 2-councillor Moseley ward. The Groups’ proposal is based on extensive and detailed consultation of local residents, area-wide and neighbourhood community organisations and residents associations. It reflects the debate and almost unanimous resolutions taken at a public meeting in January attended by several hundred residents from all parts of Moseley. It also takes into account discussions with representatives of neighbouring areas.

The Community Group’s proposal satisfies all 3 of the Commission’s criteria:
- It conforms very closely to the electorate equality yardstick
- It reflects Moseley’s overall community identity
- It is the best solution for effective and convenient local government in the area.

It also benefits from carefully thought-out boundaries taking cognisance of local geography and landmarks, prepared on detailed OS mapping. Where appropriate, the proposals incorporated whole Polling Districts but where necessary they were split to meet the community identity and good local government criteria.

Comments on Certain Technical Aspects of the Consultation Process

On its website, the Commission provided current and forecast electorate data for existing wards and polling districts. It also provided a scanned map of polling district boundaries overlaid on small scale OS mapping. Finally, it made available an online polygon drawing tool for consultees to create their own alternative boundary proposals.
However, it seems to us that despite the above, the consultation process does not operate on an entirely level playing field. Political parties and the Commission itself have an unfair advantage over individuals and voluntary organisations wishing to review the draft proposals or come up with alternatives of their own. This situation arises from the points outlined below:

- The published polling district map is not sufficiently clear. The quality of boundary line detail in some areas is poor, particularly where there are outliers and narrow slivers of land and property, as for example in the case of polling district DDD. Labels for individual polling districts are sometimes confusing, making it impossible to determine which polling district an area belongs to.
- As noted by other contributors to this consultation exercise, Polling Districts are not good building blocks for creating ward boundaries. To quote, “Their boundaries are arbitrary and idiosyncratic, many with highly irregular shapes including outliers and ‘tentacle’ extensions. [They] vary enormously in the size of their electorates”. “The larger ones are especially problematic because combining adjacent polling districts one by one (without dividing them) to build up a new ward proposal can tip the combined electorate from well below the required figure for a 1-, 2- or 3-councillor ward to far in excess of that figure. Birmingham has some of the largest polling districts in the country, some of which are larger than wards in other cities”.
- Should they wish to subdivide polling districts, voluntary organisations and the general public do not have access to computerised electorate data below polling district level at all. Access by other means is only possible in printed form by painstaking inspection of the Electoral Register in the City Council’s Elections office.
- In addition to the data access problem, voluntary organisations and the general public require a degree of computing and data manipulation skills not commonplace in the general population in order to prepare their own proposals.
- Voluntary organisations and private individuals otherwise have to prepare alternative proposals ‘blind’ not knowing what the electoral equality implications would be. Moseley was exceptionally fortunate to be able to turn to resources not available to most areas.
- The online polygon drawing tool to enable consultees to create their own alternative boundary proposals appears to have a serious drawback. The user must zoom in to a small area to view the background map detail but when digitising all but the smallest boundary polygon, the map does not scroll automatically to the adjacent area when needed.

Lastly, we trust that the Commission’s response to the wide range of complex issues raised in this and no doubt many other submissions from across the City will not be constrained by the fairly short period before it is due to publish its final recommendations on 17th May.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours faithfully

Mr. M.J. and Mrs. J.P. Marlow
Members of the Moseley Society
Map 1. The Commission’s Proposals for the Moseley Area

Map 2. The Combined Community Groups Proposal for a 2-Councillor Moseley Ward
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:

Bournbrook

- 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.
- 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,

Jill Marsal
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Marsh
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: None

Comment text:

Moseley is an historical and well defined area. Losing its traditional boundaries will threaten its historical buildings and commercial balance as it is subsumed into a larger area with differing priorities. Moseley shoals was a popular record and Moseley festival draws huge crowds and adds the local economy. Please do not let Moseley disappear.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I live in the eastern part of Acocks Green which the Boundary Commission proposes to hive off into a new Yardley West Ward.

I strongly object to long-standing settled communities being split up to create new Wards which do not share the community spirit of existing Wards. There is no such place as Yardley West. There are existing areas called Yardley and South Yardley - which adjoin Acocks Green - and these are separate communities with their own community ethos, meeting places, community activities etc.

Acocks Green, as we know it today has existed as a separate entity for more than 100 years. It has its own Neighbourhood Forum which is active in local activities to benefit the residents. Much beneficial activity involves people from across the Ward in making Acocks Green a better place in which to live. Hiving off the eastern part of Acocks Green into a new artificial construct threatens all that good work and the community it supports.

While I appreciate that the Boundary Commission wants to homogenise Birmingham and divide it up into areas of similar size and fairer representation, destroying existing vibrant communities and trying to create new, artificial Wards will dismantle existing organisations which function at little or no cost to assist the City Council and leave the new artificial Wards with no community ethos. This will simply increase the workload of a City Council which is already struggling to cope with its responsibilities!

I urge you to reconsider the division of Acocks Green. When all is said and done, it is easy to look at a map and make arbitrary changea and then walk away, job done! But please consider the people who will lose their community and their involvement in it. I live in Acocks Green, I shop in Acocks Green, and I have no interest whatever in being part of an artificial Yardley West Ward.

Regards

Adrian Martin
On 5 January 2016, I emailed you (see below) concerning my misgivings about being one of 4,000 Acocks Green residents being removed from the existing Acocks Green Ward and placed in a new Yardley West Ward.

Since I wrote, we have had a Public Meeting of the Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum at which two local Councillors presented ideas:

1. to rename Yardley West "Acocks Green North Ward" and to rename the remainder of the old Acocks Green Ward "Acocks Green South Ward"

2. to incorporate the proposed Yardley West Ward and the remaining part of Acocks Green Ward into a new, 2-Councillor, Acocks Green Ward

Given that the Boundary Commission should reflect community identity and ethos in the changes they make, I would be grateful if you could please record my full support for suggestion number 2, a new, 2-Councillor, Acocks Green Ward. This would enable us to preserve our existing community identity and our interests in all aspects of the existing Acocks Green Ward. Suggestion 1 would be a poor but acceptable solution but would sever an existing strong Ward into two.

Regards

Adrian Martin

Text of my original email:

I live in the eastern part of Acocks Green which the Boundary Commission proposes to hive off into a new Yardley West Ward.

I strongly object to long-standing settled communities being split up to create new Wards which do not share the community spirit of existing Wards. There is no such place as Yardley West. There are existing areas called Yardley and South Yardley - which adjoin Acocks Green - and these are separate communities with their own community ethos, meeting places, community activities etc.

Acocks Green, as we know it today has existed as a separate entity for more than 100 years. It has its own Neighbourhood Forum which is active in local activities to benefit the residents. Much beneficial activity involves people from across the Ward in making Acocks Green a better place in which to live. Hiving off the eastern part of Acocks Green into a new artificial construct threatens
all that good work and the community it supports.

While I appreciate that the Boundary Commission wants to homogenise Birmingham and divide it up into areas of similar size and fairer representation, destroying existing vibrant communities and trying to create new, artificial Wards will dismantle existing organisations which function at little or no cost to assist the City Council and leave the new artificial Wards with no community ethos. This will simply increase the workload of a City Council which is already struggling to cope with its responsibilities!

I urge you to reconsider the division of Acocks Green. When all is said and done, it is easy to look at a map and make arbitrary changes and then walk away, job done! But please consider the people who will lose their community and their involvement in it. I live in Acocks Green, I shop in Acocks Green, and I have no interest whatever in being part of an artificial Yardley West Ward.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 2: Boldmere
Annotation 3: [redacted]

Comment text:
We recently moved to [redacted] which according to your draft borders puts us now in Sutton Parkside. How would this affect our chances of getting into Boldmere infant school, as this was the reason for moving to where we did? Surely it makes more sense to include the marked area into Sutton Boldmere?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Gerard Martin
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Area to be included in Erdington

Comment text:
Could the area highlighted (including Erdington Train Station & Erdington Abbey) be moved into the Erdington ward? Both represent a key central point in the local community and it would be appreciated if they could remain within the Erdington Ward. The area concerned has a low population density as it is mainly school buildings/shops/church ground so would make little difference to the overall voter numbers per ward.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
JAN 15TH 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to you with reference to the proposed boundary change which will date YARDLEY OUT OF YARDLEY.

I understand that change in life is inevitable but really where is the sense in this?

YARDLEY dates before Doomsday. Its church is almost 1,000 years old. In the future are we going to talk about "Yardley Old Church, Stockford East??"

Please reconsider this boundary change and keep Yardley O the heart of it's
community at the heart of the Ward YARDLEY.
How can it possibly be anywhere else?

I object strongly to the boundary change, I would like to lodge this in the most determined of words.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews

From: Pascoe, Mark

FW: Boundary review Hall Green

29 January 2016 09:09

To: Pascoe, Mark

Subject: FW: Boundary review Hall Green

Dear Sir/Madam

I am a resident of Hall Green, living at [Redacted], Hall Green for the past 38 years.

The purpose of this e-mail is to express my concern and objection to the proposed ward changes that will mean what I call my home in Hall Green will now be called my home in Tyseley.

It is my understanding that one of the considerations in conducting electoral review is to reflect community identity. Hall Green has always had a very strong local community and identity. To call this ward where I live now Tyseley is absurd. We are surrounded by local landmarks such as Hall Green School, Hall Green Railway Station, Hall Green Parade and Hall Green Community all of which are also proposed to be called in Tyseley. We have also taken great pride in Sarehole Mill, Hall Green which would now become Sarehole Mill Tyseley!! How is that logical?

Hall Green has always been considered a desirable place to live renowned for its lovely tree lined roads and quality housing. Tyseley has always been more renowned as a strong industrial centre and this is reflected by the large amount of industrial estates and one of the city’s main refuse centers being situated there. Whilst every city has these areas and need these industrial centers I think it is damaging for our community identity to combine the two. We live in Hall Green for the reasons outlined above i.e it is a predominantly residential area.

Additionally from an economic point of view I would be concerned as to whether these proposed changes would have a negative impact on the value of my house as data will confirm that equivalent house average prices in Tyseley are lower that Hall Green. My house is my legacy to my children which I worked all my life to pay for and I fear that being classed as Tyseley will diminish this value of my legacy. I am also concerned that insurance costs may increase as well by being classed as Tyseley.

The above concerns are not driven by middle class snobbery. I am proud to call myself working class and worked all my life so that I could live in a lovely residential area such as Hall Green.

Also, we have been served very well by three excellent local councilors. The proposed changes will dilute the effectiveness of our elected representatives.

In summary I object in the strongest terms to these proposed boundary changes as I see no merit in them and I think it would have a long lasting and irreversible damaging effect on the community I have lived in for so long.

Yours sincerely

Myra Martin
Hi,

There is a lot of emotion around the new boundaries.

I struggle to get to see what the actual effects of this are other than the emotive ones.

This is what I have found are “the three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation and are to:

• Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents;

• Reflect community identity;

• Provide for effective and convenient local government"

So I can see the logic related to the first point.

I can't see the logic relating to the second and need more information to comment fairly on the third.

However, since I know there is a lot of public discontent regarding the Hall Green issue, has it been considered to simply rename the Tyseley ward to Hall Green East? This would appease Hall Green residents and my feeling is that people in Tyseley would, on the whole, see this as an improvement since Hall Green has a better reputation than Tyseley.

Thank you
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:-

a) They break up historical communities and in many cases are totally illogical.

b) Some wards are broken up too many times.
www.facebook.com/NorthBrumCommunityTogether

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 Wyreley 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 consultation ASAP!

Birmingham Mail, Dec 2015
Pascoe, Mark

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 18 January 2016 08:47
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Yardley boundaries. We oppose the suggested boundaries!

From: [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2016 12:53 PM
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Yardley boundaries. We oppose the suggested boundaries!

To Whom It May Concern

It has been bought to our attention of the proposal to call the area in which we live 'Stechford East'. We support Councillor Neil Eustace and also strongly oppose this suggestion.

We have lived in Yardley all our lives, we feel very strongly about it remaining Yardley. Our daughter attend Yardley School.
We have celebrated many occasions at St Edburgha's church aka 'Yardley Old' and feel this should remain in the area called Yardley!

Yardley dates back to before the Doomsday book. It's church is almost 1000 years old. Yardley Conservation Area was Birmingham's first. Yardley was independant until 1911.

Kind Regards

Cheryl & Neil Mason
Greetings, I have seen the purposed boundary of Hall green and im outraged to see how large you have made Tyseley. Hall green is a lovely area and does not want the name tyseley. We want our station, our school, out mill, our health centre, our church and our Shafmoor lane to remain in Hall Green. The proposed plans can not be undertaken under any circumstances.

Regards, Mr A.Matloob BengH Aerospace Technology

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Angie Mathews  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:
Feature Annotations

Map Features:
Annotation 1: Oscott  
Annotation 2: Kingstanding  
Annotation 3: Perry Common  
Annotation 4: Stockland Green  
Annotation 5: Gravelly Hill

Comment text:
Knowing north birmingham well, these proposed wards would better represent the local communities that exist. These avoid splitting communities like the draft proposals, eg it avoids the need to split Oscott and Stockland Green as in the draft announced. The Perry Common area also ensures all of the Wilton Lodge Road, with its shopping centre at the ring is in the same ward rather than split between Perry Common and a ward named Short Heath, which would mean nothing to the eastern half of that ward which is Erdington.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Katie Matthews
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Oscott
Annotation 2: Kingstanding
 Annotation 3: Perry Common
Annotation 4: Erdington
Annotation 5: Pype Hayes
Annotation 6: Castle Vale
Annotation 7: Stockland Green
Annotation 8: Gravelly Hill

Comment text:
These are our local communities, so these are how the wards should be drawn for the Council.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Marie-Helene Matthews
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I feel very strongly that Moseley Village and Moseley Park and Pool and Moseley Hall Hospital should be part of Moseley Ward. The village is crucial to our identity, as indeed is St Mary's Church and all of the places mentioned would be sat in Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward under your proposals. I really feel this would rip the heart out of the village and therefore I ask you to consider including the village as part of Moseley Ward. Since most of the places I mention are commercial premises rather than residential it shouldn't have too much of an impact on the number of residents in the ward. Many thanks.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Maggie Matthews
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I wish to object to the Boundary Commission's proposals for a Yardley West ward in Birmingham and support an alternative that is being put forward. Although I appreciate that the Commission has responded positively to local requests for a 2-Member ward for Acocks Green to enable the retention of integrated community links across the Warwick Road, the use of the Chiltern railway line as a boundary undermines that. The 4000 voters between the railway and the Grand Union canal, and east of Stockfield Road, are a fully integrated part of Acocks Green, including many local activists, as the railway has never been seen as a barrier locally. Given that some voters have to be shed from the current Acocks Green ward to achieve electoral equality I support the idea that Olton Boulevard East would be a better cut-off, with properties to the south of it forming a single-Member Fox Hollies Ward. This would reinstate the historic name for that area and would form a distinctive community, being almost entirely inter-war Council-built properties. It includes Fox Hollies Leisure Centre, Fox Hollies Forum (run by the Fox Hollies Community Association), Fox Hollies Park (with its recently established “Friends”) and Fox Green Crescent to the west of Fox Hollies Road. For electoral equality it would require the Polling District CAE to be moved into a Hall Green ward, but that area has more in common with that ward, being mostly privately-built semi-detached properties the same as those south of School Road, and with the same B28 postcode and Hall Green address. This would leave the remainder of the currently proposed Acocks Green ward to be merged with the proposed Yardley West ward to create a new 2-Member Acocks Green ward. Acocks Green has it the past encompassed Hob Moor Road (and beyond) but crucially this time it would cross the Warwick Road to facilitate those integrated community links originally sought. Again to ensure electoral equality both sides of Spring Road and roads off it to the south would need to be brought in to this proposed ward, but this would be possible, indeed desirable, following the transfer of CAE and internal changes in the Hall Green wards. I would oppose any attempt to remove the Yarnfield estate from Acocks Green ward as it has clear social and economic links to the "village" centre. Such a solution would also leave the Fox Green area “orphaned” at the end of a long thin ward with no direct public transport links to its far end. Maggie Matthews

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sheri Matthews
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Oscott
Annotation 2: Kingstanding
Annotation 3: Perry Common
Annotation 4: Erdington

Comment text:

This would keep all of Erdington and it's historic areas, within one ward. It would also ensure all of Oscott and Kingstanding are in the same ward as well, meaning that the ridiculous proposal to split Oscott down the middle with the northern section put into Kingstanding can be avoided. Finally the Perry Common community focused on Witten Lodge Road is also all in the same ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Simon Matthews
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Oscott
Annotation 2: Kingstanding
Annotation 3: Perry Common

Comment text:
These wards better represent the local communities compared to what the draft proposals show. Number 3 shows the Perry Common area, which is centred around the shopping centre at the ring and is covered by the Witton Lodge Community Association. Number 2 keeps all of the Kingstanding area in one ward, including the Golden Hind and Kingstanding Royal Mail Sorting Office, Kingstanding Road. Number 1 shows the Oscott community, for some reason this community was proposed to be broken in half in the original proposal, this is the area which calls themselves Oscott.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
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
This brief comment is in relation to proposed Ward changes in Birmingham, in particular as they affect Moseley. I have no strong feelings about changes as long as they do not impact on what Birmingham people would recognise as Moseley Village. If you took the time to visit this part of the City you would be struck by the sense of place, a physical reality which leads people to feel psychological ownership. You would find an area of architectural one-ness, a busy crossroads, a church, a park, a "village" green, a hospital........and shops, restaurants and pubs which are focused and centred around the physical coming together of the cross roads. From whichever direction you approach Moseley Village there is a clear sense of arrival in a very particular place. The proposals clearly stem from a lack of interest in, or understanding of, how any boundary alterations which conflict with this sense of place will be destructive. And for what purpose? What gain will come from splitting up the constituent parts of the Village? in my opinion, there is nothing that justifies it. Looking at a map will tell you very little and I urge you to come to Moseley and take a look on the ground before taking these proposals further.

