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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ann Clarke
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Acocks Green Conservative Association (part of Yardley Constituency Conservative Association)

Comment text:

The Acocks Green Conservative Association (part of Yardley Constituency Conservative Association) wish to support the Boundary Commission’s revised proposals for the new Acocks Green Ward especially the northern boundary being returned to the Grand Union Canal and the Ward being based as far as possible on the B27 postcode.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ann Clarke
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum

Comment text:

At the Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum public meeting held on 17th May, 2016, members confirmed that they were entirely happy with and supported the new proposals made by the Boundary Commission for the new Acocks Green Ward, especially to extend the northern boundary to the Grand Union Canal. Therefore, incorporating the whole of Acocks Green once again into one Ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mohammed Sajad
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Following up on my previous submission, I would like to give my opinion on the boundary commission's suggestions. Our provision caters to young people and families across the Alum Rock area and the most up to date recommendations from the boundary commission does not divide the ward in a way to split communities and people. We previously submitted notes to explain the reasons why Alum Rock should be one ward, combining both the proposed 'Alum Rock' and 'Saltley' wards (which is where our provision would have fallen into), and it is good to see that the submissions were not done in vain as the views of residents and local service users were listened to. I would like to use this opportunity to reiterate how vital it is for Alum Rock not to be split up and the current proposal is how the boundary should be decided. Thank you.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: John Parkinson
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Anderton Park Residents' Group

Comment text:

Please find attached the submission from Anderton Park Residents' Group in response to the LGBCE revised draft proposal for Birmingham ward arrangements relating to Moseley ward. Please note that the attached submission is the latest version and should replace the one sent to you on 9th June.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
LGBCE
14th Floor Millbank Tower
21-24 Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

17 June 2016

Please note: This is the latest version of the Anderton Park Residents' Group submission and should replace the one sent in on June 9th

Dear Sirs

Re: LGBCE further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council ward boundaries – Moseley Ward

I write further to The Anderton Park Residents’ Group’s submission responding to the LGBCE draft recommendations for ward boundaries dated 30.01.16, a copy of which is attached as Appendix 1. That submission was also incorporated at Appendix 14 of the “Response to the Boundary Commission’s Proposed Changes to the Wards of Birmingham by the Combined Community Groups of Moseley” dated February 2016.

Appendix 1 should be read as part of this submission responding to the LGBCE further draft recommendations as our reasons for being included in Moseley ward have not changed and are detailed in Appendix 1. The Anderton Park Residents’ Group wish to fully endorse both our initial response and that of the above Combined Community Groups of Moseley. As you will note from the latter (paragraph 2, page 6 refers), the Combined Community Groups of Moseley also endorse our inclusion into the new Moseley Ward.

In regard to your amended further draft proposal which would include Balsall Heath Park as part of Moseley ward, we fully agree with the Combined Community Groups of Moseley and Balsall Heath Forum that the park should remain with Balsall Heath and should not be included within the eventual Moseley Ward boundary.

In our submission of 30.01.16, our primary concern as expressed was that ‘our triangle’ should be included within the new Moseley Ward. ‘Our triangle’ specifically includes:-

- The North side of Woodstock Road from Yardley Wood Road to Anderton Park Road
- The South side of Yardley Wood Road from Anderton Park Road to Woodstock Road
- Both sides of Anderton Park Road from Yardley Wood Road to Woodstock Road
- All of Cadbury Road

However, in view of the issue of which ward Balsall Heath Park should be in, we are concerned
that the new Moseley Ward boundary should be redrawn in such a way as to fully reflect the boundary map proposed by the Combined Community Groups of Moseley, namely that both Birchwood Crescent (both sides) from Anderton Park Road up to, but not including Birchwood Road, and also Dennis Road (both sides) from Anderton Park Road up to, but not including Anderton Park Schools, be included in the new Moseley Ward.

In order to canvass the opinions of residents of the above specific parts of Birchwood Crescent and Dennis Road, a door to door survey was conducted in early June 2016.

The results of that survey were as follows:-

Dennis Road

Of the families/individual residents in the 18 properties, of those who replied (14), 93% (13) expressed a desire to be included in the new Moseley Ward. Their reasons given were very similar to our own, namely local affiliation to Moseley and effective disenfranchisement otherwise.

Birchwood Crescent

Of the families/individual residents in the 38 properties, of those who replied (21), 95% (20) expressed a desire to be included in the new Moseley Ward. Their reasons given were very similar to our own, namely local affiliation to Moseley and effective disenfranchisement otherwise.

Voter numbers

In regard to voter numbers in our area, i.e. Polling District DDD, we are very concerned that Balsall Heath Park is geographically included in DDD as are Dennis Road, Birchwood Crescent and ‘our triangle’. We understand from communication with the LGBCE Review Officer for Birmingham, Mr Mark Cooper, that Polling District voter numbers are used as the first ‘building block’ when drawing ward boundaries. However we also understand that the LGBCE can cut across polling districts based upon the strength of the evidence submitted by residents. We trust that you will appreciate the strength of feeling of residents expressed in this submission.

For the sake of convenience, I include below current voter numbers obtained from the Birmingham Electoral Office for the relevant roads in our area of concern:-

As can be seen from the above, in order to accommodate the inclusion of the above roads within the new Moseley Ward, this would require the transfer of 543 of voters from the current DDD Polling District. This would reduce the voter numbers in DDD from 1,454 to 911.

Boundary Maps

For the sake of convenience and further clarity, I attach Appendix 2, a map showing our endorsement of the Combined Community Groups of Moseley redrawn map of the Northern section of the Proposed Moseley Ward with our recommended boundary line shown in solid green line.

We trust that you will fully take into account the above when deciding upon the final Moseley Ward Boundary after the June 20 deadline. We should also like to draw your attention to the fact that our proposed boundary follows the original boundary of Birmingham up to year 1911.

Yours faithfully
John Parkinson – Chair Anderton Park Residents’ Group

**Appended:**

**Appendix 1** Ward Boundaries Consultation - Response from Anderton Park Residents’ Group (sent and received 30.01.16)

**Appendix 2** Map showing the Northern section of the Proposed Moseley Ward with our recommended boundary line shown in solid green line and the Anderton Park Residents’ Group area outlined in pink.
APPENDIX 1

Ward Boundaries Consultation - Response from Anderton Park Residents’ Group.

We wish to make our views known to the LGBCE in regard to our specific area – currently part of Sparkbrook Ward.

The Anderton Park Residents’ Group comprises residents from a triangular area bounded by Anderton Park Road, Woodstock Road and Yardley Wood Road and this is the area in question (which we will refer to as ‘our triangle’ in this document).

We acknowledge that whilst ‘our triangle’ is included in both the proposal for the new Moseley Ward proposed by LGBCE and in that of the Moseley Community Groups – and we fully endorse those inclusions – we are concerned that at the last Ward Boundaries Consultation held over the period 2001/03, we were assigned to Sparkbrook Ward instead of the new Moseley and Kings Heath Ward.

This was despite a petition by 105 residents in ‘our triangle’ requesting that we should be included in the latter. I attach a copy of the covering letter accompanying that petition. As you will see, the reasons for our request were clearly set out.

