We are now consulting local people on a new pattern of council wards for Birmingham. The Commission has an open mind about its final recommendations and will consider every piece of evidence we receive from local groups and people. Every representation will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole city or just a part of it.

If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for the whole city or just a part of it. Every representation will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole city or just a part of it.

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Birmingham which delivers:

- **Electoral equality:** each councillor represents a similar number of voters.
- **Community identity:** reflects the identity and interests of local communities.
- **Effective and convenient local government:** helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

### A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters.
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links.
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries.
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.

### Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the city?

### Community identity:

- **Transport links:** are there good links across your proposed ward? Is there any form of public transport?
- **Community groups:** is there a parish council, residents association or another group that represents the area?
- **Facilities:** does your pattern of wards reflect where local people go for shops, medical services, leisure facilities etc?
- **Interests:** what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- **Identifiable boundaries:** are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

### Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?

### Useful tips:

- Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk.
- We publish all submissions we receive on our website so you can follow what other people and organisations have told us. Go to: www.lgbce.org.uk

---

**Helping you to have your say:**

We are now consulting local people on a new pattern of council wards for Birmingham. The Commission has an open mind about its final recommendations and will consider every piece of evidence we receive from local groups and people. Every representation will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole city or just a part of it.

If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for the whole city or just a part of it. Every representation will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole city or just a part of it.

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Birmingham which delivers:

- **Electoral equality:** each councillor represents a similar number of voters.
- **Community identity:** reflects the identity and interests of local communities.
- **Effective and convenient local government:** helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

**A good pattern of wards should:**

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters.
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links.
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries.
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.

**Electoral equality:**

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the city?
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### Further draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Birmingham City Council

**Summary report**

Read the full report, view detailed maps and have your say at: [www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

Find out more at: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

Follow us on Twitter at: @LGBCE

---

**Who we are**

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

**Electoral review**

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority’s electoral arrangements are:

- The total number of councillors representing the council’s voters (‘council size’).
- The names, number and boundaries of wards or electoral divisions.
- The number of councillors representing each ward or ward.

**Why Birmingham?**

The Commission decided to conduct its electoral review following publication of Lord Kerslake’s report on the governance and organisational capabilities of Birmingham City Council. The report recommended that an electoral review should be conducted ‘to help the council produce an effective model of representative governance.’

---

**Our proposals**

Birmingham City Council currently has 120 city councillors. We propose that the council should have 101 councillors in future. The Commission believes that a council size of 101 will ensure the authority can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively and provides for a ward pattern that meets our statutory criteria.

**Electoral arrangements**

Our draft recommendations propose that Birmingham’s 101 councillors should represent 41 single-member wards and 30 two-member wards across the city.

**You have until 20 June 2016 to have your say on the recommendations**

---

**Have your say by writing to:**

- Review Officer (Birmingham)
- LGBCE
- 14th floor, Millbank Tower
- London
- SW1P 4QP

Through our consultation area:

[www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

or by email to: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The full report and interactive maps are available to view at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

Follow us on Twitter: @LGBCE
Our further draft recommendations propose that Birmingham’s 101 councillors should represent 71 electoral wards across the city.

The Commission is holding a public consultation on the proposals because it made substantial changes to the recommendations it published in December 2015.

The changes include:

- Ensuring that whole of Moseley Village is included in a ward to be represented by two councillors. The Commission’s previous proposals has divided the village between wards.
- Creating a Hall Green North ward so that Hall Green railway station and Hall Green School are included in it. Part of the Hall Green community had been included in a Tyseley ward under the previous proposals.
- Ensuring that the historic heart of Acocks Green is wholly contained in an Acocks Green ward rather than divided between wards as previously proposed.
- Including Edgbaston cricket ground in the Edgbaston ward. In addition, the new proposals recognise that the area to the south of Edgbaston reservoir identifies with the Edgbaston community. As such, the Commission has re-named its Summerfield ward as Edgbaston North ward to cover this area.
- Enlarging the proposed Erdington ward to include Erdington Abbey and Erdington railway station and the surrounding communities that consider themselves to be part of Erdington. These communities had previously been included in a Short Heath ward.
- Changes to proposed ward boundaries in Sutton Coldfield to reflect the Whitehouse Common community which had been divided between wards and creating a Sutton Vesey ward as proposed by local people.
- Changing the names of sixteen proposed wards in light of community views. For example, the retention of the Longbridge name in a Longbridge & Rubery Rednal ward, re-naming Stechford East ward as Yardley East and changing the proposed Winson Green ward to Soho & Jewellery Quarter ward.

An outline of the proposals is shown in the map to the right of this box. A detailed report on the recommendations and interactive mapping is available on our website at: www.lgbce.org.uk.

The Commission welcomes comments on these further draft recommendations whether you support the proposals or if wish to put forward alternative arrangements.

Overview of further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

View this map online and draw your own boundaries: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Follow the review on Twitter: @LGBCE

If you are viewing this page online, click on the map to go straight to our interactive consultation area

Map key:

1. Acocks Green
2. Allens Cross
3. Alum Rock
4. Aston
5. Balsall Heath
6. Bartley Green
7. Billesley
8. Birchfield
9. Bordesley & Highgate
10. Bordesley Green
11. Bournbrook & Selly Park
12. Bournville & Cotteridge
13. Bromford & Hodge Hill
14. Castle Vale
15. Edgbaston
16. Erdington
17. Frankley Great Park
18. Garets Green
19. Gibe Farm & Tile Cross
20. Hall Green South
21. Hall Green North
22. Handsworth
23. Handsworth Wood
24. Harborne
25. Heartlands
26. Highton’s Heath
27. Holyhead
28. King’s Heath
29. King’s Norton North
30. King’s Norton South
31. Kingstanding
32. Ladywood
33. Longbridge & Rubery Rednal
34. Lozells
35. Morynhull
36. Moseley
37. Nechells
38. Newtown
39. North Edgbaston
40. Northfield
41. Oscott
42. Perry Beeches
43. Perry Common
44. Perry Hall
45. Pye Hayes
46. Quinton
47. Shard End
48. Sheldon
49. Small Heath
50. Soho & Jewellery Quarter
51. South Yardley
52. Sparkbrook
53. Sparkhill
54. Stirchley
55. Stockland Green
56. Sutton Four Oaks
57. Sutton Mere Green
58. Sutton Reddicap
59. Sutton Roughley
60. Sutton Trinity
61. Sutton Vesey
62. Sutton Walmley & Minworth
63. Sutton Wylde Green
64. Tyburn
65. Tyseley & Hay Mills
66. Ward End
67. Weoley & Selly Oak
68. West Heath North
69. West Heath South
70. Yardley East
71. Yardley West & Stechford
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Have your say at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk:
- view the map of our recommendations down to street level.
- draw your own boundaries online.
- zoom into the areas that interest you most.
- find more guidance on how to have your say.
- read the full report of our recommendations.
- send us your views directly.