John Mattick.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jeannette Mayling
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

We live in Yardley and have done so for the past 56 years. We strongly oppose the proposed changes and feel that Yardley should retain its identity as a historic area of Birmingham.

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:-
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ali Mazaheri
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am writing to express my dismay at the proposed boundary change to Moseley. One of the factors that my wife and I considered in our move to Birmingham (rather than excepting a university job at a different country) was the atmosphere of Moseley Village. There is a real sense of community within this area, something I had not expected within a suburb of such a big city as Birmingham. The idea that’s removed from Moseley is somewhat bewildering. In addition the proposal effectively pulls apart two conservation areas with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Maggie McAndrew
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I am not happy at the proposals to fragment Moseley and lose its geographic identity and strong sense of place. All the local consultation which went into the 2014 Supplementary Planning Document still stands: local residents have a strong affinity with Moseley, and see it as a vigorous and positive locality. There is a substantial and interdependent voluntary, civic and cultural sector promoting and sustaining local enterprise. Brand "Moseley" is a success story for the city and undermining the area's identity and ability to act as a unit by dividing it amongst other areas really goes against all understanding of sustainable neighbourhoods. The ward boundary proposals seem to be based on arithmetical acrobatics rather than an understanding of how neighbourhoods and communities see themselves and work best.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

It is with complete disbelief and amazement that I have learnt today of the suggestion that boundary changes within “The Kerslake Report” for reducing wards within Birmingham mean that the following areas of Hall Green:

Hall Green Railway Station;
Hall Green Secondary School;
Hall Green United Community Church;
Hall Green Parade of shops

Are now to be potentially removed from Hall Green and moved into the ward of Tyseley.

As a “brummmie” of 50 years, I find this is quite confusing.

Tyseley has always been an industrialised area with a significant amount of factories and commercial property surrounded by terraced properties. Tyseley also already has its own railway station, I imagine (although I am not sure) a secondary school and has a collection of furniture retail outlets in the area that was once its shopping parade. All of these features of Tyseley are approx. 2 miles from our Hall Green areas that are (potentially) to be amalgamated.

Hall Green has always been a “green leafy suburb” of Birmingham - tree lined roads, predominantly residential property comprising of semi detached and detached housing.

Whilst I appreciate that there are needs to make changes to boundaries, it seems rather foolhardy to remove the “land marks of Hall Green” as detailed above into another Birmingham ward which we have no form of connection or similarity with.

I cannot see the need to remove the part of Hall Green where I run a business from into the ward of Tyseley, and cannot see where any logic for this has been based upon.

At worst, if we have to be split because our ward is “too big” (and I can’t see why that can be said, given the fact that I thought the aim was to reduce the number of councillors, not increase them) surely we should be Hall Green North and Hall Green South?

Your thoughts and comments on this matter would be appreciated as I am one very confused “Brummmie” at the moment!!

Kind regards,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: William McCabe
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

It seems undemocratic that some voters should have more representatives than others. Some of the names given to districts seem wrong for the area they cover. "Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill" seems to cover parts of Moseley and Edgbaston and very little of Balsall Heath. It would be easier if it were just Cannon Hill which doesn't seem to have been used as a name before or Calthorpe which was used for the part between Bristol Rd and the river at one point.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Susan McClure
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

MOSELEY has been split into several nonsensical pieces by the proposals. We have a very strong community spirit in Moseley, and we enjoy our neighbourhood proximity to similarly strong communities in Balsall Heath, Kings Heath, edgbaston, Sparkbrook and Sparkhill, but everyone knows the differences. Your proposals jumble up bits of other communities with bits of Moseley in a way that will make our lives more difficult and continued rejuvenation of our urban area even more hard work for the voluntary and elected bodies who put so much effort into it. There used to be this sort of problem before the last boundary change, and we were all relieved when at last Moseley was placed in one word and one constituency. Now someone who knows nothing about us and who has ignored advice from local bodies is proposing to tear us apart again. It beggars belief. It also does nothing to support your second and third aims. Please look more carefully at Moseley and keep the community, the conservation areas and the administrative and electoral boundaries sensitive to the community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

I am writing to raise my objections, concerns and anger at the proposals for these boundary changes.

Moseley, I think is a unique part of Birmingham. We have been voted the best place to live in England. We have a very strong sense of community and you think that you should split this up?!

We have two Conservation areas in Moseley established by Birmingham City Council. Moseley Conservation Area and St Agnes Moseley
Conservation Area

Your proposals do not encompass these. How can that be. There is a lot of history in this area.

Moseley is a very popular local centre, with award winning Farmers Market, Moseley Festival of Music which attract top bands. How can Moseley village not be in Moseley?!! How can Moseley Park and Pool not be in Moseley?!! What will happen to the groups of people who keep these going. The centre of a village has to be in the village.

Moseley is a strong community. We have a lot of local groups of people who work very hard to make it
a good place to live.
It is not just buildings
it is a community, which you
are trying to break up.
We have Moseley Forum,
Moseley in Lights, Moseley
Community Development Trust, 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. What other area
has so many groups working
for the community!!
I have lived in Moseley
all my life, (used to be in Moseley)
have (proposed to be in Balcomb Heath
and Cannon Hill) and now on (proposed to be Kings Heath) I DO NOT WANT TO LIVE IN KINGS HEATH!!

How can Balsall Heath Park be in Moseley. They are not happy either.

PLEASE PLEASE TAKE NOT OF THE PROPOSALS FROM THE MOSELEY COMMUNITY GROUPS.

The people who live here should decide we know our own community you do not.

Yours a very upset proud angry resident of Moseley

Mrs A McClusker
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Michael McDermott
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I would like to register my objection to the creation of the new Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward, to include a large part of what is now in Moseley. Moseley is one of the success stories of urban England. It is an example of what can be done when communities work together to bring about change for the good in the place they live. There are numerous groups, mostly volunteers, who work together to improve the lives of all who live in the area. It is an example of David Cameron's "Big Society" in action. It now appears that the authorities want to undermine all this hard work. It is clear that these proposals were not drawn up by someone who knows Birmingham. They might fulfil the criteria about having the correct population in each ward but in no way do they reflect the character or the rich history of these areas. The proposals clearly only follow one of the three criteria and should be reconsidered. Moseley has very different characteristics to Balsall Heath and the concerns of residents are different. They cannot adequately be met within one ward. I ask you to reconsider these proposals.

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:-

- I would like the commission to adopt Erdington Ward boundaries of half have to West.
- Wood End Rd/Kingsbury Rd to South.
- Pipe Hayes back near of Woodcote Rd to East.
- Sutton Ward to North.

Yours sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

[Postcode]

[Email]

[Phone number]
To whom it may concern

This is to vote my disgust at the governments decision to make smaller wards in my area

I DO NOT wish to live in Stechford East I live in YARDLEY and wish to remain living in this historic area.

I want the boundary commission to leave YARDLEY alone

From a proud YARDLEY resident

DIANE MCDONOUGH
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, Pyke Hayes and Stockland Green.

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

- Why change if there are no discernible improvements or arguments to warrant the change. Not satisfied that a valid case has been presented for these changes.
- Erdington is a long established community with a number of important historical buildings at Erdington Abbey, Erdington historical Cottage.
- Both business community and private individuals understand the existing boundaries.
- Where we live in Barwood Farm Road is not at all identified with or particularly close to Pyke Hayes.

Yours Sincerely

Name:-

Address:-

Postcode:-

Email:-

Phone number:-

Business Reply Licence Number
RSSG-ZY2L-EEEC

North Birmingham Community Together
96 Orchard Road
Erdington
Birmingham
B24 93D
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!

What does the commission’s plans for our area mean:-

- Erdington Abbey, Erdington Police Station, Erdington Royal Mail Sorting Office, the historic Erdington Cottages and Osborne School all to be disgraceful removed from Erdington Ward.
- Station Road and nearby roads are being ripped out of Erdington and put in Stockland Green with Spaghetti Junction.
- Proposed Erdington Parking and Conservation zones will be split across multiple wards
- Area around the Yenton Pub, Berwood Farm Road etc will be taken from Erdington and moved to Pype Hayes!

North Brum Community Together's plan fixes all of these errors made by the Commission.

To help us save our communities, please list some objections in the box overleaf, add your details and return it freepost today!
The Review Office (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor, Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Boundary Commission - Proposed Redefinition of Eldon Community

We wish to protest most strongly at the above proposals. Eldon is a long-established community with several important and historical landmarks and buildings. These include Eldon House, the former home of several prominent figures, and the nearby community resources, such as the Eldon Hall and the Eldon Park

We are not convinced that a sufficient or valid case has been made for the alteration. Existing boundaries have been made for the benefit of the community and we strongly believe that it is not in the best interests of the community to alter them without proper consultation and investigation.

We would strongly request that local residents views are taken into consideration - namely to adopt Eldon's current boundaries: Court Lane (to the West), Wood End Road/Kingsbury's Channel (to the South), Ryde Road, Ryde Road (to the East), and Suttons Road (to the North), thereby retaining the Eldon Community.

Yours sincerely,
Mr M. McDougall
Mr J. McDougall
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** Maureen McGillicuddy
- **E-mail:** [Redacted]
- **Postcode:** [Redacted]
- **Organisation Name:** [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

I think some of the proposals do not make sense for the local people and visitors to the city. Moseley Village should remain in Moseley. Hall Green station, college and school should be in Hall Green. I think the council should also think about the history of the city when changing names and boundaries. Instead of changing these names, let the local people know which road or part of a road the councillors represent and then we can choose who to vote for. I am sure people in a particular road will have the intelligence to contact their councillor or MPs regarding any issues. Surely in this day of electronics, councillors can be given the name of roads they represent and the people can be given the name of councillors without changing any of the boundaries but still ensuring they have equal numbers across Birmingham. Why make these unnecessary changes, as the city continues to grow, the wards or boundaries would need to change again.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: David McGillivray
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I wish to object to the proposals for the new ward boundaries in South Birmingham. In particular the proposal for the new Moseley ward is a travesty for the many people working to promote and protect the area currently known and accepted as Moseley. The new proposals do not include what is known throughout Birmingham as Moseley Village and does not include many organisations and partnerships with Moesely in their titles. These new boundaries appear to have been drawn up by a person or people with no knowledge of the area and simply on the grounds of equalising the number of voters in each new ward with no consideration to historical (and current) accepted boundaries. I urge the Commission to reconsider these boundary changes so that some level of common sense is applied to the new wards.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
27th January 2016

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

Dear Review Officer

I object to the proposed ward boundary for Moseley, Birmingham for many reasons. As a resident of Moseley since 1986, I chose to live here and bring up my family in Moseley for several reasons, including its strong sense of identity and community through its schools, churches, community groups, parks, leisure and local services. I live in Moseley – in fact I live within in the Moseley Conservation Area (see Moseley Conservation Area: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleyca ; I am a member of The Moseley Society; I'm a volunteer gardener at the Dovecote Garden within the grounds of Moseley Hall Hospital; I open my garden to the community for Moseley in Bloom; I shop in Moseley Village; I am a member of Moseley Private Park and Pool and frequently walk there; I use Moseley Farmers Market; I patronise pubs and restaurants in Moseley and my husband is a member of Moseley Golf Club. However, the proposed ward boundaries would mean ALL the above activities would no longer take place in Moseley! All the activities listed would be located in the proposed Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward which has, in the eyes of the community, a very different identity and location. It seems, that for bureaucratic purposes only, the boundaries have been redrawn without taking account of how they:
'reflect community identity'
or
'provide for effective government'
both of which, according to the LGBC website, are considerations in conducting an electoral review.

I am a member of the Moseley Society Planning group which currently reviews applications within the Moseley ward. The proposed changes would mean that we, the group, would be required to liaise with six different councillors over five ward administration services. How can that be effective government?
In response to the first round of consultation regarding ward boundary changes, Moseley groups joined together and provided you with what is considered to be an appropriate boundary to the ward of Moseley. Why was this disregarded?

Moreover, Moseley groups and Birmingham City Council, led by the Moseley Regeneration Group, created the 2014 Supplementary Planning Document for Moseley (SPD). The SPD is a **STATUTORY** plan for the neighbourhood of Moseley (see Moseley SPD: [http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleyspd](http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleyspd)). Again, this is totally disregarded in the proposed boundaries.

I therefore urge you to review the proposed ward boundary for Moseley and for the final ward boundary to reflect what all those who live, work, know and operate within Moseley identify the locality of Moseley to be. If in doubt as to what this locality is, I refer you to the boundaries provided to you BY PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE which conserve identity, efficient local governance, shared historical/cultural/geographical communities.

Yours faithfully

Dr Gill McGillivray

Cc: Roger Godsiff, MP
The Rt Hon Greg Clark MP
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Joy Mcgovern
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: None

Comment text:

I wish to object to the proposals to change the Birmingham Ward boundaries for the following reasons: Firstly, Birmingham is already under enough financial pressure and having to make drastic cuts to its services without wasting money on a restructure of the number of wards. I can understand that there are fluctuations in work for Councillors across the different wards, but the simple and less costly arrangement would be for the Councillors to have assistants in those areas. I live in Yardley constituency (whose history dates back to the before the Domesday Book. The people of Yardley are very proud of its history which makes its area unique. Its local church St Edburgh's is well known by the Birmingham community as being "Yardley Old Church". If you refer to St Edburgh's Church they do not know where you mean. We do not wish to be known as Stechford East. What an absolute waste of money at a time when Birmingham and England is struggling financially. Please rethink again - don't be too proud to admit that on the basis of cost, this is not good economics and there are other ways of achieving any difficulties in workload.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Want to stay Hall Green =

31/2/16

To whom it may concern:

I received a leaflet through the post with proposal for changing the boundary from Hall Green to Tysley.

I am really angry how I bought my house in good faith with Deeds that say Hall Green. If I wanted to buy a house I na Tysley that what I would have wanted but I wanted my house in Hall Green and that what I would like it to remain do not move goal post just for the sake an angry lady.
31.01.16

Dear Sir or Madam,

I attended the meeting "Your Moseley-Fight For It NOW" on January 16th 2016. I live in what has always been the centre of Moseley very close to Moseley Park and Pool, for which I am one of the hundreds of lucky key holders. Moseley is a pleasant place in which to live and quite different to Balsall Heath, Kings Heath, Stirchley and other areas that are on our borders. Our community is different, with different interests and needs. It is said to be "Bohemian" and it is true that many musicians and artists live in Moseley. I love the historic buildings and environment. My children were educated at Park Hill School in Moseley.

I am distressed that the heart of Moseley, the centre or The Village would no longer be in Moseley, I live three minutes from the shops, we would no longer be in Moseley. It is ridiculous that the Parish Church, Moseley Park and Pool (therefore Moseley Folk Festival), St Columba, our full conservation area, Moseley in Bloom, the Interfaith Group to name but a few of our wonderful things, would not be in Moseley. I feel sure that our cafes and pubs/bars which seem to be working well now would not be part of what Balsall Heath would consider decent, many of their pubs have closed, it is not what that community wants.