Although that petition (copies of which were sent to the Electoral Commission as indicated) was sent past the deadline for consultation and therefore rejected, recent meetings with residents in ‘our triangle’ confirm that the same concerns remain current. In 2001, our area had originally been included in the boundary revision endorsed by Moseley Form, but due to a lack of direct lines of communication, we were not kept informed of subsequent developments either from Sparkbrook or Moseley forum (as the attached letter outlines) This illustrates the fact that we have effectively been left disenfranchised and without appropriate representation.

Our issues and concerns are more likely to be addressed by Moseley Ward Councillors than those in Sparkbrook.

This is because the issues that are of high priority for Sparkbrook do not generally apply to us (having seen the minutes from the Sparkbrook forum over the last 13 years).

In summary:-

- Geographically, we live in Moseley. Our postcode and telephone number code
are for Moseley (B13 and 449 respectively)

- We affiliate far more with Moseley than with Sparkbrook.
- We don’t tend to use the facilities in Sparkbrook.
- We use Moseley for socialising, worship, shopping, cultural activities and also many of our children are educated there.
- We actively participate in all that Moseley has to offer and are enthusiastic supporters of the farmers market and Moseley in Bloom, and various artistic and musical events.

We therefore request that this time around residents/voters in ‘our triangle’ be included in the new Moseley Ward.

Specifically, ‘our triangle’ (Anderton Park Residents’ Group) comprises the following roads:-

- The North side of Woodstock Road from Yardley Wood Road to Anderton Park Road
- The South side of Yardley Wood Road from Anderton Park Road to Woodstock Road
- Both sides of Anderton Park Road from Yardley Wood Road to Woodstock Road
- All of Cadbury Road

Please see the attached map with the boundaries of ‘our triangle’ delineated and shaded green – this is now shown in Appendix 2 outlined in pink

John Parkinson - Chair Anderton Park Residents’ Group

Appended:

Copy of petition to Electoral Commission 2003
Letter from Mr Ahmad, Chief Legal Officer Birmingham City Council dated 12/11/03
APPENDIX 2

Map showing the Northern section of the Proposed Moseley Ward with our recommended boundary line shown in solid green line and the Anderton Park Residents’ Group area outlined in pink.

Boundary now proposed by Anderton Park Residents’ Group together with Moseley Communities and Balsall Heath Forum

Proposed Moseley Ward boundary –

Anderton Park Residents’ Group area -
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Joe Holyoak
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Balsall Heath Forum

Comment text:

I write as the coordinator of the Balsall Heath Neighbourhood Plan, for Balsall Heath Forum, adopted in December 2015, the first in Birmingham. The current boundary proposal is very unsatisfactory for Balsall Heath and its neighbourhood plan, as it gets divided into two halves, one in Balsall Heath Ward and one in Sparkbrook Ward. This will inevitably make it more difficult to implement the neighbourhood plan. The Government wants neighbourhood plans to play a major part in the local planning in England. We support this idea. But if this is to be, then local government boundaries must reflect the existence of neighbourhood plans. Please enlarge the Balsall Heath Ward so that it reflects the boundary of the neighbourhood plan, and reduce the size of Sparkbrook Ward accordingly.
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Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in my capacity as Chair of Balsall Heath Is our Planet, a charity founded 2009 to work with everyone who lives or works in Balsall Heath in bringing about environmental improvements to the neighbourhood.

Unfortunately we cannot accept that the Boundary Commission’s recommendation of May 2016 to divide our neighbourhood in two up Moseley Road A435, and put Balsall Heath Park into Moseley ward, would reflect natural community boundaries, or facilitate public administration.

BHIOP’s steering committee has representatives from St Paul’s Community Development Trust and Balsall Heath Forum who have been the primary actors in the regeneration of Balsall Heath, but who are located west of Moseley Road, in what you propose as a new Sparkbrook Ward. The Sparkbrook Ward that you have proposed is too large, in our view, and would take in parts of other neighbourhoods, including a great piece of Balsall Heath, creating unnecessary difficulties and divisions in future.

Co-operation between the organisations that make up our neighbourhood, across ethnic and religious lines, has been built up with a huge amount of work and commitment, culminating in the ground-breaking Balsall Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Having the entire neighbourhood within a single ward has been very helpful in building relationships with councillors who have responsibility for the whole of Balsall Heath.

Our steering group is therefore unanimously of the view that the small Balsall Heath Ward of 8,000 electors confined to the east of Moseley Road, as proposed in your draft recommendations should be expanded to embrace the whole neighbourhood, as it has always been defined.

Yours faithfully

Richard Beard
Chair
Balsall Heath is our Planet
`19.06.16 Dear Sir/Madam I am writing on behalf of Balsall Heath Local History Society which
has been active in this community since 1979. We have, over the years, done extensive work to support and contribute to the remarkable
regeneration of this deprived neighbourhood. Balsall Heath is a coherent and cohesive community, based on the parish created by the
division of Kings Norton parish in 1862. From that time until 1891 the parish was governed by a Local Board of Health. Then in 1891
Balsall Heath was annexed by the City of Birmingham. This may read like the story of many other Birmingham suburbs. However, Balsall
Heath is very different. It is an area with a richly diverse population as well as many disadvantages: high unemployment, poverty, poor
educational attainment, dreadful health statistics, overcrowding, a largely ageing housing stock. In spite of all this, Balsall Heath is an
exuberant and flourishing neighbourhood, full of local pride, with a strong sense of its own history and identity. Our Society mounts
frequent exhibitions, displays and talks which draw together the whole community in celebrating achievements by all in the community,
both past and present. They are always very well attended. Community cohesion here is a strong and vibrant force for driving forward the
Neighbourhood Plan, which won massive support in the referendum last year. Our Society is committed to working in partnership with
other third sector organisations, residents’ groups and faith organisations to ensure this plan comes to fruition. We are appalled at the
Boundary Commission’s proposal to impose a recommendation which would cut our community in half. Surely this makes a mockery of the
whole Neighbourhood Plan process? The boundaries proposed have no historical basis and are completely at odds with the expressed wish of
local residents. Yours faithfully, Valerie M. Hart. Treasurer of Balsall Heath Local History Society original document attached
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Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing on behalf of Balsall Heath Local History Society which has been active in this community since 1979. We have, over the years, done extensive work to support and contribute to the remarkable regeneration of this deprived neighbourhood.

Balsall Heath is a coherent and cohesive community, based on the parish created by the division of Kings Norton parish in 1862. From that time until 1891 the parish was governed by a Local Board of Health. Then in 1891 Balsall Heath was annexed by the City of Birmingham. This may read like the story of many other Birmingham suburbs. However, Balsall Heath is very different.

It is an area with a richly diverse population as well as many disadvantages: high unemployment, poverty, poor educational attainment, dreadful health statistics, overcrowding, a largely ageing housing stock.

In spite of all this, Balsall Heath is an exuberant and flourishing neighbourhood, full of local pride, with a strong sense of its own history and identity. Our Society mounts frequent exhibitions, displays and talks which draw together the whole community in celebrating achievements by all in the community, both past and present. They are always very well attended. Community cohesion here is a strong and vibrant force for driving forward the Neighbourhood Plan, which won massive support in the referendum last year. Our Society is committed to working in partnership with other third sector organisations, residents’ groups and faith organisations to ensure this plan comes to fruition.