We would not be properly represented in the new wards.

I am not a native of Birmingham, but have lived here since 1974. It was a shock to see the proposals for changing other ward boundaries within the city, the proposed loss of other historic areas such as Longbridge and The Jewellery Quarter, and to learn that Birmingham will lose 19 councillors. It feels as if Birmingham is being "punished."

I hope that you will listen to us and understand the strong feelings that so many Moseley people have about what is proposed for our area.

Yours Faithfully

Lorraine McGowan, proud Moseley Resident
Pascoe, Mark

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 18 January 2016 08:45
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Objection to Hall Green Boundary changes

-----Original Message-----
From: martin mcgowan
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2016 5:19 PM
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Objection to Hall Green Boundary changes

> Sirs,
> 
> We would like to object to the Boundary Commission’s proposal to the extension of the Tyseley ward. As far as we are concerned our house was built in Hall Green and will always be a part of Hall Green, not Tyseley! This will have serious consequences on the local house prices and local businesses and is something we are going to fight against.
> 
> The gloves are off and you’re in for one hell of a fight with us and the other Hall Green (yes Hall Green!!) residents!
> 
> Yours furiously,
> 
> The McGowan Family
>


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

28th January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Boundary changes in Birmingham and Swanshurst Lane

I have just become aware of your proposed boundary changes for electoral wards in Birmingham. Prior to the last boundary my house in [redacted] was inside Moseley ward. I was happy to be in Moseley ward and did not understand why we were moved into Springfield ward. Now you are trying to move us again into another ward that we do not identify with. Residents in the Lane have no desire to engage with this change and urge you to think again and listen to local voices.

[redacted] in Swanshurst Lane since the [redacted] I have always identified with the Moseley community. I never identified with Springfield ward and do not understand what Sparkhill South ward would look like.

As a Swanshurst Lane [redacted] I ask you to return our dear Lane to Moseley ward to ensure we return to where we belong. The Lane was in the ward for most of the last century and I therefore urge you to amend your plans in line with the boundary proposals suggested by Moseley Community Groups.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Mrs Eileen McGuinness
To whom it may concern

We feel that the proposed boundary changes to certain areas of Hall green compromises the identity and history of B28. We know the area very well with relatives, friends, work colleagues all living in the area and we know how concerned and puzzled they are with the boundary change.

This will also effect the city council and add to their expense due to signage expenditure to buildings, roads, railway stations and also there is a possibility house prices could also be effected.

If its not broke don't fix it please.

Regards

Peter and Catherine Mcilduff
Dear Sirs,

I am responding against the proposal to change the boundary of Hall Green.

38 years ago we lived in Sparkbrook - in a rented back terrace house - and we aspired to live in Hall Green where family and friends had made their home, a place I saw as having real character and good amenities. Sarehole Mill, with its mystical links with Tolkien, wide tree lined roads, good shops, a railway station, bus routes, Churches for most denominations, places of learning, doctors and dentist. Everything our young family needed. We worked hard and saved, bought a house on and brought up two sons here. We have great neighbours, a multi-cultural area that is friendly and quiet.

I was and my husband so upset if he thought that I was unhappy here. If our councillors are willing and able to manage the affairs of Hall Green as they stand now....and I understand that they are (according to the Meeting we had with them last week) then why would you want to split our community apart?

I know that sometimes things have to change - but surely only if it's for the Better. I cannot see anything better in living in the Industrious, run-down, rubbish tip area of our City known as Tyseley.

So please, reconsider and leave us as we are.....Happy in Hall Green.

Maureen McIlwraith
Dear Sir/ Madam,

I write regards

Local Government Boundary

Changes. Review I wish to
make clear I do not wish

Hall Green to made part

of Tysoley, or another

Borough, of Birmingham.

Yours,
Drs C McKeown & D Low

February 6th 2016

The Review Officer
LGBCE
14th Floor Millbank Tower
London, SW1 4QP

Dear Sir

Re Proposed Boundary Commission changes in Birmingham - Moseley

We would like to comment on the above recommendations, specifically as they apply to Moseley.
While recognising the need to rationalise the number of voters in each ward and reduce the total number of councillors we feel that the boundaries proposed for Moseley are inappropriate.
The guidance makes reference to ‘reflecting community identity’ and ‘providing for effective and convenient local government’. The proposed changes contradict both these objectives.
Moseley has had an identity and community centred on the central crossroads near St Mary’s church for hundreds of years. It has been identified as one of the best places to live because of its sense of community and diversity. There are numerous very active community groups underpinning and reinforcing this. For them to work effectively it is important for Moseley to speak with one voice and communicate clearly with the council through its councillors. Moseley is fortunate in having a history of being represented by good, active, councillors from different parties. The proposed ward boundary changes would make this much more difficult and less efficient.
In particular, a boundary through the middle of Moseley would make nonsense of all the hard work done by local people on the Supplementary Planning Document 2014 which looked at Moseley as a whole.
We would support the alternative boundary proposed by the Moseley Society and other local groups.
Not only would this work better for Moseley but also for Kings Heath and Balsall Heath which have their own identities and communities.

Yours faithfully

Carole McKeown & David Low
Dear Sir Re Proposed Boundary Commission changes in Birmingham - Moseley We would like to comment on the above recommendations, specifically as they apply to Moseley. While recognising the need to rationalise the number of voters in each ward and reduce the total number of councillors we feel that the boundaries proposed for Moseley are inappropriate. The guidance makes reference to ‘reflecting community identity’ and ‘providing for effective and convenient local government’. The proposed changes contradict both these objectives. Moseley has had an identity and community centred on the central crossroads near St Mary’s church for hundreds of years. It has been identified as one of the best places to live because of its sense of community and diversity. There are numerous very active community groups underpinning and reinforcing this. For them to work effectively it is important for Moseley to speak with one voice and communicate clearly with the council through its councillors. Moseley is fortunate in having a history of being represented by good, active, councillors from different parties. The proposed ward boundary changes would make this much more difficult and less efficient. In particular, a boundary through the middle of Moseley would make nonsense of all the hard work done by local people on the Supplementary Planning Document 2014 which looked at Moseley as a whole. We would support the alternative boundary proposed by the Moseley Society and other local groups. Not only would this work better for Moseley but also for Kings Heath and Balsall Heath which have their own identities and communities. Yours faithfully Carole McKeown & David Low

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Emma McKinney
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I think it's wrong to take Moseley Village out of Moseley. The area has such a vibrant history and a really great scene it would be like ripping the heart out of Moseley - BAD IDEA!

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Margaret mclaughlin
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Please do not change moseleys name Marginalising it will be detrimental to the area It has a rich and succinct history Regards Margaret McLaughlin

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I live at [redacted] and strongly object to Moseley being split into several wards for the following reasons:
- The current proposal would dissolve a well established community focused on this location and risk destroying local governance.
- The collaboration between Moseley based volunteers and council officers to improve economic development in this part of the city would be wasted.
- Key amenities logically focal points for local community participation and support ie centre of Moseley as a public space, Moseley Park, Moseley Exchange, Moseley Parish Church, must be in the Moseley Ward.
- The wealth of voluntary activities identified with and centred on Moseley create a rich attractive civic life integral to this locality thriving. (see Moseley Forum, Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Sustainable Moseley, Moseley B13 Magazine) These would be threatened by the fragmentation the current proposals represent.

Yours sincerely
Dr Eileen McLeod
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:-

19 BHAM COUNCIL MAD - DO THEY NEVER LEARN, THEY TRIED TO MAKE SUTTON COLDFIELD PART OF BHAM, IT EVENTUALLY HAD TO CLIMB DOWN AS SHE HAD A ROYAL CHARTER THEY COULDN'T OVERTURN, SO NOW LET'S START MESSING WITH ERDINGTON - POLICE TRAINING STATIONS AND SOME HISTORIC BUILDINGS. THE COUNCIL IS SUPPOSED TO SHORT OF MONEY BUT THEY SEEM TO WANT TO WASTE EVEN MORE OF WHAT THEY HAVE NOT GOT.

Yours Sincerely
Name:- Mrs. J. M. Murray
Address:-
Postcode:
Email:-
Phone number:-
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 or Madam,

I am writing to you on behalf of my family, to express deep concern at the proposed boundary changes for Hall Green in Birmingham. My understanding is that under the proposals, Cateswell Road in Hall Green, Birmingham, will come under the ward of Tyseley. As a family, having lived in Hall Green all our lives, we feel that this proposal if it goes ahead, will unfairly take away our unique local identity, and as Cateswell Road has been in Hall Green since it was built, we feel that this proposal is not acceptable, as it is effectively being forced upon us. We are proud of our identity in Hall Green, and our unique local heritage, and do not therefore wish to become part of the Tyseley ward, and lose this unique identity.

We are also active members of the Hall Green Residents Association, which is the longest running association of its kind in the country, having started in 1925, and we feel that this Association will also be lost if the proposed boundary changes go ahead.

Since hearing about the proposals we have been extremely upset as a family, and deeply concerned, about the proposals.

We would therefore ask you to please reconsider the proposals, and to reconsider the proposed boundary changes.

Yours sincerely,

Kate McNamara on behalf of the McNamara Family.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ian McPherson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

See letter attached

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Points to cover in objection to Boundary Commission

We were advised against providing a standard letter for people to send, as this reduces the impact – identical letters, however many there are, are just counted as one submission.

Your message should be as individual as possible. Please select from the following the points that you are passionate or angry about – and express your feelings in your message.

If you would like more help with writing your message please get in touch and we will try to do so – but we are all busy volunteers!

I attended the Jan 16th meeting ‘Your Moseley – fight for it NOW’ and expressed my objection to the proposal there. I’m now writing to make sure that you take note of my objection.

Or, if you were not there:

I’ve heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from . . . . . .

I live at . . . . . . and I strongly object to being in the proposed . . . . . . Ward because . . . . . .

Or, if you would be within the proposed Moseley boundary:

I live at . . . . . . and strongly object to the split of Moseley into different Wards.

The proposed boundary would

choose a word: damage or harm or 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/losses that would affect me most is/are:

Choose from the following, changing the wording to suit you:

- 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 for:

Choose from the following:

Responses can be made by post to the following address:

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

Or can be made online at this link:

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/add/informed-representation/5688?...

AND – ANOTHER MESSAGE NEEDS TO BE WRITTEN!

Two other matters were referred to at the meeting:
1 - Moseley is not the only part of Birmingham where the proposals appear to be crazy.
2 - Only Birmingham is having the number of Councillors reduced (we are to lose 19) in this Ward Boundary Review

The meeting (over 400 people, perhaps 500) also voted that the boundary review for the whole of Birmingham should be rejected (one against and one abstention).

We must write to Greg Clark, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to ask him to stop the current Review and to look at Birmingham again.

Email: greg.clark@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you very much for your support.

Please keep in touch by coming to our open committee meetings on the last Tuesday of the month – or on Face Book/Twitter/comments on our website

on behalf of the Moseley Forum Committee

18 Jan 2016
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Liz meenagh
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

We have recently moved to Birmingham and would like to make the following objections to boundary redrawing: A. Edgbaston is a well renowned area and the pride of Birmingham which is one of the reasons we chose it B. Edgbaston has a strong identity and it seems to us that Lyttelton Rd embodies that identity- the Edbaston reservoir is just minutes away. B. Redrawing boundaries is expensive and there are so many other more pressing priorities for council expenditure C. Money saved by not redrawing boundaries would be better spent on helping areas around Summerfield Park deal with litter and refuse management D. There are better ways of improving the reputation of an area than changing the map- investment in local facilities to raise the profile as one example E. I have not been able to see what argument there is for redrawing boundaries so not sure what the proposed benefit would be to residents?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: ali mehr
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

**Comment text:**

I am a resident of Edgbaston and object to the proposed boundary change that will remove my house from the Edgbaston ward and place it in a newly composed ward of Summerfield. My Family and I have been residents of Edgbaston nearly 20 years. We first lived more centrally within Edgbaston and have for the last 12 years moved into a larger property on the North side of Edgbaston. We maintain friendships within the Edgbaston area and our community does not extend in the area of proposed Summerfield. We were not informed of the initial consultation process from July 2015 to September 2015. There has been no communication to us about the process from the council or the LGBCC prior to us initiating communication. This is wrong.

Consultation Criteria The criteria specifically rejects any submission regarding change in valuation and insurance premiums, with the statement that there is no evidence of any effect. They have produced no evidence of this statement. As there is no evidence to refute or support this statement then we have asked expert witnesses point of view. Local residential property agents, Robert Powell & Co and Hadleigh have confirmed that there will be an adverse effect on property prices. This will affect my ability to change mortgage companies. They cannot ignore these comments as there is evidence which proves the concerns are correct. Criteria 1 – Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities? Dealing with the legislative requirement to reflect community identity. The proposed ward of Summerfield is a combination of parts of Birmingham that are economically and socially diverse without current connection. The part of Edgbaston that falls north of the Hagley Road has nothing in common with Winson Green, Ladywood etc. There would be no community identity. There would be no hub to the ward and it would not have any recognition for its residents as a community or be understood as an area of Birmingham. Edgbaston is a community in itself. The Hagley Road is now a substantial major artery for the city but it is traversed many times a day by North Edgbaston residents as we travel to the university, hospitals, shops, sports clubs, doctors, dentists and schools of Edgbaston that we work at, visit or take our children to. My children have lived in Edgbaston all their lives and refer to living in Edgbaston. It’s a brand, it’s a location, and it’s a community that is recognisable outside of Birmingham or even the UK. I am proud to live in Edgbaston in a classic Edgbaston house, proud of my neighbourhood and my neighbours who have worked hard to look after and improve their local community, driving out some anti-social issues that were a problem locally some years ago. The Edgbaston brand has been key to the improvement locally that has created a pleasant, safe part of the wider ward and it is questionable whether this could continue to be the case if removed from the ward. Sadly other parts of the proposed Summerfield ward are very different with differing value systems. We are linked socially and on a daily basis with Edgbaston and not the proposed Summerfield area. Summerfield as a proposed ward fails to deal with the legislative requirement to reflect community identity.

Criteria 2 – How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Dealing with the legislative requirement to improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents and also for the provision of effective and convenient local government. The need to reduce the ward size of Edgbaston is understood. However, the proposed ward is being added to at its western boundary with parts of more modern Harborne that are part of the Harborne community. It seems that this is at the expense of our area which is part of original Edgbaston. Withdrawing the Harborne addition is my recommendation. Maintaining or improving electoral equality is more than just a numbers game.
It is giving an electorate the opportunity to self-determine by recognising communities. If a ward is just geography, self-determination and equality is unlikely. A polarised ward such as the proposed Summerfield would be highly difficult to represent. The disparity in the electorate socially and economically would create that difficulty. That would be unfair on the electorate. The Edgbaston ward is currently able to elect fair representation for its community which shares value systems and needs. The proposed ward should not include North Edgbaston as it would not improve electoral equality in the area and may adversely impact equality. Edgbaston ward size can be managed by removing the proposed Harborne inclusion and would therefore continue to provide fair representation for the electorate whilst achieving effective and convenient local government. Criteria 3 – Are the names of the proposed wards right? Summerfield might work the ward if it did not include north Edgbaston. Summerfield is not acceptable as a name to me as a resident of Edgbaston, specifically North Edgbaston. It has no sense of area. It conveys nothing about location. I have given consideration to being part of ward called Edgbaston Reservoir as an alternative to Summerfield however, the removal of North Edgbaston from Edgbaston seems unnecessary given that it should be possible to keep Edgbaston intact by not adding odd bits of other well defined communities, specifically Harborne. The BC appears to have produced various ward names that are unnecessary proposed changes to well understood locations and communities of Birmingham. Redrawing of the wards should focus on identifying communities and not splitting them up. I respectfully ask the BC consultation gives full and genuine consideration to my submission in relation to maintaining North Edgbaston within the Edgbaston ward for all the grounds set out but most particularly on the grounds of preserving a historic, well defined and well understood community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: susannah Mehr
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I am a resident of Edgbaston and object to the proposed boundary change that will remove my house from the Edgbaston ward and place it in a newly composed ward of Summerfield. My Family and I have been residents of Edgbaston nearly 20 years. We first lived more centrally within Edgbaston and have for the last 12 years moved into a larger property on the North side of Edgbaston. We maintain friendships within the Edgbaston area and our community does not extend in the area of proposed Summerfield. We were not informed of the initial consultation process from July 2015 to September 2015. There has been no communication to us about the process from the council or the LGBC prior to us initiating communication. This is wrong.