We are appalled at the Boundary Commission’s proposal to impose a recommendation which would cut our community in half. Surely this makes a mockery of the whole Neighbourhood Plan process? The boundaries proposed have no historical basis and are completely at odds with the expressed wish of local residents.

Yours faithfully,

Valerie M. Hart. Treasurer of Balsall Heath Local history Society
Dear Mark Pascoe,

Following our telephone conversation this morning I attach the Banners Gate Neighbourhood Forum submission.

Kind regards,

Tony Willis (Chair, Banners Gate Neighbourhood Forum)
At 7.30 p.m. on Monday, 23rd May, a scheduled meeting of the Banners Gate Neighbourhood Forum was held at the Banners Gate Community Hall. Present were 42 residents including two city councillors, three of the six new town councillors and one councillor who is a member of the city and the town. Additionally, at the monthly Banners Gate Community Association Coffee Morning on Tuesday, 17th May, 41 residents were informed of the revised proposals. The information was also emailed to the 149 residents on our newsletter mailing list.

From these three groups of residents all the comments received have been very positive with not one negative remark. The fact that the history of the area has been preserved by the retention of the name Vesey was very well received.

At the Neighbourhood Forum meeting the main item on the agenda was Boundary changes. Those present were provided with the maps (attached), one showing the recommended new ward boundary and the other the new ward boundary in the context of the town.

The three main points in the conclusion of our submission, dated 7th February 2016, were read out. Residents were then asked to compare those requests with the maps of the newly revised recommendations, point by point.

First point; we had requested that if Sutton Parkside’s boundary were to stay as per proposed recommendations, it should be known as Sutton Banners Gate, first choice, or Sutton Vesey.

The latest draft recommendation names it Sutton Vesey – very well received.

Second point; that the boundary of Vesey ward embracing Sutton Park should, at least, include the playground, car park, Longmoor Pool and Westwood Coppice so that the new wards would maintain responsibility for their part of the park used by local residents, not forgetting that the residents of the Lodge wished to be in Sutton.

The latest proposal, recommends not only the areas we requested should be included, but, to the delight of those residents who have been made aware of the revised proposal, it also includes other areas that residents use. That change has been much appreciated.

Third point; that Banners Gate and Boldmere should become one ward, Sutton Vesey, with two councillors

The latest proposal includes just that suggestion.

Needless to say, when those present at the Neighbourhood Forum meeting voted to accept the proposal it was passed unanimously. There have also been very positive responses from the 149 residents who were emailed the revised proposal and also from the 41 residents at the Coffee Morning.

All in all, the responses have been very appreciative of the fact that our history and our immediate and extended neighbourhood have been obviously valued and for that we thank you.

We are extremely grateful to the commission for the attention it has paid to our requests and are very pleased that the joining of Banners Gate with Boldmere will retain the ancient ward of Vesey.

Tony Willis (Chairman, Banners Gate Neighbourhood Forum) 

June 6th, 2016

Attached: two maps, one of Sutton Vesey and one of Sutton Coldfield
From: Beverly Edmead
Sent: 26 May 2016 10:05
To: Mayers, Mishka <mishka.mayers@LGBCE.ORG.UK>

Hello,

I am writing to you on behalf of Bartley Green Ward Committee to express their thanks and appreciation for taking the residents’ concerns regarding their ward boundary into account.

Kind regards,

Beverly Edmead
Community Governance Team
Neighbourhood and Communities Division
Room 11, Ground Floor
Council House Extension
Margaret Street
Birmingham B3 3BU

Link to Committee Management Information System (CMIS) - provides access to Council’s Committee meetings from 15 June 2015 onwards: https://birmingham.cmis.uk.com/birmingham
Meetings prior to 15 June 2015 are available on CMIS under the ‘Historical Data’ tab (“Committees pre 15 June 2015”).

From: Mayers, Mishka [mailto:mishka.mayers@LGBCE.ORG.UK]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 4:50 PM
To: Beverly Edmead
Subject: Electoral Review of Birmingham: Further Draft Recommendations
From: David Grainger
Sent: 28 April 2016 20:14
To: reviews; David Grainger
Subject: Re: Electoral Review Birmingham

Would you please forward the attached document to the relevant officers dealing with the Review of Ward Boundaries in Birmingham

David Grainger
Chairman
Beech lanes neighbourhood Forum
Birmingham Ward Boundaries Review

Response by Beech Lanes Neighbourhood Forum to Supplementary comments by Birmingham Conservative Party

These comments are supplementary to comments we made in response to the first public consultation by the Local Government Boundary Commission. Our purpose in submitting this supplementary report is to rebut certain representations made by the Birmingham Conservative Party.

Summary of our previous comments. The Beech Lanes Neighbourhood Forum is a non-party political association of all the residents of the Neighbourhood Forum area which is the area in Quinton Ward bounded by the main roads, Hagley Road West (A456), Lordswood Road (A4040), Court Oak Road (A4123) and Wolverhampton Road South (A4123). The Forum area comprises just under 2,000 dwellings. Following a public meeting which considered the representations that the Neighbourhood Forum should make to the Local Government Boundary Commission, a report was submitted which reflected the unanimous views expressed by those attending. The representation made was that the whole of the Neighbourhood Forum area be transferred from Quinton Ward to a Ward based on Harborne. This was a consequence of the fact that the area is geographically part of the ancient parish of Harborne and Harborne is the area with which the residents feel associated. There is no feeling of being part of Quinton.

Preliminary Recommendations of the Boundary Commission. In their preliminary report, the Local Government Boundary Commission has accepted much of our recommendations except that the boundary has been drawn down a minor road, Balden Road, rather than the major dual carriageway road, Wolverhampton Road South.

Supplementary Comments by Birmingham Conservative Party, with our comments appended.

<p>| Page 14 | Finally the Quinton/Harborne/Edgbaston Communities have been broken up with the addition of large parts of Harborne, areas which has always been in Harborne Ward added to both Edgbaston and Quinton. | It was our intention that we should reconnect the community of the Beech Lanes Neighbourhood Forum with Harborne, its historical place. |
| Page 16 | We propose that these are returned to the Harborne Ward while the Quinborne area which has been added to the Harborne Ward is returned to Quinton Ward where it has always been. | We do not understand what is meant by the Quinborne area. They appear to be referring to the area we know as the Beech Lanes. The term Quinborne is a made up name purely for the Quinborne Community Centre, a single building which is not even in our area. We accept that the Quinborne Community Centre has never been in Harborne and no one has ever suggested that it should be in Harborne. However the major part of the Beech Lanes area was historically part of Harborne |
| Page 16 | We propose one simple swap to secure a ward which actually represents the community of Quinton. The Quinborne area of Quinton which has been put in Harborne should be returned to Quinton | Please see our comments above. There is no plan to move the Quinborne area into Harborne. However we do oppose the suggestion that the Beech Lanes area remain in Quinton Ward. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 28</th>
<th>The Harborne Parish Boundaries show clearly that Lordswood Road is a well known barrier between Harborne and Quinton communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a reference to the boundaries of the Church of England parishes. Yes we agree that Lordswood Road does form the boundary between the parish of St Peter Harborne and the parish of St Faith &amp; St Laurence Harborne. If we followed this argument to its logical conclusion we would also exclude the parish of St John Harborne from Harborne Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 53</th>
<th>It also defines where Hagley Road ends and Hagley Road West begins, the historical point where Harborne Ward ends and Quinton Ward begins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factually incorrect. In our previous representations we showed that the historical boundary between Harborne (historically in Staffordshire) and Quinton (historically has been at different times in Shropshire and Worcestershire before being incorporated into Birmingham). We also showed that the boundary markers between Harborne and Quinton are at or near the western points of the Beech Lanes area at opposite ends of Wolverhampton Road South.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 53</th>
<th>The move to Balden Road is also questionable due to its residential nature. A single carriageway road and residential particular (sic) with its houses close to the road the proposed boundary splits a community between Quinton and Harborne Wards. It is also notable that the road junction at Hagley Road West does not allow for all possible turns with the turn from Hagley Road West (eastbound) onto Balden Road is forbidden at the junction, so eastbound traffic must take an alternative road. With this traffic movement unavailable it means that Balden Road is not a defining road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We agree fully with this statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion.** We ask the Local Government Boundary Commission to look again at our previous report and to disregard the views expressed by Birmingham Conservative Party which in no way represent the views of those residents of Beech Lanes Neighbourhood Forum who have expressed an opinion either in a public meeting or in conversation with members of the Management Committee.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stanley Graham alkins
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Boldmere Neighbourhood Forum