Consultation Criteria The criteria specifically rejects any submission regarding change in valuation and insurance premiums, with the statement that there is no evidence of any effect. They have produced no evidence of this statement. As there is no evidence to refute or support this statement then we have asked expert witnesses point of view. Local residential property agents, Robert Powell & Co and Hadleigh have confirmed that there will be an adverse effect on property prices. This will affect my ability to change mortgage companies. They cannot ignore these comments as there is evidence which proves the concerns are correct. Criteria 1 – Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities? Dealing with the legislative requirement to reflect community identity. The proposed ward of Summerfield is a combination of parts of Birmingham that are economically and socially diverse without current connection. The part of Edgbaston that falls north of the Hagley Road has nothing in common with Winson Green, Ladywood etc. There would be no community identity. There would be no hub to the ward and it would not have any recognition for its residents as a community or be understood as an area of Birmingham. Edgbaston is a community in itself. The Hagley Road is now a substantial major artery for the city but it is traversed many times a day by North Edgbaston residents as we travel to the university, hospitals, shops, sports clubs, doctors, dentists and schools of Edgbaston that we work at, visit or take our children to. My children have lived in Edgbaston all their lives and refer to living in Edgbaston. It’s a brand, it’s a location, and it’s a community that is recognisable outside of Birmingham or even the UK. I am proud to live in Edgbaston in a classic Edgbaston house, proud of my neighbourhood and my neighbours who have worked hard to look after and improve their local community, driving out some anti-social issues that were a problem locally some years ago. The Edgbaston brand has been key to the improvement locally that has created a pleasant, safe part of the wider ward and it is questionable whether this could continue to be the case if removed from the ward. Sadly other parts of the proposed Summerfield ward are very different with differing value systems. We are linked socially and on a daily basis with Edgbaston and not the proposed Summerfield area. Summerfield as a proposed ward fails to deal with the legislative requirement to reflect community identity.

Criteria 2 – How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Dealing with the legislative requirement to improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents and also for the provision of effective and convenient local government. The need to reduce the ward size of Edgbaston is understood. However, the proposed ward is being added to at its western boundary with parts of more modern Harborne that are part of the Harborne community. It seems that this is at the expense of our area which is part of original Edgbaston. Withdrawing the Harborne addition is my recommendation. Maintaining or improving electoral equality is more than just a numbers game.
It is giving an electorate the opportunity to self-determine by recognising communities. If a ward is just geography, self-determination and equality is unlikely. A polarised ward such as the proposed Summerfield would be highly difficult to represent. The disparity in the electorate socially and economically would create that difficulty. That would be unfair on the electorate. The Edgbaston ward is currently able to elect fair representation for its community which shares value systems and needs. The proposed ward should not include North Edgbaston as it would not improve electoral equality in the area and may adversely impact equality. Edgbaston ward size can be managed by removing the proposed Harborne inclusion and would therefore continue to provide fair representation for the electorate whilst achieving effective and convenient local government. Criteria 3 – Are the names of the proposed wards right? Summerfield might work the ward if it did not include north Edgbaston. Summerfield is not acceptable as a name to me as a resident of Edgbaston, specifically North Edgbaston. It has no sense of area. It conveys nothing about location. I have given consideration to being part of ward called Edgbaston Reservoir as an alternative to Summerfield however, the removal of North Edgbaston from Edgbaston seems unnecessary given that it should be possible to keep Edgbaston intact by not adding odd bits of other well defined communities, specifically Harborne. The BC appears to have produced various ward names that are unnecessary proposed changes to well understood locations and communities of Birmingham. Redrawing of the wards should focus on identifying communities and not splitting them up. I respectfully ask the BC consultation gives full and genuine consideration to my submission in relation to maintaining North Edgbaston within the Edgbaston ward for all the grounds set out but most particularly on the grounds of preserving a historic, well defined and well understood community.

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:-

It's all in the name

How can

Erdington Station
Erdington Abbey
Erdington Police Station
Erdington Royal Mail Sorting Office

Not be in the Erdington Ward

All this draft proposal needs rethinking

Yours Sincerely

Name:- P. C. MELLS
Address:
Postcode:
Email:
Phone number:
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 broke 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 voice heard—take action now!

Save our local community now by petition letter overleaf and retur
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: ronald merricks
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I object to this proposal that of removing the name of Yardley to stechford east, lots of people now Yardley is a nice place to live, I for one want to keep it that way

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hi I strongly believe that Hall Green should Remain a B28 and not Tysley as it would devalue a lot of good for the area like devaluing house prices and the local schools. I am a current resident at [REDACTED] and main reason I bought my house in October 2014 is because of the nice area and schools we have here.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Carmel Midgley

E-mail: [Redacted]

Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I object to the proposals for Moseley. We are all custodians of the village and by cutting up the responsibility into 5 Wards and 6 Councillors, only one of whom will have a sole interest for part of Moseley proper, is wrong. Moseley is a jewel in Birmingham's crown and without actively looking after it we will lose it. Stop these changes.

Uploaded Documents:

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

Dear Sir,

I am, as are many of our neighbours, appalled and bemused at the proposed changes to Ward Boundaries in the Area.

Who are these invisible folks at the L.G.B. Commission? How much real thought has gone into their idiotic draft (daft) proposals, which are supposedly intended to even out the "votes" (or voters?) per ward and reduce the number of councillors by around 20 or so?

I have been a ___ for 76 years, due to the foresight of my father who moved into ___ in 1940, with his thinking "Leafy Hall Green" would offer better schooling for myself (which it did, York Road Infants/Junior) and an all round better family life. My wife is also a lifelong ___ and we intend to be so for a few more years!

So, get real "Commission" and let sleeping dogs lie.

Yours faithfully

[Name redacted]
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 village is historically older than the districts proposed to change- and should stay as it is- why change something that has been one for years- just to satisfy unelected councillors, we do strongly feel it should not happen- save our communities for all our future generations.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Andrene Miller

**E-mail:** [REDACTED]

**Postcode:** [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:** Moseley B13 Magazine

**Comment text:**

Hello, I was at the Jan 16th meeting ‘Your Moseley – fight for it NOW’ and expressed my objection to the proposal there. I believe the plans for Birmingham, the country's second city, are ill conceived and do not adhere to the the commission's own rules and I am writing to make sure that you take note of my objection to the plans that will dismember my community. I moved to Moseley from London in 2011. I was attracted to the area by its clear sense of identity. Four years on, I really understand what makes Moseley the thriving community it is. Underpinning all work volunteers have been motivated to carry out in the community over many decades and that makes Moseley a successful community is its 150-years of historical cohesion. And the madness of the proposed changes will destroy that. How can it be logical to create boundaries where: 1 A proposed Moseley ward boundary does not include the two Moseley conservation areas 2 Moseley Village, including its shops and parish church would become part of a larger ward called Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. 3 The proposed boundaries would dismantle a well established community of place and wreck local governance by making the decision process convoluted and thereby less effective. 4 Where my house will no longer be in Moseley but Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. 5 Any new boundary must logically include: • The centre of Moseley • Moseley Parish Church • St Columba’s Church • Moseley Park • The Moseley Exchange • The Moseley Bog The boundary changes will have a chilling effect on the activities of community initiatives that help to keep Moseley a thriving place to live and do business: 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. The work of many years on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, and the resulting Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the efforts of volunteers and council officers, to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted. This appears short sighted at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate development in line with the reopening of mooted element of the HS2 Moseley connectivity package. I strongly object to the commission's proposals and urge you to and look at and adopt the proposal put forward by our community. Many thanks Andrene Miller

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Carol Miller
E-mail: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

The proposals for the Moseley area appear not to meet the criteria stated by LGBC to 'Reflect community identity' or to 'Provide for effective and convenient local government'. The criterion to equalise 'the number of electors each councillor represents' seems to be the main, indeed the only, consideration. Further, there seems to have been no consideration given to the Moseley Supplementary Development Plan, accepted by the City Council in 2014. Moseley has developed a particular identity, attractive to residents, businesses and visitors. Several voluntary groups work with the Councillors for the Moseley and Kings Heath Ward and with Council staff to maintain and develop Moseley's sense of place. As an example, I have been involved with Moseley in Bloom for the past eight years. Moseley in Bloom volunteers work with businesses and residents to make Moseley cleaner and greener and have won eight Gold Awards in the RHS Heart of England in Bloom campaign and have nine times been designated Best Urban Community. We have also been in the Britain in Bloom Nation Finals three times, winning Silver and Silver Gilt awards. Our three ward Councillors have always actively supported our efforts and Birmingham City Council staff collaborate with us in our horticultural enterprises and in our work to maintain the cleanliness of the centre and residential areas. The proposed changes to the boundaries would split Moseley into five parts making it extremely difficult to work on a coherent plan. Presumably, each of the proposed wards would have different priorities and there could be no guarantee of consistency to meet the criteria for Britain in Bloom. Indeed, the deployment of time required to liaise with five different wards and their Councillors could be a considerable deterrent to success. A further example is the Greener, Cleaner, Safer, Environment group that works in Moseley and Kings Heath. Chaired by a Councillor, the group comprises Council officers (for example from Fleet and Waste Management, Environmental Services, our Place Manager) the Police and various voluntary groups. We work on priorities for maintaining the cleanliness and safety of our neighbourhood and, through the group, have direct access to key people when there are concerns about services. This is surely a good example of citizens and Councils working together and, as in the example of Moseley in Bloom, would be much more difficult to manage if liaison was necessary with five different wards. A brief glance at the proposed changes reveals several absurd anomalies. Balsall Heath Park would become part of Moseley; Moseley Bog Nature Reserve would become part of Sparkhill South; Moseley Park and Pool would become part of Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. Further, the centre of Moseley is not included in the ward called Moseley. These examples suggest that the proposals have not been designed to 'reflect community identity' and represent an inefficient way to encourage the government to support community cohesion.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
We ask the commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham to represent a Castle Vale Ward, a Erdington Ward, a Gravelly Hill Ward, a Kingstanding Ward, an 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.

H.
Miller
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jennifer Miller
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I have lived in [REDACTED] in the Vesey ward for over 30 years. My community is in the Boldmere area as I use the shops, restaurants, the Bishop Vesey pub and library. I feel that the historical identity of Vesey should be preserved. The name of Parkside that has been mentioned has come out of the blue and has no relevance to the area. I strongly believe that the only boundary should include Boldmere and Banners Gate as one area called Vesey with 2 councillors. This was overwhelmingly supported by the residents of Banners Gate and Boldmere at the recent meetings. Sutton Park would benefit by being more equally divided between the wards, making it easier to administer. If it is controlled by Four Oaks it would be difficult for the residents to address situations or problems. Four Oaks councillors would not have any incentive to deal with the residents of Boldmere and Banners Gate as there is no reward in the form of votes! At the very least the gates of the park and the existing stretch of park land and private land should be in Vesey.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

Moseley must include Moseley Parish church, the Moseley Cross Roads and Moseley Park. Your map will not register any lines I draw. Your website also fails to upload a simple text file so I will put all the text here. Proposed Boundary Changes for Moseley I have been a resident in Moseley for over 30 years. It was a surprise to me to receive a notification through the door from "Moseleyforum" that suggested boundary changes would mean Moseley basically would cease to exist. It seems to me undemocratic that a decision is made with far reaching consequences and as a citizen affected by this decision I am not directly given any details about how or why the decision has been made. I suspect that if it was proposed that Westminster Palace was in future going to be in Camden due to boundary changes there would be a different approach. Moseley was mentioned in the Domesday Book and so has a legitimate heritage far beyond Birmingham itself and the proposed wards of Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. The heart of Moseley is the cross roads between Alcester Road and Salisbury Road. This hub, St Mary's Moseley Church and Moseley Park will no longer be in Moseley with the proposed changes; this is ridiculous. Moseley is recognised as an extremely desirable place to live because of its range of amenities and access to Birmingham City centre. (http://www.thetimes.co.uk/sto/style/homes_and_gardens/best_places/article1527439.ece) Please leave the boundaries of Moseley unchanged. The Boundary Commission is duty bound to take into account local ties which would be broken by changes to constituencies. These proposals contravene this requirement. Prof Martin R Miller

Uploaded Documents:

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

January 14th 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes for Moseley

I have been a resident in Moseley for over 30 years. It was a surprise to me to receive a notification through the door from "Moseleyforum" that suggested boundary changes would mean Moseley basically would cease to exist.

It seems to me undemocratic that a decision is made with far reaching consequences and as a citizen affected by this decision I am not directly given any details about how or why the decision has been made. I suspect that if it was proposed that Westminster Palace was in future going to be in Camden due to boundary changes there would be a different approach.

Moseley was mentioned in the Domesday Book and so it has a legitimate heritage far beyond Birmingham itself and the proposed wards of Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. The heart of Moseley is the cross roads between Alcester Road and Salisbury Road. This hub, St Mary's Moseley Church and Moseley Park will no longer be in Moseley with the proposed changes; this is ridiculous. Moseley is recognised as an extremely desirable place to live because of its range of amenities and access to Birmingham City centre. (http://www.thetimes.co.uk/story/.../article1527439.ece)

Please leave the boundaries of Moseley unchanged. The Boundary Commission is duty bound to take into account local ties which would be broken by the proposed changes to constituencies. These proposals contravene this requirement.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Prof Martin R Miller
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Miller
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

As a resident of Vesey Ward, I object very strongly to the removal of our Vesey name. Having attended local meetings I know I am not on my own. I consider the new name of Park side should not be considered, and request that Boldmere and Banners gate should be combined to form one Ward with two councilors. The ill-considered movement of Sutton Park boundaries to Four Oaks control detracts from all the good work local Banners Gate residents have fought for will be wasted if control is not local and effectively administered.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear BC,

Oh dear, here we go again! The new boundary changes are yet again a disaster.

Apart from the fact you have chopped up communities, we are under-represented with councillors. This is not fair. Given the population of Sutton I would suggest we need 11 councillors not 10.

Having just 10 councillors would mean we are under-represented and this in turn would mean we are likely to receive less funding.

26.1.16
I would also point out that the Commission has left out Whitehouse Common altogether!

Whilst I appreciate it is very difficult to select which area goes where when you do not live locally there must be a better way of doing it!

Yours faithfully

[Signature]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Susan Millington
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I have just read that Yardley Parish Church, St Edburgha's, might not be in the parish of Yardley if the new boundary changes are acted upon. What manner of madness is this? How can the ancient parish of Yardley be broken up like this? St Edburgha's has a long established historical and spiritual link to the parish, over a thousand years of Christian heritage and the conservation area is truly a jewel in the crown of this area. I don't think that links like this should be changed and disturbed in this way. It is important to continue our heritage and to cherish it. The ancient Yardley Parish Church should surely and firmly remain in the ancient parish of Yardley. The ancient name and its history should not be broken up. This picturesque site is well known and loved and is a haven in an otherwise busy and built up area. Its beautiful setting is visited and enjoyed by many. How can the ancient parish church not be in the same parish as its name? I think this boundary change proposition is ridiculous and should not go ahead.

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"

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

We cannot emphasise just how much this means to the residents of Erdington and its surrounding wards to keep historic features such as Erdington Abbey, Police Station, Train Station, the old Erdington Cottage homes and many other local historic features in Erdington.

Yours sincerely
Mr V J Millward and Mrs J Millward
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 are politically motivated changes made by persons who do not live in the wards affected and have no consideration for the views of the residents of the wards.

In addition Historic Properties such as "Erdington House" and Erdington Cottages are named after the area they are situated in! That should not alter and they should remain in "ERDINGTON"

Yours Sincerely:

[Redacted]

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
As an active resident of Moseley, Birmingham, for over 40 years, I would like to comment on the latest Local Government Boundary Commission proposals.

Whilst one of your three considerations in conducting an electoral review is to improve electoral equality, your proposed boundary changes for Moseley would cause so much damage to our historic, thriving, vibrant, diverse community, that the effect would be decidedly undemocratic and destructive.

We are an active community, involved in many local initiatives with a dozen or more societies, groups and committees dedicated to nurturing and developing our neighbourhood for the benefit of all residents. We have always worked closely with our local councillors, who have represented us and supported us well. The new proposals to slice the ward up into smaller units, each with one single councillor, would sabotage the civic achievements and progress developed over many years. The proposals would also mean that Moseley’s iconic buildings and institutions would no longer be within the Moseley Ward (Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley Hall hospital, Moseley Golf Club, Moseley Community Development Trust, Moseley Farmers' Market and many more would be in other wards, but should be and deserve to be in Moseley.)