Comment text:

Dear Sirs, On behalf of the Boldmere Neighbourhood Forum, can I thank for addressing our concerns over the original proposals. Your revised proposals are as much as we could have wished for with one exception. The recreational area at the eastern end of Monmouth Drive has historically been linked and greatly used by the residents of the Vesey Ward. It has been supported with actions and finance from the three Neighbourhood Forums that make up the Vesey Ward. We would like to think that you could reconsider and restore it to the Vesey Ward. Yours Sincerely S G Alkins
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None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Karen Osborne

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

Organisation Name: Brandwood Forum

Comment text:

Please include Vicarage Road Triangle in the new Kings Heath/Brandwood Ward (Please see attached pdf of AREA) This small section of Vicarage road is split down the middle between the Bournville Ward and Brandwood Ward even though the 'Welcome to Kings Heath signs' are located before the Hazellwell Church and on Cartland Road after the railway track. Cllr Huxtable (Bournville Ward) has already proposed that the area right of the railway track be included in the new Kings Heath/Brandwood Ward proposal because at the moment it is in Bournville Ward. Why should this triangle should become part of the new Kings Heath Ward? This small section of Vicarage road is split down the middle between the Bournville Ward and Brandwood Ward even though the 'Welcome to Kings Heath signs' are located before the Hazellwell Church and on Cartland Road after the railway track. This triangle is 'cut off' from the Bournville ward by the railway track which seems to be a much more sensible border, seeing as residents who use the shops/church/post office/doctors surgery all live across the other side of the road ie in the Brandwood Ward. Because this small area is split between two wards, it is very difficult to get consensus on street cleaning/road safety and other local issues because the Cllrs/Street Cleaning teams/Amey Street Programme etc are located in the Bournville ward. Once the new Boundaries go ahead, then this area will also become a different Constituency as well and become even more difficult for residents. Karen Osborne Resident Kings Road and Chair of Brandwood Forum The following residents have commented to Brandwood Forum: 1) My name is Mr John Tighe and I am a resident of Vicarage Rd. I fully agree with your proposal to include the shops and Post Office/Priory Rd in the Kings Heath Ward 2) We are at [redacted] We are happy with new changes but would like to see the Vicarage road from kings heath centre to, at least, priory road; become part of kings heath ward. This in order that there is no incongruity in the administration of services to the areas which are clearly integral to kings heath. Mr Phil Alden 3) Lesley Spofforth [redacted] Boundary changes Vicarage Road should be and always has been Kings Heath.
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Please include Vicarage Road Triangle in the new Kings Heath/Brandwood Ward

This small section of Vicarage road is split down the middle between the Bournville Ward and Brandwood Ward even though the ‘Welcome to Kings Heath signs’ are located before the Hazellwell Church and on Cartland Road after the railway track.

Cllr Huxtable (Bournville Ward) has already proposed that the area right of the railway track be included in the new Kings Heath/Brandwood Ward proposal because at the moment it is in Bournville Ward.

Why should this triangle should become part of the new Kings Heath Ward?

This small section of Vicarage road is split down the middle between the Bournville Ward and Brandwood Ward even though the ‘Welcome to Kings Heath signs’ are located before the Hazellwell Church and on Cartland Road after the railway track.

This triangle is ‘cut off’ from the Bournville ward by the railway track which seems to be a much more sensible border, seeing as residents who use the shops/church/post office/doctors surgery all live across the other side of the road ie in the Brandwood Ward.

Because this small area is split between two wards, it is very difficult to get consensus on street cleaning/road safety and other local issues because the Cllrs/Street Cleaning teams/Amey Street Programme etc are located in the Bournville ward.

Once the new Boundaries go ahead, then this area will also become a different Constituency as well and become even more difficult for residents.

Karen Osborne

Resident Kings Road and Chair of Brandwood Forum
The following residents have commented to Brandwood Forum:

1) My name is Mr John Tighe and i am a resident of Vicarage Rd. I fully agree with your proposal to include the shops and Post Office/Priory Rd in the Kings Heath Ward

2) We are at [redacted] We are happy with new changes but would like to see the Vicarage road from kings heath centre to, at least, priory road; become part of kings heath ward. This in order that there is no incongruity in the administration of services to the areas which are clearly integral to kings heath. Mr Phil Alden

3) Lesley Spofforth [redacted]
Boundary changes Vicarage Road should be and always has been Kings Heath.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: S. Ali
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Cannon Hill Neighbourhood Community Watch

Feature Annotations

Annotation 1: Cannon Hill Monument
Annotation 2: Moseley
Annotation 4: Balsall Heath

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Cannon Hill Monument
Annotation 2: Moseley
Annotation 4: Balsall Heath

Comment text:

Our area is called Cannon Hill it is a mixture of areas and traditionally has always been seen as part of Balsall Heath (see our history book). It has always been very clear that the west side of Pershore Road is Edgbaston. The East side is split, North of Edgbaston Road/Brighton Road is Balsall Heath and the Cricket Ground until recently has always used a B12 post-code showing this. South of Edgbaston Road and Brighton Road is Moseley and thus the actu Cannon Hill Park is in Moseley (not Hall Green or Selly Oak but Moseley, although we just say Canon Hill if within a furlong). Please address the border issue here. The railway line always divided Highgate from Sparkbrok not the Ring Road, although given the disuse of the line it is acceptable as a borderer. The Sparkbrook western boundary is StratfordRoad/Stoney Lane. Durham Road (and Golden Hillock Road) has always been the division of Sparkbrok and Sparkhill not the the wiggly line that is all over the place between the roads Additionally Highgate and a substantial part of Sparkbrook i.e. Balsall Heath Park and all of Ladypool Road is in Balsall Heath

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Anne Haigh
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: CP4SO

Comment text:

Please see the attached submission from CP4SO. Basically though - Don’t split Selly Oak into 3 wards with 6 councillors – give the community 1 ward with 1 councillor to ensure we can continue to work with the elected representative to move Selly Oak forward as a community.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
We are writing this response to the proposed ward boundary for Selly Oak in Birmingham on behalf of Community Partnership for Selly Oak (CP4SO). This is an alliance of around 14 community groups who work in partnership on common issues affecting Selly Oak and its neighbours, while each group retains its own local responsibility for its more local issues.