Moseley is not just the built environment. The people who live and work here are constantly striving to improve the economic, cultural, social and environmental opportunities.
We also participate in regional and national events—Heritage Open Week, Britain in Bloom, Folk and Jazz festivals. The successful outcome of these events is down to the loyalty, energy and passion shown by local councillors, businesses, schools and residents.

I urge you to take notice of all the responses to your proposals for Moseley Ward boundary changes and to reconsider your proposals.

MRS. BARBARA HELEN MINOVI
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: dzenana
Date: 2 February 2016 at 17:03:18 GMT
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Fw: Consultation Response: Proposed Changes to Hall Green

Hi,

I’ve sent the below email to the Boundary Commission about the Hall Green area changes. If you just forward the email to reviews@lgbce.org.uk and sign as you.

We have until Feb 8th to respond to the proposals I think.

For the attention of the Boundary Commission,

I am writing to you to highlight my profound disappointment at the proposals for the Hall Green ward to be split into three wards – Hall Green North, Hall Green South and Tyseley. I am against splitting this ward into three for a number of valid reasons, particularly as Hall Green has a great historic past which must be preserved.
Firstly, I would like to state that my preference is for the status quo to remain and believe that Hall Green should remain in its entirety.

The reasons I am against such a split is that I have lived in Hall Green for many years and it is an area of great historic interest. Hall Green’s origins date back to the 16th century. The first record of Hawe Green dates back to 1562, taking its name from a medieval family whose moated hall stood at the junction of School Road and Fox Hollies Road.

The modern centre of Hall Green has spread along the Stratford Road. This route is of great antiquity and was mentioned in the Yardley Charter of 972 AD. For 1000 years, people have travelled through Hall Green. For years, it was the main route into Birmingham. Although Hall Green as a residential district is a mid-20th-century suburban development, very many residential areas in the north of the ward were built between 1910 and the 1920s. It is very proud of its Arts and Crafts buildings.

The Church of the Ascension is a Grade II* Listed building is over 300 years old dating from 1703. It remains one of the few neo-classical church buildings in the city. The streets around the church form the important Hall Green Conservation Area.

In addition, there has been a Hall Green school for 300 years. There’s been a station in Hall Green for over 100 years. Hall Green United Community Church has existed for nearly 100 years. Hall Green Parade has existed for over 100 years and Sarehole Mill dates back more than 250 years. With this in mind, a Hall Green ward boundary that does not encompass the whole Hall Green conservation area and the historic buildings mentioned is ripping apart an area with over 300 years of historical importance.

Recently Hall Green has undergone great demographic changes. For many years, community organisations have been working hard to forge good community links between the different faiths in the community and the different generations. The number of young people in the ward has grown considerably in the last ten years. It now needs a period of real stability so that the community cohesion of the area can continue to be nurtured and fostered.

The community group WeAreB28 have worked very hard to bridge the divide caused by the Stratford Road and now the Boundary Commission are intending to undo all this good work by creating Hall Green North and South – the divide being the Stratford Road.

Hall Green is composed of residents and community members who enjoy taking an active part in their community, whether the activities being offered by the various religious organisations, the schools, the Library, South & City College, Fircones, a centre providing activities for senior residents, Beechcraft Tennis & Multi Sports club and community events such as the Arts Festivals and various community markets as well as the annual Middle Earth Festival.

Hall Green has only one council asset – Hall Green Library – but it is rich in religious community buildings and also has Highfield Hall. If the ward of Tyseley is created, Hall Green will lose South & City College, Sarehole Mill, Hall Green School, Hall Green station, Hall
Green parade, Hall Green Medical Centre and Hall Green United Community church (the former Methodist church). Everyone in Hall Green will be affected by these changes.

I am aware that certain electoral changes need to be made but I would stress the great importance of retaining the name of ‘Hall Green’ if it comes to a split. I support calling the wards Hall Green east or west and support the Labour Groups proposals.

I sincerely hope for the good of the local community and the preservation of a great local history that the Boundary Commission reviews its proposals for the Hall Green area.

Yours Sincerely,

Haris Gazibegovic
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Bina Mistry
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 5: JRR Tolkien
Annotation 6: Edgbaston Reservoir
Annotation 7: My house

Comment text:

My postcode is [redacted] [annotation 3 - blue]. I am part of the Edgbaston ward at present and the changes proposed will put me into Summerfield. As you can see there is a large reservoir separating most of the residents in the new Summerfield. I feel separated from the community near to me as the new changes will mean I will be literally down the road from another two wards. The Edgbaston reservoir itself has no residents so I don't understand why it is stripped from its identity and moved into Summerfield; its a shame that it will lose its identity. The famous J R R Tolkien lived on Stirling Road and the two towers Perrotts Folly and Edgbaston Waterworks Tower which inspired his book will also move into the new ward Summerfield so again its losing its history and identity. I would like to rethink the Edgbaston line and for the reservoir and the residents below it to remain in Edgbaston (around 816). I hope this injustice will not be done to so much history.

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, Pye Hayes and Stockland Green.

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

They would destroy the heart of a thriving community. How can ‘Erdington’ Station, ‘Erdington’ Police Station and ‘Erdington’ Sorting Office not be in Erdington? Particularly the sorting office and police station being some 100 metres from ‘Erdington High Street’

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

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Mitchell
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: 
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Erdington
Annotation 2: Pype Hayes
Comment text:

I regularly visit friends who live in Erdington. The community is a real surprise, because it is not one of the wealthiest areas, yet it has better community pride than anywhere in the City. You walk down the street and everyone talks to you, saying hello etc, or talking about some little piece of local history. Whether it be some of the old buildings, or one of the many churches, Erdington is covered in heritage and the local area, which has existed since the Doomsday book really should be preserved as well. I have also shown what I understand the Pype Hayes community to be, the area has some community events such as fireworks display or the Pype Hayes Remembrance Day parade and seems to be an area which also is very well defined locally.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Pascoe, Mark

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 08 February 2016 14:39
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Changes to Ward Boundary - Erdington, Birmingham

From: Ian
Sent: 07 February 2016 10:46
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Changes to Ward Boundary - Erdington, Birmingham

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to lodge an objection to your plans to change the Ward Boundary for Erdington in Birmingham. I object to the changes because it will destroy the historic heart of Erdington 'Village' which has existed for many years.

How can 'Erdington' Abbey, 'Erdington' Police Station and 'Erdington' Railway Station not be part of Erdington?

A suitable solution, I would suggest, would be for the boundary for the Erdington Ward to exist with boundaries consisting of the border of Sutton Coldfield to the North, Court Lane to the West, to the South, the traditional border with Gravelly Hill/Birches Green off Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road and, to the East, the border of Pype Hayes so that Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive remain in Erdington.

Yours sincerely

I W Mitchell
From: I M
Sent: 07 February 2016 10:57
To: reviews <reviews@lbce.org.uk>
Subject: Changes to Boundaries - Erdington in Birmingham

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to lodge an objection to your plans to change the Ward Boundary for Erdington in Birmingham. I object to the changes because it will destroy the historic heart of Erdington 'Village' which has existed for many years.

How can 'Erdington' Abbey, 'Erdington' Police Station and 'Erdington' Railway Station not be part of Erdington?

Please consider this:

A Pype Hayes Ward including Birches Green, a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a Perry Common Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, a two member Kingstanding Ward, a Stockland Green Ward and a two member Oscott Ward.

The boundary for the Erdington Ward could exist with boundaries consisting of the border of Sutton Coldfield to the North, Court Lane to the West, to the South, the traditional border with Gravelly Hill/Birches Green off Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road and, to the East, the border of Pype Hayes so that Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive remain in Erdington.

Yours sincerely

Mrs L E Mitchell
ERDINGTON
To whom it may concern,

I am very disappointed that we have not been informed of any proposed changes to our ward. We have only found out by chance when my partner picked up a leaflet in a local business. We have not received any written information. If we have not had any information, how many other people have not received this as well and are unable to voice their concerns. I feel that this will not be a comprehensive consultation as it appears the date for any concerns has now passed.

I was brought up in Hall Green and apart from a brief period away, returned to the area to set up home. I have loved being part of the community in Hall Green and I am proud of where I live. It is ridiculous to divide Hall Green where it's railway station, school and the iconic Sarehole Mill which is part of the Tolkien legacy will no longer be part of Hall Green and will come under Tyseley. I feel we would lose part of the identity of Hall Green.

There has been a Hall Green school for 300 years. There’s been a station in Hall Green for over 100 years. Hall Green United Community Church has existed for nearly 100 years. Hall Green Parade has existed for over 100 years and Sarehole Mill dates back more than 250 years.

With this in mind, a Hall Green ward boundary that does not encompass the whole Hall Green conservation area and the historic buildings mentioned is ripping apart an area with over 300 years of historical importance.

If the ward of Tyseley is created, Hall Green will lose South and City College, Sarehole Mill, Hall Green School, Hall Green Station, Hall green Medical Centre and Hall Green United Community Church.

The new Tyseley ward, while taking up much of Hall Green, seems to be no where near the real Tyseley. The real Tyseley is in Yardley West.

There have been 3 councillors representing the Hall Green ward for a long time and they have been of excellent calibre, mainly living in the area and being passionate
about it. If one councillor was sick or on holiday, the others would take over. This will be much more difficult if Hall Green is split into single one member wards.

Yours faithfully

Denise Moffitt and Andrew Bubb
From: Shazad Mohammed

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 12:28 PM

To: reviews <reviews@lbce.org.uk>

Cc: 

Subject: Proposed boundary changes to Hall Green.

To Whom It May Concern

Today I received a flier informing me that under the proposed Boundary Changes following the Kerslake review of Birmingham governance my road, [redacted], will no longer be in Hall Green but instead in Tyseley.

This is wrong for so many reasons and patently unfair. I bought my house in 2012 for [redacted], I moved from Sparkhill to Hall Green because in Birmingham Hall Green is known as a nice family area and the school catchment area was suitable for certain schools that I wanted my children to attend. I did not want to move to Tyseley, where the property prices are significantly lower and schools not as good. Why has the new proposal deemed fit to wipe tens of thousands (if not hundreds of thousands of pounds) off of peoples properties. It is not unreasonable for me to believe that I would be raising my family in Hall Green because my road is sandwiched in between Hall Green Station and Hall Green United Church. If the boundary change proposal goes through and I decide to sell my house in order to move to Hall Green proper I will not receive the amount of money I paid for it because of the aforementioned reasons. Will the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be willing to compensate me for the disparity in the house price before and after the boundary change?

I could not be more opposed to these proposed plans, they show total disregard for the people of Hall Green who have no wish to live in Tyseley. British people seek fairness and equality in their lives, that is a fundamental British value and one that must be upheld by scrapping this ludicrous proposal for a boundary change that will negatively impact on thousands of people.

Sincerely

Shazad Mohammed

[redacted]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Shafique Mohammed
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I endorse the boundary commission proposals for Sparkbrook ward

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sadia Mohammed
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I have recently been shown the new boundary commission proposal for the creation of a new Tyseley Ward. I am very happy that we are getting a one member ward, in line with the recommendations of the Kerslake Report.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Sir/madam,

I have read your proposal to re-name the historic area of Yardley, Birmingham, where I live as Stechford East. This means that the conservation area (Yardley Village) which our most prominent feature and which includes our 1000 year old church, will lose the identity which it has held since the Domesday Book. Yardley is an established ward, which has been well-managed by local politicians from all three major parties over the years. The consensus is, as expressed by all residents, is that there is no need to alter the status of the ward and I urge you to reconsider your unnecessary proposals.

Yours,

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

Re-Proposed Boundary Change

Hall Green to Tyseley

Dear Sirs/Madam

So the Boundary Commission in its wisdom suggests Hall Green be split into N,S, and Tyseley!! However, part of their remit is to familiarise themselves in those areas to enable the joining of compatible communities. It is preposterous that this should ever have been proposed. Hall Green as the name depicts is a tree lined, pleasant suburb with a wealth of history dating back to 970ad. when the Stratford Road was first recorded. The following is a mere fraction of the deprivation this community will suffer.

Hall Green parade late 1890.
The Church of the Ascension Grade 11 listed, which has stood for the last 300 yrs. in a conservation area. The community Church circa 1900.

Sarehole Mill, origin 1766 - 350 years later and a £450, 000 refurbishment from the Museum Trust Restoration fund, fully working and producing flour, the only one in the country. Living in Wake Green Road from 1895 - 1900 his childhood memories of themill, Moseley Bog, the water tower & surrounding fields and farms were to lay the foundations on which Tolkien in later years based his now renowned trilogy of books.

Hall Green Residents Assoc. established in 1920 and still active, delivering leaflets this week. Our library hosts many groups and clubs as diverse as follows;


Hall Green Open Gardens, est. 1997 twice annually open to the public under the NGS.

scheme Sales of home grown plants plus teas and cakes are donated to NGS St. Mary's Hospice and the Air Ambulance. Festivals are held annually, Middle Earth in celebration of Tolkien, The Mella, various other events and regular markets.

TYSELEY

Developed as a working class district mainly industry with accomodation for the workforce. The Railway station opened in 1908 and closed 1969, now used as the Birmingham Railway Museum. Various amenities are listed on line which I failed to find details of.
The board proposes the unity of these wards which are at opposite ends of the spectrum, so how can it be claimed their rules have been adhered to? This exercise is to reduce by twenty ward councillors, the remaining one hundred to be allocated wards of equal numbers. One councillor each will suffice. In cases of absenteeism, illness or annual leave who will deputise? This exercise will cost tens of millions of pounds to implement. To divide the councillors pro-rata between the wards the cost would be negligible. Why in times of austerity is ratepayers money to be squandered in this manner. It appalls and infuriates me that lines on a map can rip apart our community and dictate how we may address our homes. People aspire to live in Hall Green, families grow up here, their children buy their houses here, some people live out their lives here. For thirty-two years my home, my friends and neighbours, my support network has been here in Hall Green. The pathetic reasons given for this demolition of our community does not bear scrutiny when assessing the devastating affects.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

Lynn Mole.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: patric monney
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Typical of Birmingham thinking. When you have a good thing (and Moseley is a good thing) you just have to poke your messy little fingers into the mix. Please leave us alone and play in someone else's park. There are precious few areas left in Birmingham that have not suffered from half-baked or scurrilous interventions by government bodies, that has left the residents and businesses adrift. This is another and it will be resisted. Leave well alone and let us continue to support and have pride in our area as we have successfully done in the past. Thank You.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Annotation 1: These North Edgbaston areas have more in common with the rest of Edgbaston.

Comment text:

There are two distinct areas of North Edgbaston, north of the Hagley Road that share much more in common with Edgbaston and Harborne than with the other elements of the proposed new Summerfield ward. These two areas are: Vernon Rd/Montague Road/Clarendon Road and the area around St Augustine’s Church. By removing these areas from Edgbaston ward, the risk increases that the distinctive character of those areas will deteriorate and it is certainly likely that house prices will drop. I can see no logical reason why those areas as marked on the map cannot still remain as part of Edgbaston, especially as there appears to be an acceptance that some properties on the north side of the Hagley Road should still be part of the Edgbaston ward.

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:

TOTAL WASTE OF MONEY AND TIME.
This is really unnecessary.
Erdington Ward is fine as it is.
Surely taxpayers’ money can be used in a more appropriate way.

Yours Sincerely,

[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 Mail, Dec 2015
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Penny Moore
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Comment text:

Hello I also have concerns about how the proposed boundaries would work with the existing district boundaries the district needs to contain whole wards or there will be chaos! I belong to a group that are district based and it would be very difficult to work if the districts contained parts of wards, this would also lead to MPs having constituents in multiple districts.

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, Pye Hayes and Stockland Green.

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:- the proposed changes make community cohesion difficult, where communities are already struggling, such as Waven Road being split into two, Perry Common not having all of Wotton Lodge Road, to name but a few.

Yours Sincerely

Name: Pauline Moore

Address: 

Postcode: 

Email: 

Phone number:
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 Sirs,

I am writing in relation to the potential boundary change for Yardley to become Stechford.

Myself and my family would like to strongly oppose this change. We have been residents of the area for many years and Yardley Old Church, or St Eg burga's Church, is almost 1000 years old and holds special memories for our family. Myself and my husband were married there, and my son and myself were christened there.

We therefore see no reason for the proposal for this change and again, reiterate, that it is strongly opposed.

We look forward to hearing further information in due course.

Regards,

Sheryl Moore, and Mr and Mrs Barnden
Dear sir or madam,

I am writing to register my dis-approval of the proposed boundary changes to the Erdington ward.