We are extremely disappointed that the latest proposal still divides Selly Oak and does not in any way represent how the community uses the area.

Given that how the community uses their area was meant to be one of the fundamental principles that the Commission used to determine how to redraw boundaries it seems inconceivable that the Commission continues to divide Selly Oak into 3 wards – and especially moving a large portion into Weoley Ward which most people do not use on a daily basis due to natural boundaries e.g. the Cemetery.

Also no consideration has been given to how the ward works at present in addressing issues that all the ward faces – and instead seems deliberately designed to make community working much harder in the future by splitting 1 ward across 3 separate wards.

Clearly the Commission are on the side of someone/some organisation that wants to divide the community so addressing these issues becomes considerably more complex, working with 3 different wards, 3 different councillors and reducing the ability of the Selly Oak residents to work cohesively to improve their locality.

When a representative from CP4SO attended a presentation by LGBCE representatives last year they stressed that how the community used the area was a key principle – and cited an example in London where people never crossed a large dual carriageway. They didn’t believe that community but when they checked it out they realised it was a natural boundary and so used it as a ward boundary.

Clearly the Commission are not taking the same approach here in Selly Oak in Birmingham as they did in London.

We reiterate our objections to the proposals to divide Selly Oak and request our option for a 1 councillor ward for Selly Oak. The picture below illustrates where we propose the commission places the boundaries.
In Summary:
Don’t split Selly Oak into 3 wards with 6 councillors – give the community 1 ward with 1 councillor to ensure we can continue to work with the elected representative to move Selly Oak forward as a community.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Tom Keeley
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Edgbaston Labour Party

Comment text:

Dear Sir/Madam, I note with concern your projected electorate figures for the new Edgbaston Ward. The variance on the 2015 figures is -32% and on the 2021 figures it is -5%. This equates to a prediction that the population of the new Edgbaston Ward will increase by over 5000 (or a 50% increase) in 5 years. I fail to understand what this prediction is based upon. A population increase of 50% in an area of the city would represent a major demographic shift, requiring a huge response from the council. Furthermore, if this is based on the potential of registering the areas considerable student population, this is completely unrealistic under the new IER system that is a huge barrier to participation in the electoral process in this group. The current plans for Edgbaston will result in the smallest ward in the city that is represented by 2 councillors. I strongly urge the LGBCE to reconsider this proposal and increase the population of this ward. The two areas which could easily be included are the Benmore Estate or the Waterworks Estate. Both these areas have considerable connections to Edgbaston (especially the Benmore).

Yours Tom Keeley

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mohammed Ashraf
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Fallows Road Residents Association

Comment text:

As on previous 2 occasions, residents of Fallows Road and surrounding roads support the Sparkbrook boundaries that have been proposed. Regards Mohammed Ashraf Chair, Fallows Road Residents Association

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Pranav Gupta
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

North Edgbaston should not be called this as it incorporates a large amount of Soho, Harborne and Ladywood - it is hardly representative of Edgbaston. People will become confused if you call it North Edgbaston. Therefore, I suggest you use the previous 'Summerfield' name or think of a new name which is not completely linked to Edgbaston. It should be called 'Edgwood or Edgewood' as it is located at the edge of Ladywood but is also close to Edgbaston.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ralf DeCambre
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: Hands On Handsworth Residents' Association

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1:

Annotation 2: Why Split the Park ... It is named Handsworth Park for a reason!!!

Annotation 3: Why not follow the Hamstead Road up to the Island of Wellington Road and Church Lane?

Comment text:

I think that this whole process has not been strongly promoted among the local residents, some of whom I have recently made aware that their property was proposed to be moved into another Ward. My fellow neighbours consider themselves as living in Handsworth NOT Birchfield. Also Why split our park? It is Handsworth Park... not Birchfield Park!!! Please take this into consideration and amend these plans, as you have already done... so I can see it is possible.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Tassadiq Hussain
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Hodge Hill Community Centre

Comment text:

The Hodge Hill Community Centre is supportive of the local government boundary commission proposal for the two member ward; Bromford and Hodge Hill. The Hodge Hill Community Centre was set up to serve the needs of the communities in Bromford and Hodge Hill. This is the only centre of its kind serving the needs of the local faith communities for Bromford and Hodge Hill, providing vital services. We feel that the community centre has brought communities together from all walks of life and brought about social cohesion.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Hodge Hill
Sent: 14 June 2016 13:51
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Fw: WASHWOOD HEATH - BIRMINGHAM

Thank you for involving our Group in the review of the Council Wards in Birmingham.

We have consulted many of the members of public who use our services and they have given there views. Majority are poorly educated and speak little English, have no knowledge of the boundary's or the political set up.

Voting is done on family allegiance and religious grounds, when our team explained that they can have a say, strong indications were given that a Single Councillor's would make it fairer all round and the Younger members indicated that the area is too typical and needs to have a better services as litter, crime etc has not been previously dealt with.

Thanks
M. AZAM

From: Hodge Hill
Sent: 13 June 2016 13:38
To: review@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: WASHWOOD HEATH - BIRMINGHAM

Thank you for involving our Group in the review of the Council Wards in Birmingham.

We have consulted many of the members of public who use our services and they have given there views. Majority are poorly educated and speak little English, have no knowledge of the boundary's or the political set up.

Voting is done on family allegiance and religious grounds, when our team explained that they can have a say, strong indications were given that a Single Councillor's would make it fairer all round and the Younger members indicated that the area is too typical and needs to have a better services as litter, crime etc has not been previously dealt with.

Thanks
M. AZAM
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Imran Hussain
E-mail: [redacted]
postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Fallows residents association

Comment text:

I'm a resident of sparkbrook and I am very happy with the proposal given from the boundary commissioner to sparkbrook ward. Pls keep it this way.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Khalid Hussain
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Jamia't Us-Salam

Comment text:

I am writing to the boundary commission following the proposals which impact my local area and local mosque where I am the Imam. I live in Ward End and the mosque is situated on Alum Rock Road I’m the current Washwood Heath Ward. We have recently also occupied the former health centre/clinic on Treford Lane for religious/worship purposes. This would therefore mean that under the current proposals, the different provisions which I run will fall under different wards when essentially, the community is exactly the same. The worshippers who attend the mosque on Alum Rock Road, come from Treford Lane, Burney Lane, Bankdale Road and also the roads which will come under the new Ward End. This shows how the tight knit community of Ward End is one and should not be separated at all - especially to be joined to an area which doesn't have any link whatsoever with the local area. After prayers this Ramadhan, we had a discussion with some of the worshippers about the changes and it was agreed that Tile Cross & Glebe Farm do not have any link to Ward End at all and that geographically, there is a natural break in between the areas. This does not seem like an appropriate way to split a community and I know that local people will always associate the,selves as being residents of Ward End. The local schools are attended by children on Bankdale Road, Treford Lane and Burney Lane, our mosque is also attended by children who live on those roads. This does not seem like a sensible option and I would like to urge the boundary commission to consider this as a view held by hundreds and hundreds of local people who will agree with myself. Bankdale road, Treford lane, Cotterills lane, Burney lane and Pelham road should all stay in Ward End and not be moved into Tile Cross and Glebe Farm as the communities, services, needs and locations are very different. Please don’t split up this area as we live in a cohesive society and enjoy being an important part of the Ward End community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Tom Tierney
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Kings Heath Residents Forum

Comment text:

I am writing on behalf of Kings Heath Residents Forum. We are pleased generally with the most recent proposal for a two-member Kings Heath Ward and feel the Commission has listened to the previous submissions from ourselves and others. The area identified as the Kings Heath Ward in the latest proposal is certainly much closer to the area which the local community recognises as Kings Heath. There is one key issue we wish to bring to your intention. We feel one part of the proposed ward boundary needs a serious rethink. On the west side of the proposed Kings Heath ward we would suggest the boundary with Stirchley ward should be the railway line rather than the intersection of Cartland Rd and Vicarage Rd (B4122). Here, there is a small triangular area which includes some shops, Priory Rd and Bloomsbury Grove which we feel belong in Kings Heath Ward. The current street sign for Kings Heath includes this area and we would suggest that it will be confusing to ignore a historic marker which people locally have recognised for a long time. If the street sign remains there will undoubtedly be confusion. If it is moved at a later date this will incur a significant expense for Birmingham City Council which is very short of resources and needs to prioritise essential services. We understand that the shopkeepers and people resident within that area tend to identify that area as part of Kings Heath. There are a few additional comments which we would also add. Firstly, you will recall that our previous submission included the suggestion that Highbury Park should be part of Kings Heath as one of the entrances opens onto Kings Heath High St. We support the decision to include the whole park and associated buildings within one ward but still see an argument for this to be within Kings Heath ward. However, we feel that there are good relationships with Moseley Forum and would assume that either ward would be able to establish a working partnership around issues related to Highbury Park. Secondly, we agree with the decision to name the area Kings Heath Ward as Kings Heath is the name used most widely in the community for this larger area. Finally, a number of people have welcomed the reinstatement of the apostrophe in King’s Heath. There is no clear consensus within the Residents Forum Management Committee about this. We look forward to your final proposals in due course. Tom Tierney On behalf of Kings Heath Residents Forum

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Asghar Ali
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: Larches Park Resident Group

Comment text:

Please find letter of support attached for Sparkbrook ward Asghar Ali

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Larches Park Resident Group in SUPPORT of Sparkbrook boundaries.
Dear Boundary Commission

Larches Park Resident Group has been setup from 2010, representing the local community. Our activities range from fun days in the park, Easter egg hunts, community cleanups, community outings and much more.

Following a consultation with local residents of our area, residents identify themselves as 'residents of Sparkbrook', so support the proposals put forward by boundary commission.

Best regards

Asghar Ali
Chairperson
Larches Park Resident Group


https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g0AyFU_Mz_c

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

Dear LGBCE,

We write on behalf of residents on the Abbey Fields Estate, formerly called the Lyndhurst estate. We are the neighbourhood forum that covers this area and work widely with other local groups in the area.

We would first like to thank the Commission for including the Abbey Church area in the proposed Erdington Ward and for making it a two member ward. We very much support these changes and welcome the commission listening on these points. Particularly given the estate takes its name from the Abbey Church.

However we must also ask that the commission makes a further change as it has sadly decided to still leave the area around the Yenton pub (the estate local) out of the Erdington Ward despite it clearly having always been part of Erdington. That area (Douay Road) is home to the local Scout troop who clearly advertises all their events as being in Erdington. The area is only a few metres walk from the Abbey Fields yet part of Perry Common round Jerry’s Lane which is included in Erdington Ward despite it clearly being part of Perry Common historically and nowhere near to round here.

We have again discussed the plans as a group and are supportive of the counter proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together Group. We understand that this would allow all of Erdington to be in the same ward while only make four minor changes elsewhere to balance numbers. All these other changes would in fact support the base wards of a 2 member Erdington, Stockland Green and 1 member Castle Vale, Pype Hayes, Tyburn, Perry Common wards. This would mean the commission wins and residents win. We are very proud of our area please help continue to grow the pride we have in Erdington locally by keeping it together.

Best Wishes

Derek Walton
Vice-Chair Lyndhurst (now Abbey Fields) Neighbourhood Forum
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Fiona Tyson
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Moor Green Residents' Association West

Comment text:

This is a response from Moor Green Residents Association (West). Thank you for listening to the views of Moseley residents. Our Residents Association Committee is pleased that the LGBC has heard the voices of the different groups in Moseley and those of the wide range of individual members of the public who contributed to the range of local submissions. We are pleased to still be working with our friends and neighbours across the Moseley ward that is proposed and feel that a 2 councillor ward will allow this active local community to continue to go from strength to strength.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Tony Thapar
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name: Moseley Community Development Trust

Comment text:

Comments from Tony Thapar - Moseley Community Development Trust. In my previous submission, I asked that the Commission work with natural communities as it seeks to revise Birmingham’s ward boundaries. I would now like to say that I am pleased that the Commission did think again and has offered a revised Moseley Ward. I am in support of the revised 2 councillor ward for Moseley. However, I would prefer to see the northern boundary changed to better reflect the natural community of Balsall Heath; it’s clear Balsall Heath Park should be in the ward of Balsall Heath. It seems to me that there is the capacity to amend the northern boundary to reduce the numbers in Moseley Ward and allow the Balsall Heath electorate to grow.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Mark

Please find attached our submission with 8 appendices.

We warmly accept much of the LGBCE’s revised Ward for Moseley: most of our community has been thrilled at the response from the LGBCE to Moseley’s 460 submissions.

These documents have come out of further discussions with two key boundary areas and representatives from Balsall Heath Forum: we believe that these small areas or zones still need to be redrawn in order to meet your three guiding criteria. We look forward to your final decisions and hope that you will agree with our findings.

Please acknowledge receipt of these documents as they were too difficult to put onto the website.

Kind regards
David

David Isgrove
Vice Chair of Moseley Forum on behalf of the Joint Moseley Communities

Direct Dial: 

Email: 

Kind regards
David
RESPONSE TO THE ELECTORAL REVIEW OF BIRMINGHAM: FURTHER DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COMBINED COMMUNITY GROUPS OF MOSELEY June 2016
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BACKGROUND:

This document is a response to the further draft recommendations proposed for the wards of Birmingham by The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) with particular reference to Moseley and the surrounding area.

As in our previous submission, it has been compiled by a working group drawn from eight community and business groups currently working with Moseley communities (Moseley Forum; Moseley Society; Moseley Community Development Trust; Greener, Cleaner, Safer Environment group; Moseley Churches; Moseley Regeneration Group; Moseley B13 magazine editorial group; Moseley Farmers’ Market; local Moseley Businesses.)

The methodology behind the electoral numbers referred to in this response can be found in Appendix 2 in our previous submission.