I live on [redacted] and will be effectively moved out of Erdington and into Pype Hayes. Looking at the ward plans, logic says that this area should be be absorbed into Wylde Green if it needs to be altered at all.

I strongly disagree that the historic area of Erdington around the Abbey should be removed from the ward into Stockland Green.

Thank you for your attention,
Keith Morby.
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 live at [redacted], and looking at the ward plans, logic says that my bit should be absorbed into Wyke Green, if anywhere.

I strongly object to the historic area of Erdington around the Abbey being moved out into Stockland Green.

Please leave the boundaries as they are!

Yours Sincerely

Name: [Redacted]  
Address: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]  
Email: [Redacted]  
Phone number: [Redacted]

RECEIVED
29 JAN 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 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/Madam

Re: WeAre28 – Boundary Change – Hall Green

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed boundary change in Hall Green.

I have lived in Hall Green for 43 years. I want my name and address added to the petition against this boundary change.

I would like to add that Hall Green should stay in Hall Green and the boundary should not be changed. I have been very happy living in Hall Green for the past 43 years and I am not happy with this proposal.

The people in Hall Green get on well with each other.

I wish to point out that Hall Green has an awful lot to offer to residents and local business so why the need for change.

This has not been given a lot of thought and the people of Hall Green was not given a lot of notice in regards to this.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

Mrs Andrew Morgan
Dear Sir/Madam

Re: WeAre28 – Boundary Change – Hall Green

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed boundary change in Hall Green.

I have lived in Hall Green for 43 years. I want my name and address added to the petition against this boundary change. I wish to stress that Hall Green needs to stay as Hall Green and not to be changed.

Also Hall Green has been a happy place to live in and everyone gets along so well, why does this need to be changed? There are so many things going for us in Hall Green. Why do we want to come under an Industrial Estate? We shall not be moved.

Why does someone in London who does not know the people of Hall Green make such a decision to change Hall Green, surely they could be utilising their time in dealing with more pressing issues?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Mrs M.E.Morgan
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Carole Morley
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I currently live in Yardley and am proud of its heritage. Changing the name of the area to Stechford East would be a travesty. The council has already allowed people to erode the look and feel of the area by building extensions and changing houses so they are no longer in keeping with the conservation area a stone's throw away. PLEASE do not change the name so we lose even more of our link back to Yardley's proud history. Listen to the people you are supposed to be serving.

Uploaded Documents:

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

21 January 2016

Sir,

Hall Green, Birmingham Proposed Boundary Changes

I am writing with reference to the proposed boundary changes for Hall Green, Birmingham. My wife and I were very concerned when learnt of the proposal that our road would be removed from the Hall Green ward and placed in the Tyseley ward. Subsequently I have researched the proposal and have become increasingly concerned and upset at this change.

I understand that many of the Kerslake recommendations make sense and that the review of the local government electoral process was perhaps needed. I also understand that the Kerslake review conclusion that the number of wards in Birmingham needed to be reduced is on the face of it, a sensible proposition. I want you to understand that I do not object the principle of redrawing the boundaries in Birmingham. However, whilst the principle is fine it is the practice that is unacceptable.

We live on [redacted] in the north of the Hall Green ward, our road and a number of others in our locality are to be transferred to the Tyseley ward. I wholeheartedly object to this for a number of reasons. After reviewing the proposals it is obvious to me that the process of redrawing the boundaries was done arbitrarily without any knowledge of our community, by simply drawing a line on a ward boundary map that fulfilled the need for having about 8000 voters per ward. This appears to have been done without any regard for the history of the local area, the families and community affected by the change, or the need to have effective representation within local government.

It is a shameful that the proposals for the drawing of the Hall Green north ward boundary has been done without any reference to the history of the area. Hall Green is a large ward, hence why it is represented by three councillors. The majority of the ward was built during the interwar years. However the North of the ward which is subject to the proposals, including our road, was built between 1900 and 1920.

Our house was built in 1912, and on photographs taken from Sarehole Mill in the early 1920's, our house can be seen on the hill in an essentially rural setting. The Hall Green Station was built in
1908, the main row of retail businesses is Hall Green Parade was built in 1913. The reason I mention these dates is that this area will be ripped from Hall Green by the boundary proposals, even though this is the oldest area of Hall Green with the majority of the ward built between the wars. So it should be considered that although this is the very northern edge of the ward it is in fact the heart of Hall Green as a community, as it is historically the oldest part of the ward.

I am very concerned regarding the effect that the proposal will have on the community of Hall Green, over the previous few years it has become increasingly multicultural, both from an ethnic and religious point of view. Whilst other areas of Birmingham have issues of integration, Hall Green is a model of cultural integration, and this is in part due to the result of the work and efforts of the local councillors who represent Hall Green. Our councillors have done sterling work for all members of the community, if the boundary change proposal goes ahead I and my neighbours shall be deprived of the councillors who know and live in our ward. If the proposal goes forward we shall not be represented by councillors who are part of the Hall Green community.

The committee or individuals who drew up this proposal for Hall Green show their lack of knowledge of the local area, or a lack of care for the results of their proposals. Why is the name of the proposed ward to be Tyseley? A review of the maps provided on your web site shows the nonsense that the name Tyseley is. The actual area of Tyseley is the Yardley West ward and is separated from our road by both the Sparkbrook and the Acocks Green wards! The proposal may be more acceptable if the proposed name of the new ward was to be Hall Green North, then at least we would still feel that we had some electoral connection to our Hall Green locality. It should also be noted that the area known as Tyseley bears no relation to the area of Hall Green. Tyseley is predominantly a rundown industrial area, with warehousing, the Kings Road public waste disposal site, and a railway goods yard. It has none of the merits of suburban Hall Green.

Taking account of the above I would implore the commission to reconsider the proposals it has made. To that end I would like to suggest the following:

1) The current proposals are dropped and that the current ward boundaries, and representation, are left unaffected by the review.

2) That if the proposals are continued with, that the name of the created ward is changed from "Tyseley" to the more representative "Hall Green North" ward

3) That the needs of the local community are already fairly and effectively represented by the current councillors and that the ward could be split internally within the current boundaries. Thus providing the local electorate with the current representation but on a one member per ward basis.

4) I have examined two alternative ward boundary plans that have been prepared by the three existing councillors. Both of these plans provide for north Hall Green to remain in the Hall Green ward whilst still fulfilling the aims of the Boundary Commission in line with the Kerslake recommendations. I urge the commission to fully examine these alternative proposals and adopt one as the plan for the Hall Green ward in the Publication of final recommendations.

5) That the Commission understand the effect that their proposals are having on the community of Hall Green, and to take this in to consideration when making their final recommendations.
I trust that my views receive their due consideration, and that the commission takes in to account the depth of feeling of the electorate of Hall Green, that their proposals have created. I urge the commission to reconsider the proposals in line with the majority of the respondents who express a view during this consultation period.

Yours faithfully

Ian Morley
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Steve Morley  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]  
Organisation Name: [Redacted]  

**Comment text:**

I disagree with the proposal to re-name the Yardley boundary.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Paul Mormoris
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am deeply concerned that the ancient parish name of Yardley is to be lost under the proposed title of Stechford East. Please reconsider the naming of the district. The name Stechford has a limited history and is an incorrect spelling of the old area name. Stechford came about after a railway sign-maker misspelt the station name!! Please retain Yardley as it has a greater resonance with local residence and an ancient lineage which is worth maintaining. Thank yo I've lived at various addresses in Stechford & Yardley for over 20 years. I have been school governor and member of residents association during this time. Paul Mormoris

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:-
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:-

We live closer to Erdington Village and railway than Stockland Green!!
I can walk to these locations but not Stockland Green.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone no:-
Perhaps you could provide details of the submission on Acocks Green that suggested a ward boundary along the railway line to Solihull.

I am aware of at least half the 12 submissions made on Acocks Green and none of them proposed that boundary. In deed any one with any understanding of the nature and working of local communities could not possibly seriously suggest such boundaries.

Your comment that you are content that this boundary reflects community identity shows that the Boundary Commission is no longer fit for purpose.
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Jill Morris  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I am astonished and appalled at the proposal in respect of Erdington it may be an area that struggles with socio economic challenges but it is also one of proud history (mentioned as far back as Domesday) and many social and popular history high points e.g. Its victorian benefactors such as Josiah Mason and Mothers night club. I have lived here for most of my life and do not wish to have a new boundary imposed. No benefit to either myself or other residents has been identified or clarified. This may be an emotive stance but is one voiced by allI know who are aware of the proposal who appear to be the still poorly informed minority. Who can take the village out of the boundary how can the parish no longer be in the boundary? This is senseless political meddling and manipulation please think again.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stefanie Morrison
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

The boundary of Hall Green should not change because we have lived here for years with all the facilities we need. We have a history here and that should not be lost. Why change something that works well as it is? We do not want change thank you!!

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Morris
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

No comments on the ward or parish boundaries. However I note in your Draft Recommendations you say (para 37) 'Sutton Coldfield Town Council should comprise 24 councillors, as at present'. Firstly there is no 'at present' since the Reorganisation Order has not come into force (as you acknowledge) and it may be amended before it does. Thus I think it incumbent on you to justify your recommendation. Why, when councillor numbers are falling in BCC, do you recommend such a high number? My view is that, since the Town Councillors will have very little power and no caseload, one per ward is easily sufficient.

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:-

Erdington Abbey has been there since 1850 so we don't understand why you would want to take it out of Erdington.
Likewise Erdington Station Fire Station Royal Mail sorting office Osbourne School and cottages. I would plead with you to reconsider and listen to the people who live in Erdington.

Yours Sincerely

Name: Teresa Morrissey
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 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:-

Yours Sincerely

Name:- MRS. J. MORRIS
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
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!**
To: Pascoe, Mark  
Subject: FW: Birmingham Ward consultation

-----Original Message-----
From: Deborah Moseley  
Sent: 08 February 2016 22:38  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Birmingham Ward consultation

Dear Review Officer,

I have lived in Moseley since 1986. As a single person my husband had lived in Moseley and as he had enjoyed the community spirt from then we chose to live there after our marriage and bring up our children.

My children attended Moseley primary school and due to the community spirit which is so prevalent in Moseley they walked to school with other school mates on a daily basis.

Geographically, Mosely is a inner city ward of Birmingham. However due to the community it thrives and frequently win area in blooms award and this is due to the residents of Moseley. The "village green" is the heart of Moseley where the successful monthly farmer’s market take place. The high street is vibrant and has many independent shops. In fact Moseley prides itself on the number of such shops. The Moseley Society of which I am a member has been integral to developing the area.

I do not understand the rationale of the proposal to divide Moseley nor to remove its high street and place it in the proposed Cannon Hill and Balsall Heath ward. I do not recognise why this ward has been created. Cannon Hill is not an area it is a park.
My suggestion is that Moseley should remain as a stand alone ward. Its boundaries should be Brighton Road, Yardley Wood Road, wake green road, cold bath road, Springfield road, Valentine's road, queensbridge road, moor green lane, Russell road.

I also consider that the Jewellery quarter should be as stand alone ward. It’s an area of historic and current interest in the Jewellery trade. It attracts business to the City and should be given its own recognition.

I understand the envision of the wards is due to the recommendation in the Kerslake report to reduce the number of Councillors from 120 to 101. I believe the propose changes is a big sledge hammer to reduce the number of Councillors by 19.
I do understand how nationally recognised landmarks are arbitrarily moved without any rationale. E.g Sarehole Mill.

One of the draft aims to maintain communities, yet you propose to split Billesley lane, Moseley between the Moseley and Kings Heath Ward. Yet for the reason of not wanting to split communities it has been proposed that Monyhall Hall Road remain under one ward. This is inconsistency. There are wards that have hardly had any changes made, namely most of the wards in Sutton Coldfield, yet no rationale is provided for this.

I hope that the Commission will not ignore the wishes of the residents of Moseley and keep The Moseley ward as it stands as this is what the locals recognise.
Deborah
"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"

regards Janet Moseley
From: keith moseley
Sent: 08 February 2016 10:10
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Keep Erdington together

“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”

K.Moseley
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Celia Moss
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

The proposals for Moseley and Kings Heath are devastating for the residents of this ward. Moseley is a fantastic community with a really strong identity. Your proposals are utterly destructive. Please listen to the residents.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Madeleine Mott
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

Responding to the Moseley boundary changes Dear Sir/ Madam Further to the proposed new boundaries for wards in the Moseley area, I would like to comment on the proposals which would, if implemented, change how my family and I are represented and how local services are shaped. I understand that the wish to reflect community identity is among the main considerations of this process. I would respectfully state that dividing Moseley into several wards, including removing the actual village centre from the Moseley ward would have the opposite effect. Born and bred in Moseley, I have returned to the area with my family, attracted by the quality of life in this thriving Birmingham suburb, its distinct character and community spirit. Moseley is not just its buildings, parks and 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 to nurture and develop the place they live in and love. We are active users of the Village, its services and groups, and believe that the strong shared sense of what makes Moseley great is its residents commitment and their the consistent activity to the place itself. It is my view that these proposals parcel Moseley and the surrounding areas up in a way that is at best bewildering and at worst, detrimental to a place that works very well. Yours faithfully Madeleine Mott

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir or Madam,

**Opposition to proposed Boundary Changes in Birmingham affecting the Moseley Area**

I am writing to you to express in the strongest terms my opposition to the proposed boundary changes in the Moseley area of Birmingham.

I suspect that you will have had other correspondence around this. You will be aware that Moseley is a popular and well loved area of Birmingham. It was identified as the best urban area in England in which to live in 2015 in the Sunday Times, hosts the Farmers market identified as the best in the UK 2009 and 2012, and regularly wins 'Britain in Bloom’ competitions. It is next to Cannon Hill Park, and it has a small park just off the central shopping area, which is host to two music festivals a year, one Jazz and one Folk. The Monkeys headlined last Autumn's Folk Festival.

All this, and a range of other local activities such as Christmas Lights and the local shopkeepers group, is underpinned by a rich mix of local groups, including the Moseley Society, Local History Groups, and Moseley Forum.

The proposed boundary changes would shatter this structure. The area would be split into five different areas with six different counsellors. The very centre of Moseley would no longer be in the Moseley Ward. There are two conservation areas in Moseley, each would be split in this plan. Moseley Park would be in Balsall Health!
I have joined one or two Moseley Forum Meetings with our Moseley Counsellors and the local police, there is clarity and focus which has enables decision making which in part has made Moseley what it is. I can’t imagine ever sitting in a Moseley Forum meeting with six different counsellors, for each of whom Moseley is just a small ‘bit’ of their ward. It simply would not work.

The proposals would dilute what we have in Moseley, fragment what we have built here, and slow and confuse decision making.

Please reconsider and redraft the proposed boundaries to create a single area which encompasses the whole of Moseley.

And if you are tempted after reading this letter to want to have a city break do come up and visit us, not only is it a really nice place but it’s really handy to pop over and see the Cricket in Edgbaston!

Yours sincerely,

Lawrence Moulin
To The Review Officer (Birmingham),

Hall Green is a small but vibrant community that I am blessed to be a part of. As a young student, this area has done much for my education and my welfare. I attended Hall Green Secondary School for 5 years, and I can honestly state that it's people, it's teachers, and it's history has shaped its pupils as passionate individuals through establishing a loving communal atmosphere.

As a person of ethnic minority, my parents placed immense value within the education of myself and my siblings. We moved to this area because we knew it's worth. We knew it's standard of living, it's standard of education, the respect and kind mannerisms of its people. Attending this smaller secondary school has allowed us to maintain close ties with both our teachers and our classmates. The friends I had made during my years there all live within my area, and this has aided in establishing friendships of over ten years. Our community are not merely neighbours, but close friends.

As a student of English literature, the history of my area is profoundly important to how I identify myself as an individual. Sarehole Mill is a huge part of my childhood, and is a great historical site within even literature. The old village of Sarehole (now on the border of Hall Green and Moseley) is where J. R. R. Tolkien lived as a child and gained inspiration for the Hobbit's home "The Shire" as well as the book, "The Lord Of The Rings". I am currently studying Tolkien at University, and it is amazing to witness how this area is central to even my undergraduate studies. As the home of Tolkien, Hall Green has great resonance and uniqueness, and is a central spot for uniting our community. Its annual holding of fairs and markets unites our community and gathers old friends together, as well as encouraging new friendships to be established too.
Dividing us as a community is not in the best interests of all those who live here. Living as one community in Hall Green establishes a safe environment for its people, one that is difficult to come by and not present in many other communities. We see it as we visit the local library, a place that I have visited for almost ten years. We interact with many generations of Hall Green both at this community library and at our schools. Young, old, teenagers, adolescents, we have all established close communal ties by living under the same area. It is cruel to separate such a community as ours.