Maps and documents supporting our proposed Ward can be found at Appendices 1 to 8

SUMMARY:

The Combined Community Groups of Moseley warmly welcome the further draft recommendations around the proposed boundary changes to the Moseley and Kings Heath Ward as detailed in the further draft LGBCE recommendations of May 2016 and we are now confident that effective and convenient local government in our area will be strengthened and supported by these changes. In particular, we are pleased that:

- Moseley Village is now at the centre of Moseley Ward
- Moseley Ward boundary is now closely aligned with the Moseley SPD (Special Planning Document) boundary.
- Moseley Ward now clearly reflects the views expressed through the many community and individual submissions that were generated by the initial proposals
- Moseley Ward now includes our significant local landmarks such as Moseley Park and Pool and Moseley Bog

However, there are a few small areas that we feel are still not best served by the new recommendations, and following communication from residents living in those areas we would like to draw your attention to the areas where we feel adjustments could and should be made to ensure effective local government for our whole community and those around us such as Balsall Heath to the North.

As before, we anticipate that you will receive a significant number of individual responses supporting our comments, however, due to the strength of feeling amongst the communities of Moseley, we feel it is important to back these responses with a community submission.
Our specific issues are detailed below:

MAP SHOWING OUR AREAS OF CONCERN IN THE PROPOSED TWO COUNCILLOR WARD, MOSELEY (Also Appendix 1)

1. **WAKE GREEN ROAD (nos 213 to 247), GREEN ROAD & CUL-DE-SACS BURKE AVENUE AND KEEL DRIVE**

The latest proposals put the 18 houses in Wake Green Road (East side) into the Sparkhill Ward. However, these houses have long been strongly connected to the Moseley Community and its cultural identity. One of its residents even had a wood named after her within Moseley Bog. The residents are highly active in many areas of Moseley life (see Appendix 3 for their submission and survey results). They have always been part of Moseley even before 1911 when the area was taken over by Birmingham. To cut off these houses from Moseley and put them into a ward with which there is no physical or cultural connection goes against the LGBCE criteria. As it only involves 30 electors, it keeps Moseley and the ward next to it within their numbers remit.

Secondly, the LGBCE proposals cut Green Road in the Moseley Ward in half so that the northern side and the two cul-de-sacs off it, namely Burke Avenue and Keel Drive, are part of the Sparkhill ward to the north even though there is no direct connection, neither physical nor community, with that Ward. (see appendix 5 for photographic evidence) The residents of these streets are concerned that being on the edge of three different wards their representation
will be marginalised in favour of more central areas. In addition, the residents are active citizens who engage with a number of the established Moseley groups, along with their neighbours in Green Road and Lower Wake Green Road around the corner: they feel that being excluded from the Moseley Ward would leave their community contribution isolated and ignored. See Appendix 2 for detailed maps and Appendix 4 for their submission and survey results.

These two proposals add 98 electors to the Moseley Ward total figure.

Map showing location of these roads and proposed boundary. (See Appendix 2 for comparison with the LGBCE’s proposal)

Therefore, we propose that Moseley Ward should include 213 to 247 Wake Green Road, Burke Avenue, Keel Drive and the Northern side of Green Road to ensure effective local government and preserve the community identity.
2. (a) ANDERTON PARK ROAD, CADBURY ROAD, BIRCHWOOD CRESCENT, ALDER ROAD & BALSALL HEATH PARK

The latest LGBCE proposals include Balsall Heath Park in Moseley Ward: this park is vital to the communities of Balsall Heath and plays a key part in their Neighbourhood Plan. We therefore urge the LGCBE to return the park to Balsall Heath Ward.

We are pleased that you have included some of these roads within the proposed Moseley Ward. However, as in our previous response, we urge the LGCBE to recognise the boundary that the Moseley communities AND Balsall Heath Forum have identified as dividing the two Wards.

The Residents’ Group in this area have submitted their proposal (Appendix 7) which we fully endorse.

Therefore, we propose that Moseley Ward should not include Balsall Heath Park and that the boundary between Moseley Ward and Balsall Heath Ward should lie as detailed in the attached map (see below and Appendix 6) and our previous proposal.

Map showing location of the proposed boundary in the Balsall Heath Park area
2 (b) Brighton Road Anomaly

The latest LGBCE proposals drew the boundary along Brighton Road. This poses a problem for those residents and properties lying on the South side of this road. A high security fence was constructed to the South of them creating a strong physical barrier between the Moseley communities of Trafalgar Road and its cul-de-sacs with the very different community that identifies with Brighton Road and Balsall Heath. Our proposed boundary appears to cut through a building but it is in fact two totally different buildings that happen to share part of a wall.

As the map below shows, there is no physical or community link between Moseley and Balsall Heath. *(Also see Appendix 6 for comparison with the LGBCE proposals)*

For good governance both sides of Brighton Road have to be included in the proposed Balsall Heath Ward.

**Map showing the proposed boundary South of Brighton Road**

Therefore, we propose that the boundary should not run along Brighton Rd but be placed 200m south along the High Security fence that separates the two communities to ensure effective local government and preserve the community identities of these two wards.

This would remove 50 electors from the total for the Moseley Communities Proposal for the Moseley Ward to bring the overall total to 16,512.

*(See appendix 8 for a breakdown of this figure by polling districts)*

We believe the proposed two councillor ward of Moseley along with the three minor changes suggested above meets all the criteria set out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and we look forward to your final conclusions.

Should you have any questions or require any further information about our proposal please contact:

**David Isgrove**
Vice-Chair of Moseley Forum
The two areas of concern as shown on our original submission:

1. The Eastern section of Sarehole
   213 to 247 WAKE GREEN ROAD
   GREEN ROAD & CUL DE SACS
   BURKE AVENUE AND KEEL DRIVE

2. The Northern Boundary with Balsall Heath:
   (a) BIRCHWOOD CRESCENT, ALDER RD & BALSALL HEATH PARK
   (b) BRIGHTON RD

APPENDIX 1

The Proposed Moseley Ward
Map of Eastern section of proposed Moseley Ward

Appendix 2

Moseley Joint Communities, Lower Wake Green Road and Sarehole Residents Association Submission for Proposed Eastern Boundary

1. Boundary proposed by the LGBCE
2. Boundary now proposed by Moseley Communities, the Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group and Sarehole Residents Association (in blue)
Appendix 3

Submission by the Lower Wake Green Road Residents group (nos 213-217) and survey evidence to support our joint proposals

Response to the Boundary Commission Proposals
Lower Wake Green Road Residents’ Group (213-247)

We are a close community of Moseley residents living in a block of houses numbered 213-247 Wake Green Road. This response has been put together after consulting each household in our block in writing, emails, face-to-face meetings and telephone calls.

Residents’ survey
Number of properties in the area of concern - 18
Number of properties consulted regarding the boundary proposal - 17 (215 is empty)
residents asked - Do you consider yourself part of Moseley and why?
Do you object to the Boundary being changed to place you in Sparkhill ward?
Number of residents responded - 17
% of those responding considering themselves part of Moseley - 100% unanimous
% of those responding objecting to the boundary being changed - 100% unanimous

The views expressed in this response to the proposals are unanimous. Every household in our block has been hand delivered a final copy of this response and every resident responding has agreed the content.