It is often proclaimed that the public voice is the one that matters, then listen and take heed of our voices. We do not wish to be separated. We do not wish to be divided. We have lived together as one community since the 16th century. Hall Green is our area, our community, and our home. Our platform for our education, our individuality, and our voices. Do not divide B28.

Signed
Humma Mouzam
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:-

WHY TRY TO MEND SOMETHING THAT IS NOT BROKEN. IT HAS WORKED FOR I DON'T KNOW FOR SO MANY YEARS NOW. THE ONLY THING TO CHANGE IS OUR CURRENT CONSTITUENCY HAVING TO FIGHT AND FIGHT FOR THINGS THAT NEED DOING (<BOTH PARTIES>)

Yours Sincerely

[Name]

[Address]

[Postcode]

[Email]

[Phone number]
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!
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Andrew Mudie
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Response to Boundary Changes affecting Edgbaston Dear Sirs, I’d like to make my objection clear regarding the proposed boundary changes to Birmingham. In particular, I am referring to the area in which I live, Edgbaston. The current proposal has indicated that the part of Edgbaston in which I live will be sliced off the Edgbaston ward and mixed in to a new ward named Summerfield. My address is [REDACTED] Firstly can I say that I was amazed when I first heard about the Boundary Commissions work to alter Birmingham’s ward boundaries. I had no idea this was happening and only found out because a friend has stumbled across an article whilst on a train with time to kill. I would like it to be known that whatever effort was made to notify the electorate of this change, it was not effective. Out of around 70 people that I have talked to about this, only 2 had heard about it. I am feel very strongly about this proposed change and the potential affects that it can have on the area in which I have lived for nearly all my adult life. I’d like to make it clear that I do not agree with it and would like the Boundary Commission to reconsider its proposal. The following points should explain why I think the change will have a negative impact on this area and our heritage. This will take away our History This area of Edgbaston has architecture/property that dates back into the mid 1800’s with numerous houses, businesses and school with beautiful architecture that correspond precisely with Edgbaston as an area. We have copies of deeds that show an 1854 house as being in Edgbaston. My personal history is very involved with this area of Edgbaston. I first moved here over 20 years ago when I was a student, and have started my career, built a successful business and now run a business (employ people) from here that trades predominantly with the wider Edgbaston area. I have no connection with ‘Summerfield’, and it has no history as it has never been a suburb here. This will undermine our Community I have seen this area grow from strength to strength over the years and our community here has collectively improved this area year on year. Investment is high and it is now considered a desirable area compared to how it was 20 years ago and beyond. I am involved with a neighbourhood watch group where people clearly care about their area. There has been a North Edgbaston Residents Association in the past and also a newly formed North Edgbaston Residents Group, which has been created to inform people of these proposed boundary changes. I personally have strong links with Edgbaston. My children go to school in Edgbaston, we socialise in Edgbaston, we go to clubs in Edgbaston, my business operates mainly in Edgbaston, I am proud to be part of Edgbaston. I have no connection whatsoever with ‘Summerfield’. Impact on Investment and settlement As explained, our area had grown with investment from people who have seen the area improving and who want to be involved with the growing community here. Tearing apart our history and community identity by changing the boundaries will, in my opinion most definitely have a negative impact on desirability to settle here and also further investment, which will deaden the rate of growth and improvement of the area. This will start to undo everything that long standing residents have done to restore the area and cannot be seen as anything but negative from any point of view. Numbers and Boundary proposal I would like to be able to help put together a proposal for the boundary commission as is requested. I have tried using the website software however it will not allow any of the lines drawn on there to remain, and they are deleted as soon as you try and deselect the pencil option. I also have no idea whatsoever about how many electors are in each road to begin to come up with an alternative proposal that fits with the criteria. I would be happy to be involved with the process.
if that option or information was available. The information provided by you shows that Edgbaston currently has 10,096 voters, and Summerfield will have 13,244. There is a simple rational to suggest that the North part of Edgbaston could remain within Edgbaston and it would reduce Summerfield and increase Edgbaston so they would almost reverse in numbers currently. The 2021 electorate seems to show the proposed Edgbaston as having a further 50% or voters (10,096 increasing to 14,966. This has not been explained and I struggle to understand where all these new inhabitants will come from in the Edgbaston area. Can someone please explain this?) Clearly another contradiction of the current criteria is jagged line which denotes the boundary between the proposed Edgbaston and the proposed Summerfield. This is most definitely not a clear defined boundary, which is part of the proposal criteria. Can someone please explain this also? In summary: To remove us out of Edgbaston is wrong because: • Loss of history • Negative impact on community identity • Negative impact on investment and settlement • It’s not providing electoral equality • It’s not created a clear defined boundary I wanted to live in Edgbaston. I chose to live in Edgbaston. Now I am being told that I am to be part of somewhere that has no history or ties with myself or my community here. History is one of the founding principles of our society; even our Prime Minister recently said that we are a nation that is built on, and proud of, our history. Please do not slice up our communities in this callous way. These proposals must be rejected. Regards Andrew Mudie

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Response to Boundary Changes affecting Edgbaston

Dear Sirs,

I’d like to make my objection clear regarding the proposed boundary changes to Birmingham. In particular, I am referring to the area in which I live, Edgbaston. The current proposal has indicated that the part of Edgbaston in which I live will be sliced off the Edgbaston ward and mixed in to a new ward named Summerfield. My address is [redacted], Edgbaston.

Firstly can I say that I was amazed when I first heard about the Boundary Commissions work to alter Birmingham’s ward boundaries. I had no idea this was happening and only found out because a friend has stumbled across an article whilst on a train with time to kill. I would like it to be known that whatever effort was made to notify the electorate of this change, it was not effective. Out of around 70 people that I have talked to about this, only 2 had heard about it.

I am feel very strongly about this proposed change and the potential affects that it can have on the area in which I have lived for nearly all my adult life. I’d like to make it clear that I do not agree with it and would like the Boundary Commission to reconsider its proposal. The following points should explain why I think the change will have a negative impact on this area and our heritage.

This will take away our History

This area of Edgbaston has architecture/property that dates back into the mid 1800’s with numerous houses, businesses and school with beautiful architecture that correspond precisely with Edgbaston as an area. We have copies of deeds that show an 1854 house as being in Edgbaston. My personal history is very involved with this area of Edgbaston. I first moved here over 20 years ago when I was a student, and have started my career, built a successful business and now run a business and (employ people) from here that trades predominantly with the wider Edgbaston area. I have no connection with ‘Summerfield’, and it has no history as it has never been a suburb here.

This will undermine our Community

I have seen this area grow from strength to strength over the years and our community here has collectively improved this area year on year. Investment is high and it is now considered a desirable area compared to how it was 20 years ago and beyond. I am involved with a neighbourhood watch group where people clearly care about their area. There has been a North Edgbaston Residents Association in the past and also a newly formed North Edgbaston Residents Group, which has been created to inform people of these proposed boundary changes. I personally have strong links with Edgbaston. My children go to school in Edgbaston, we socialise in Edgbaston, we go to clubs in Edgbaston, my business operates mainly in Edgbaston, I am proud to be part of Edgbaston. I have no connection whatsoever with ‘Summerfield’.
Impact on Investment and settlement

As explained, our area had grown with investment from people who have seen the area improving and who want to be involved with the growing community here. Tearing apart our history and community identity by changing the boundaries will, in my opinion most definitely have a negative impact on desirability to settle here and also further investment, which will deafen the rate of growth and improvement of the area. This will start to undo everything that long standing residents have done to restore the area and cannot be seen as anything but negative from any point of view.

Numbers and Boundary proposal

I would like to be able to help put together a proposal for the boundary commission as is requested. I have tried using the website software however it will not allow any of the lines drawn on there to remain, and they are deleted as soon as you try and deselect the pencil option. I also have no idea whatsoever about how many electors are in each road to begin to come up with an alternative proposal that fits with the criteria. I would be happy to be involved with the process if that option or information was available.

The information provided by you shows that Edgbaston currently has 10,096 voters, and Summerfield will have 13,244. There is a simple rational to suggest that the North part of Edgbaston could remain within Edgbaston and it would reduce Summerfield and increase Edgbaston so they would almost reverse in numbers currently. The 2021 electorate seems to show the proposed Edgbaston as having a further 50% or voters (10,096 increasing to 14,966. This has not been explained and I struggle to understand where all these new inhabitants will come from in the Edgbaston area. Can someone please explain this?)

Clearly another contradiction of the current criteria is jagged line which denotes the boundary between the proposed Edgbaston and the proposed Summerfield. This is most definitely not a clear defined boundary, which is part of the proposal criteria. Can someone please explain this also?

In summary:

To remove us out of Edgbaston is wrong because:

- Loss of history
- Negative impact on community identity
- Negative impact on investment and settlement
- It’s not providing electoral equality
- It’s not created a clear defined boundary

I wanted to live in Edgbaston. I chose to live in Edgbaston. Now I am being told that I am to be part of somewhere that has no history or ties with myself or my community here. History is one of the
founding principles of our society; even our Prime Minister recently said that we are a nation that is built on, and proud of, our history. Please do not slice up our communities in this callous way. These proposals must be rejected.

Regards

Andrew Mudie
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
- Name: Victoria Nudie
- E-mail: 
- Postcode: 
- Organisation Name: n/a

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Proposal to maintain key areas & historical communities of Edgbaston

Comment text:

I am currently a resident in the north part of Edgbaston, where I have chosen to live for the last 12 years. I was a young adult when I moved here from leafy, Warwickshire and chose this location due to the long history and kind communities I have been familiar with. I have been here for more than 20 years ago and had 7 children. We have lived in 3 different properties, all within this area of Edgbaston. My children are still at school in Harborne, at Blue Coat, so we chose this school as the state school we were allocated was in Ladywood and the communities of the children are far too far removed from our own, that we did not feel as if they would fit in. My husband runs his business from home, and works mainly for clients in the Edgbaston area. We are members of the Edgbaston Priory Club, Botanical Gardens and use the facilities of doctors, dentists, opticians, vets and so on, in Harborne and Edgbaston. Our lives, the businesses and the people we connect with daily are all within the Edgbaston ward. Therefore I object strongly to the proposed boundary changes for the Edgbaston ward, which would change where I live from Edgbaston to Summerfield. I do not feel that myself or my family will be represented within the new ward, the spectrum of individuals once you include areas of Soho and Ladywood would be too vast, that there would be no cohesion as a community and therefore no electoral equality for any us. I feel that the views of residents have not been considered – especially as the guidance regarding clear ward definitions is being ignored as the businesses on the Hagley Road are still to be included within Edgbaston, but not the residents that actually purchased in the area and are raising families here. Summerfield is not a ward name that would work – I moved to Edgbaston because of the recognition and the history associated with it – I can just hear the conversation now with 'out of towners' – "oh you live in Summerfield, where's that then, oh it used to be Edgbaston did it, what happened there?" I believe that the comments about property pricing – in that they will not be considered as there is no evidence they would be affected – is just not, and an area you well know you would have difficulty in arguing in a court of law. I believe that it would be better served to maintain Edgbaston as Edgbaston and look at adapting the other areas to ensure that headcount limits are adhered to - which would still enable the changes required with the council, without disrupting residents futures. We are committed to Edgbaston and have worked hard to be good members of the community with a strong moral compass and yet you want to take that away from us. Finally, neither my husband or I were informed of the changes at all – not by post, email, phone or public communication. It was only through the community that we have fostered in this area, that the information was happened upon, shared and rapidly re-communicated. It feels underhand and dishonest. Therefore I cannot see how this proposal could be progressed – we live in a democracy don’t we?

Uploaded Documents:
- None Uploaded

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/6836
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mohammed S Mughal
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

As a resident of Sparkbrook ward I support the boundary proposed by the commission.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Zabir Mumtaz
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I am very happy with the creation of the new Tyseley Ward

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Andrew Murphy  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**  

**Comment text:**

I have an uneasy feeling. Borne from the idea that a change in boundaries will create confusion to residents now banded in different areas. Maybe more importantly the exercise will be costly. The planning, the consultation, the change in signage. small business will find that a change creates uncertainty and also result in reduced revenues. A more poignant response would be to leave the boundaries as they are and work on greater community cohesion. show us what we can achieve when we are together not point out that we are divided and can be shifted by unknown civil servants with the swipe of their virtual pencil. Dr Andrew Murphy.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
5 February 2016

The Review Officer
LGBCE
14th Floor, Millbank Tower
Millbank
LONDON SW1P 4QP

City of Birmingham Electoral Review Consultation 2015

Please find attached a copy of my response to the LGBCE Consultation on the Draft Recommendations, which takes place between 15 December 2015 and 8 February 2016. As stated previously, the future of Birmingham is of great importance to the West Midlands Region as a whole, with the creation of a new West Midlands Combined Authority and an elected Mayor.

In the case of Birmingham, the intention was to create new wards for 100 city councillors, in all-out elections starting in 2018. Unfortunately, the LGBCE is proposing 101 councillors, which makes it difficult to allocate wards equally to Birmingham’s 10 constituencies. I believe that a satisfactory result with 100 would have been possible, had the forthcoming Constituency Review been borne in mind. I can only surmise that the councillors will meet in Room 101.

While it is accepted that the LGBCE has no power to change constituency boundaries, my original submission considered ways in which its proposed wards would have contributed to the electoral equality of Birmingham’s 10 constituencies. It does not seem that this was given due consideration.

I believe that most of the current Recommendations are acceptable and are representative of local communities, but there have been a few anomalies, which I have commented on in my response. I hope changes can be made in areas where it was felt that submissions “appeared to divide communities”.

David Murray

Liberal Democrats Policy Chair of the West Midlands Regional Party
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION for ENGLAND
2015 ELECTORAL REVIEW of BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS
15 DECEMBER 2015 to 8 FEB 2016: 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 It is unfortunate that the Commission has come up with 101 councillors in its Draft Recommendations, in line with the Labour Party’s submission, as against the LGBCE’s initial request for 100 councillors. With 100 councillors, each of Birmingham’s 10 constituencies would have had 10 city councillors each, with similar electorates, and be totally contained within the City. Now, whichever way it is arranged, there will be one odd ward left out of the City. In view of the impending Constituency Review, this seems rather short-sighted.

1.2 The initial information provided electorates for the Birmingham polling districts in 2014, and estimates for the changes in electorate in 2021. In the past it has been a requirement that Reviews used the boundaries of existing parishes, polling districts and wards. This can restrict satisfactory solutions. It is noted that the LGBCE has split 75 polling districts in its Recommendations for Birmingham, and this has given it greater flexibility in meeting its criteria.

1.3 I had commented in my original submission that the existing polling districts had strange and irrational boundaries in many places, not related to existing roads, railways, rivers or canals. I said it would have helped if the Commission were able to redraw these boundaries in a more logical relationship, although the electorates would have to be adjusted to suit. Future predictions are not listed to levels below that of polling district, and splitting requires access to the current electoral registers, and calculation of the percentage changes in electorate which might occur by 2021.

1.4 The electorates of the current polling districts vary between a few hundred and several thousand, making it difficult to even up the electorates to create single-member wards. With the opportunity provided by the LGBCE to split polling districts, it is now possible to create more single-member wards from the two-member wards, particularly where the combination represents different communities, and where the name given does not include both.

1.5 This submission is proposing 67 single-member wards, and 17 two-member wards, giving a total of 84 wards altogether.
LGBCB BIRMINGHAM ELECTORAL REVIEW

2. Comment on the Draft Recommendations for LGBPCE Wards:

2.1 Comments on Recommendations for the Edgbaston constituency: Bartley Green, Quinton, Harborne, and Edgbaston.
These are all 2-member wards representing distinct communities, so it is not considered necessary to try to split them into single-member wards. The LGBPCE created a new boundary between Quinton & Harborne, following the postcode boundary NE of Balden Road. This boundary should be continued NE of Queen's Park Road, keeping all of the B32 area in Quinton. This small correction will even up the electorates between the two, and remove a 'kink' in the proposed boundary. Edgbaston should retain the CHE polling district, to keep the cricket ground and the area west of the River Rea in Edgbaston, but leave CHK with Balsall Heath, leaving Edgbaston with 16,842 electors.

2.2 Comments on Recommendations for the Erdington constituency: Kingstanding, Perry Common, Short Heath, Stockland Green, Erdington, Pype Hayes, Tyburn, and Castle Vale:
The main concern here is with Stockland Green. The NE boundary should continue along Station Road, and not include Erdington Abbey & Station. The SW boundary should include more of DGA from Perry Common (perhaps from just south of Kenneth Grove and Welbeck Grove) and then continue SE of the Witton boating lakes to meet the boundary between it and Short Heath. This would straighten the boundary, increase the electorate of Stockland Green from its near minimum, and retain more of its existing community. The boundary between Pype Hayes and Erdington is not clear and identifiable. It could be improved by using Holly Lane as the boundary northwards, round or across the playing field north of Woodacre Road, including Beeches and Chestnut Drives in Pype Hayes and joining the A452 at Grange Road. This would also even up the electorates between these two wards.

2.3 Comments on Recommendations for the Hall Green constituency: Hall Green, Moseley & King's Heath, Sparkbrook, and Springfield:
This was one of the areas where the LGBPCE claimed that the proposals it had received "appeared to divide communities". In proposing its own warding arrangements, the LGBPCE does not appear to have resolved this issue. The view of the Moseley submission at the first stage has now been reinforced by a community meeting in Moseley at which around 500 people attended, and were unanimous in support of a better solution (or to abandon the Review altogether!) Since that meeting, a working group has produced a definitive solution for Moseley. For a start, they reject the proposal for a Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill ward, which included a large part of Moseley, and a 1-member Moseley ward which excluded ‘The Village’ itself. 3 of the 4 submissions for the whole of Birmingham proposed a 2-member Moseley ward (although with different boundaries). So a possible solution is suggested overleaf, with the existing Sparkbrook becoming a 2-member Balsall Heath & Sparkbrook ward.
### LGBCE 2015: Draft

#### Recommendations

Alternative SE wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sparkbrook</td>
<td>16,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandwood</td>
<td>8,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sparkbrook (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHK</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>2,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDB</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDC</td>
<td>2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDF</td>
<td>2,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>2,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDH</td>
<td>2,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDJ</td>
<td>3,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,818</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sparkhill (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DDD (part)</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDE</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDI</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>3,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEB (part)</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>1,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DED</td>
<td>1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>1,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEE (part)</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA (part)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,272</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Springfield (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEB (part)</td>
<td>1,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF (part)</td>
<td>4,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI (part)</td>
<td>1,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,636</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moseley (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG (part)</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSH</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSJ</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSK</td>
<td>3,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDD (part)</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF (part)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEG (part)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEH</td>
<td>1,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI (part)</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,601</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**King’s Heath (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDA (part)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA (part)</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>2,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG (part)</td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hall Green North (1)**

(LGBCE’s Tyseley)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAA (part)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJA</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJB</td>
<td>1,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEE (part)</td>
<td>4,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,337</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Billesley (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>+507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,243</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stirchley (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>- 636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,987</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+586 to King’s Heath

### Notes:

The existing Sparkbrook ward could become Balsall Heath & Sparkbrook with 1,003 CHK electors added from Edgbaston & 1,876 (CHE) returned.

This keeps all Moseley east of the River Rea and keeps the cricket ground in Edgbaston! DEB has been split to give Sparkhill & Springfield identical electorates per councillor, but this is not essential if a better split can be determined.

The 2-member Moseley ward uses the boundary supported by the Forum, other local groups, and the public meeting on 16 January. If it is felt that this adds more to Moseley at the expense of King’s Heath, the SE boundary could be adjusted to follow a line from School Road along Cambridge Road, then south of Coldbath Pool to Swanshurst Lane.

Polling district CSC was not part of Stirchley, and keeping it with Moseley adds 636 more electors, and gives it a clear and identifiable boundary.

LGBCE’s ‘Hall Green N’ would become ‘Hall Green Central’, and ‘Hall Green S’ stays the same.
Hall Green is effectively three single-member wards. The LGBCE has called the northern one Tyseley, even though Tyseley is not in the ward! It would be sensible to give them all Hall Green names, which would keep the residents happy who wanted to keep ‘their’ three councillors. So Tyseley would become Hall Green North, Hall Green North would become Hall Green Central, and Hall Green South would remain the same. Otherwise, no change in areas.

2.4 Comments on Recommendations for the Hodge Hill constituency: Bordesley Green, Hodge Hill, Shard End, and Washwood Heath:
No comment on the 4 new wards of Bordesley & Highgate, Bordesley Green, Heartlands, and Small Heath. The Bromford & Hodge Hill ward should just be Hodge Hill, as Bromford is actually north of the M6, the River Tame, and the railway, is not in the ward at all, whatever the Junior School might be called. The current 3-member ward is all Hodge Hill, and there is logic in one third of it now carrying the name Ward End. The Glebe Farm and Tile Cross is an excessively long, thin 2-member ward, and should be split at its centre into separate Glebe Farm, and Tile Cross wards, to provide effective & convenient local government, along the line suggested by local resident Kathryn Aldis. The remains of the Washwood Heath ward, should become a 2-member ward as proposed by the Labour party, but just called Saltley, and not include the Alum Rock name. Alum Rock is in the north-east of Labour’s Heartlands ward, and it would be inappropriate to have a ward named outside it.

2.5 Comments on Recommendations for the Ladywood constituency: Aston, Ladywood, Nechells, Soho:
Aston should be split into two single-member wards. Polling districts CBG, CBH & CBI should form a Birchfield East ward to complement the LGBCE Birchfield ward, which should be re-named Birchfield West, as Birchfield spans the two. The boundary with Aston could be more identifiable up the Witton Road, losing part of CBH to Aston. The SE boundary of Aston should be as in the Labour party submission, to the end of Park Lane and north up the A5127 Lichfield Road. This would be more logical, and put Aston station in the ward. It would not leave Nechells ward short, losing a few 100 electors. Otherwise the new Holyhead, Ladywood, Newtown and Summerfield seem satisfactory. There is serious concern that the Jewellery Quarter has not been recognised in its own commercial right, although the Labour party submission included its name in its 2-member ward with Winson Green. Although this ward is near the minimum electorate, it would be possible to split it into two almost equal wards by including DBG, part of DBD up Norton Street, and the SE part of DBE, with the Jewellery Quarter polling districts CPE and CPF.

2.6 Comments on Recommendations for the Northfield constituency: King’s Norton, Longbridge, Northfield, Weoley:
No comment on Allens Cross, Frankley, Hawkesley, Northfield West, or West Heath. Rednal & Rubery ward should just be called Rednal, as most of Rubery is outside the ward and the City, although sad to lose the Longbridge name, which it could retain if there is sufficient demand from residents. The
northern boundary of Northfield East should follow Wychall Road up to The Darkies. This would meet up logically with Northfield West, and even up its electorate with King’s Norton. The new Weoley ward contains most of Selly Oak. These are two quite separate communities and could easily be split. Selly Oak would have CYA, CYB, CYJ, DNB, DND, DNI & DNK (8,518) and Weoley would have CCK, most CCF, DNA, DNC, half DNE & DNJ (8,696).

2.7 Comments on Recommendations for the Perry Barr constituency: Handsworth Wood, Lozells & East Handsworth, Oscott, & Perry Barr: The LGBCE has included all the part of Oscott north of the B4149 King’s Road with its Kingstanding ward, and this seems to work well. However the remaining part should be two single-member wards. The southern part with polling districts CVE, CVG, part CVH & part CVF should be called Perry Beeches, and the northern part Old Oscott (to differentiate it from New Oscott further north in Sutton Parkside). Because 302 electors from CVH have been taken into Kingstanding, the southern ward would need part of CVF along Goodway Road & the southern part of Birdbrook Road to bring its electorate in range, and similar to Old Oscott. The LGBCE Perry Beeches should be re-named Perry Park, and it and its neighbour Perry Hall are both satisfactory. So are the three wards of Holyhead, Handsworth and Lozells, but Birchfield should be re-named Birchfield West to match the proposed Birchfield East created from the 2-member Aston ward. (see 2.5) That would leave Handsworth Wood as the only 2-member ward in the area, and this could be two single-member wards of Handsworth Wood (CKE, part of CKD, CKG, CKI, CKJ & CRA) and Hamstead Hall (CKA, CKB, CKC, part of CKD & CKF). 300 electors from CKD would even up the electorates to 15,755 (See map)

2.8 Comments on Recommendations for the “Selly Oak” constituency: Billesley, Bournville, Brandwood, Selly Oak: If the DEH polling district becomes part of a 2-member Moseley ward, then Billesley will need the part of DEG south of Swanshurst Lane and not just the ‘Vimy triangle’. In exchange, the small triangular area of CDA north of Wheeler’s Lane (the rest of which forms the northern boundary of Billesley) can be added to King’s Heath with additional electors from Brandwood’s CGA, which it will need too. Otherwise the LGBCE’s proposals for Brandwood, Monyhull, and Highter’s Heath seem satisfactory. The Bournville & Cotteridge communities should be split into separate wards along Hole Lane, Heath Road & Mary Vale Road, which will give them similar electorates. Stirchley ward does not need the CSC polling district from Moseley (but Moseley does) so using Dad’s Lane as the northern boundary reduces Stirchley’s electorate to a respectable 7,987. The western part of Selly Oak has been addressed in 2.6, leaving the rest as a 2-member Bournbrook & Selly Park Ward. These two are quite different communities. Bournbrook has a large number of small Victorian terraced houses occupied mainly by students. Selly Park has larger family homes. A suitable boundary would be down Bournbrook & Raddlebarn Roads, and would ensure good governance for the different demographics represented.
2.9 Comments on Recommendations for the Yardley constituency: Acocks Green, Sheldon, Stechford & Yardley N, South Yardley:
The NW boundary of Acocks Green is not very logical as it is, and would be better if it followed its original boundary along the Warwick Road to the main railway line, leaving out the Birmingham Railway Museum and its sidings. Otherwise the residents opted for a 2-member ward, compared to Acocks Green and Fox Hollies single-member wards in my original submission. The Conservative party had proposed two-member Stechford and Yardley wards, but the LGBCSE split them both into single-member wards as East & West. The northern boundary of Yardley West should logically follow the line of Hob Moor Road, as does the adjoining boundary of Yardley East, rather than snaking up and down along its length. Under the circumstances, it does seem odd to leave Sheldon as a 2-member ward, when it divides almost exactly along polling district boundaries into two almost equal wards. In my initial submission I called one Lyndon Green ward, and the other Sheldon ward, but they could be called Sheldon East and West, as with the other four wards.

2.10 Comments on Recommendations for Sutton Coldfield constituency: Sutton Four Oaks, Sutton New Hall, Sutton Trinity and Sutton Vesey:
The LGBCSE has produced eight single-member wards: Boldmere, Four Oaks, Maney, Mere Green, Parkside, Reddicap, Roughley, and Wylde Green. One two-member ward, Walsley & Minworth would have been difficult to split, due to it having to elect 5 town councillors to its newly formed Town Council. Five wards will elect 2, three will elect 3 towards the total of 24 members. Sutton Four Oaks is the only ward keeping its original name. It seems a pity to lose the Vesey name to Boldmere, due to Bishop Vesey’s historical connections to the area, and the preferred name for Parkside was Banners Gate. Also the ‘Town Centre’ name chosen by the Town Centre Referendum Group has become ‘Maney’ which doesn’t give any indication of its location at the centre. Otherwise, no comment, other than any that the residents may contribute.

3 Conclusion:
It is to be hoped that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCSE) will receive many contributions from Birmingham residents, in response to the Draft Recommendations, setting out their views as to how the revision of ward boundaries should take place in their local area, and the appropriateness of the given names. It is not possible in a submission for the whole of Birmingham to have extensive knowledge of the day-to-day activities, relationships, and organisations, which local residents can supply. Some of this detail may support the proposals in this submission, but there may be some better alternatives in certain areas, where local knowledge can justify a change, provided that it does not impact unfairly on adjacent areas.

David Murray, Lib Dems Policy Chair, West Midlands Regional Executive
Map showing the southern wards and how they'd be able to fit with the proposed Moseley boundary in the South West

The green line is the Moseley boundary and the blue lines showing how Kings Heath and Brandwood could maintain their numbers.
Glebe Farm & Tile Cross is a long narrow ward, combining a mix of communities north of the Birmingham Loop railway. It can be split as shown into two single-member wards, along the boundary proposed by local resident Kathryn Alvis.
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The northern boundary of Northfield East should be along Wychall Road, to join up with Northfield West at The Darkies. Northfield East has 7,725 electors, and King’s Norton has 8,150 electors so this logical transfer should not be a problem.
The Bournville & Cotteridge communities should be split into separate wards along Heath Road and Mary Vale Road.
The Northern boundary of Yardley East has been rationalised along Hob Moor Road, above the Recreation Ground. This would be the preferred solution for Yardley West to create a clear and identifiable boundary along Hob Moor Road.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: James Murray
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

You have only just recently moved this boundary into Harborne and new housing estates have been sold as such. Any change in their ward would mean a decrease in house pricing and you would yet again cause a generation of young people using the Help to Buy scheme into a negative equity situation. How you can allow that I simply do not know. The wards are perfectly represented at this moment in time and I see no reason to move these boundaries again. Your map is also severely out of date suggesting you actually are unaware of the effect you are having.

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:-

What's the next step?
Changing postcodes??

Leave Erdington and its areas alone!!

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone number: [Redacted]
Dear Sir,
I was horrified to hear about the proposed changes your commission has suggested for the boundary of Moseley ward, Birmingham. Should this go ahead it will rip out the heart of this vibrant community. “Moseley village” should stay within the Moseley boundary. I support the recommendations made by the following community groups:
Moseley Forum
The Moseley Society
The Moseley ReGen Group
The Moseley Community Development Trust
Moseley Businesses The Moseley Society

yours sincerely

Tricia Murray
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Christopher Murtagh
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I would like to object to the proposed changes to the Moseley ward. I appreciate the need to split Moseley away from Kings Heath and believe that to be a good idea however. I share what seems to be the unanimous opinion of the people who live in Moseley that proposed plans would be disastrous for Moseley Village. I am baffled by the reasoning for excluding Moseley High Street from the ward of Moseley, if Moseley's size had to be reduced to fit some kind of quota of councillors, surely the heart of Moseley would be the core that is kept, not that I think it should be reduced for some administrative reason. Surely the councillors and administration of an area should be made to fit the existing area and community and not vice versa. I don't own a property in Moseley, I rent however I am sure that some of the people who own properties on Chandry road or Salisbury road, roads with some of the highest house prices in Birmingham, will see a loss in their property value as it becomes part of the Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. I am currently setting up a business called Moseley Beer Company LTD. When we were deciding on what to name the company we thought a lot about what we would like to express in our name. We chose Moseley as it already has a lot of meaning for people, when people think of Moseley, they think of creativity, individuality, consciousness of the environment, as well as history. Moseley is apart from most of Birmingham in being a suburb that thinks it is a Victorian village. It is a place where people try to support independent businesses and protest against Tescos developments, and other property developers. It's a place where people care to plant trees and maintain fantastic floral displays. It is a place with two conservation areas. Due to all these things Moseley was recently voted the best place in the uk for city living. Moseley is place that means something to a lot of people, which is why so many of the businesses in the area have chose to use Moseley in their name. Moseley golf course, Moseley Exchange and Moseley Ashfield Cricket Ground are all businesses and organisations that would no longer be in Moseley if your proposed plans go through. Not to mention other attractions such as Moseley Park and Pool and Moseley Bog. Moseley folk festival and The Mostly Jazz festival are held annually in Moseley Park and Pool generating a lot of extra trade for the bars and restaurants of the area. It is unfair and damaging to the business of these places to no longer be in the ward of Moseley, also it just doesn't make any sense, it is as if someone was to suddenly say the Eiffel Tower is no longer in Paris. I would very much like an explanation as to why these new ward boundaries were drawn up. I could only think that whoever did this, knew nothing of the area, and of the type of people who live in Moseley. There is a great deal of community spirit in Moseley, it is one of it's greatest attractions. I think it could be very damaging to the many local organisations that have sprung up in Moseley, I don't think any other area of Birmingham has so many clubs and societies, conservation organisations and various groups looking after it's well being, and providing a good reason for people to meet. The work of these organisations would be impacted when organizing events across so many wards. I believe the ward changes could be damaging economically to the people of Moseley as well as damaging the the community spirit of the area. Why butcher Moseley to create these new wards? I have never met anyone who identified as being from Cannon Hill, so why create it if there is no need? I very much hope that you listen to the concerns of the people of Moseley and redraw your plans. I have attached a map of what is traditionally viewed as Moseley.