Ours is an ancient, historic area of Moseley, famous in particular for the beautiful conservation area of Moseley Bog, which is directly opposite our block of houses, a few yards away. A well known Moseley resident and tireless conservationist and supporter of Moseley Bog was Joy Fifer of 245 Wake Green Road, in our block. She fought until the end of her life to save this beautiful natural area in her home village of Moseley, indeed part of the Bog is named after her, "Joy's Wood". Joy was awarded a "Supermillenium Hero of Moseley" award by the Lord Mayor of Birmingham on 13/05/00 for her work regarding Moseley Bog, and also an MBE on 2/3/2001. She is remembered as the founding mother of the environment and urban wildlife movement nationally. We residents think it would be a disrespectful travesty to repay Joy Fifer’s loyalty to and hard work for her community of Moseley and the marvellous legacy she has left behind by shifting her home (where her husband Alan, life president of friends of Moseley Bog and Joy's Wood, still lives) into the area of Sparkhill. She was extremely proud of being a Moseley resident and she loved Moseley, her husband confirms she would be absolutely horrified by the current proposals.

Current residents in our block are now "friends of Moseley Bog" and have volunteered their time clearing brambles and walkways for the common good and benefit of our Moseley community. Many of us walk to the Bog daily to walk our dogs and take our exercise. Another famous neighbour was JRR Tolkien, who lived at 264 Wake Green Road, Moseley, and famously based his books around our beautiful Moseley Bog and surrounding area of the ford on Green Road and Sarehole Mill. We residents of 213-247 WGR are proud of this heritage and take great pride in our area of Moseley and its rich history.

Our residents are fully involved in the wider Moseley community and we collectively feel absolutely part of everyday Moseley life. Between us we have educated our children in Moseley at Moseley C of E primary school, and been governors as well as parents at that school, and at St Bernard's...
Primary school in Moseley which is directly opposite our block and by any reasonable person would be seen as being in the same area as our block; worshipped at St Mary's Church in Moseley, and been PCC members and choir members, as well as parishioners at that church, our children have been Christened and later married at that church demonstrating a lifetime of association with Moseley; we have sent our children to brownies and Cubs at what was Centre 13 in School Road, Moseley; our children have learned to dance at Moseley Dance Centre; We have played tennis and attended bonfires at Moseley Tennis Club in Billesley Lane; we attend our doctor's surgery in Wake Green Road, Moseley village; we regularly walk or drive down our road into the village to enjoy the benefits our fantastic centre has to offer including our award-winning farmers' market, our pubs and restaurants, cafes and shops. Many of us residents have lived our entire lives in Moseley, were educated here, married here, have lived in various roads in Moseley, always remaining in Moseley as it is part of who we are, we are Moseleyites and very proud of it! We love our village, its atmosphere, its people, its facilities and we are proud to have lifelong associations with our village which we dearly wish to continue.

213-247 Wake Green Road has been part of Moseley since records began. Various residents in our block have house title deeds relating back to the turn of the last century when these houses were built referring to the land where our block is situated as "Wake Green, Moseley, Worcester". The county may have changed, but for us residents living in this beautiful historic area, it is of paramount importance that we remain in Moseley, the place where we have our roots, have lived our lives, raised our children, and wish to live in until our old age.

On a practical level, houses in the next block heading away from Moseley, namely 249-267 Wake Green Road, are within the proposed new boundary of Moseley, which makes absolutely no sense whatsoever as they are further away from Moseley Centre albeit in the same road as our block. It would make no sense at all to walk down the same road and change from Sparkhill to Moseley the further away from Moseley centre you walk. It is ludicrous and also divisive of the Wake Green Road community, which, albeit on a main road, does exist. Wake Green Road leads directly into Moseley, it is the main road in Moseley and is synonymous with Moseley throughout the city of Birmingham, it should remain within Moseley. Furthermore, for many reasons, including road safety liabilities (there are 2 schools on this section of Wake Green Road, St Bernard’s Primary and Moseley Secondary) it does not make sense to have the Ward boundary running along the centre of the main road making 2 wards liable for regulation/implementation of matters of concern and safety issues to residents and other road users, in particular the hundreds of school children using this section of Wake Green Road every morning and afternoon. For community cohesiveness and practical reasons it makes much more sense for Wake Green Road to be fully within the one ward of Moseley as it always has been.

We as residents of B13 absolutely oppose the LGBCE proposals and urge that the boundary submission proposed by the Moseley Boundary Working Group incorporating the Moseley Forum and Moseley Society, be accepted, and that the Moseley border remains along the back of our houses as it always has done, so that our block remains in the Moseley ward, see Appendix 1. It is much more sensible to have boundaries across the back of houses where there is little or no contact, rather than across the front of homes in the middle of a road where relationships are made and people live and work in the same street, causing an artificial division to be created between them to the detriment of the community. We wish to vote on matters that affect our lives, that are relevant
to us and relate to our local area, community and services that we access, that is all in Moseley. As a community we have no ties with Sparkhill, we do not eat there, shop there, or use the local services there, we do not associate ourselves with the Sparkhill community in any way, which is a matter of paramount importance. All our community ties are with Moseley. We are just 18 households of Moseley people who wish to retain our home identity, our culture, our addresses and our way of life, 18 households will make no significant difference to the ward numbers or help achieve the LGBC’s aims. The cost is too high and devastating for the 18 households involved, we therefore reject the proposals put forward.

Appendix 1

1. Boundary now proposed by Moseley Communities, the Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group and Sarehole Residents Association (in blue)
Sarehole Residents' Association:
The combined residents of Green Road B13, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive:
Submission to revise the proposed Moseley Ward Boundary.

The revised proposed changes to the Electoral Wards show many sensible alterations in line with the information provided by Moseley residents. However our enclave in the Sarehole/Wake Green area of Moseley has been left in an untenable situation. The boundary line has been drawn through the middle of our community along Green Road. This means that neighbours who share similar outlooks, interests and geographical location have been put into different wards. The boundary separates a cohesive community who, despite being comprised of families with a range of cultural heritages, identify closely with Moseley and each other. The Moseley Forum included our area in their previous submission and the local residents emphasised their affiliation with Moseley Ward - and their objection to being placed in Sparkhill Ward.

It makes no sense to divide our community. This part of Green Road, that includes two cul-de-sacs, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive, is a small country style lane with a community centred around a communal green space that has accommodated street parties to celebrate national and local events. We have enclosed some photographs that illustrate this.

We share a Neighbourhood Watch and work together to prevent and remediate anti-social behaviour in the area. Our community comprises 11 dwellings in Burke Avenue, 9 in Keel Drive and 22 along both sides of Green Rd. The River Cole divides the Moseley postcode B13 and Hall Green postcode B28. The only exits from Burke Avenue and Keel Drive are onto Green Road and direct access from Green Road is the Wake Green Road and Moseley. Furthermore, due to the historical and cultural links, residents of Green Road, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive turn towards Moseley for their personal, familial and domestic needs. There are no direct road links or affinity with Sparkhill.

In a recent door-to-door survey we were able to speak with 35 of the 42 households in this area (85%). The Boundary Commission’s proposals regarding our community were unanimously rejected. We want to stay together within Moseley Ward.

Our enclave is historically connected to Gracewell and Foster Trusts (located in Gracewell Road that has been included in Moseley Ward) as Mr. Foster, the solicitor who bequeathed the land, used to live in a house on Green Road. His garden extended into what is now Keel Drive. Another house and garden, similar to that on the corner of Green Road and Gracewell Rd used to occupy the area that is now Burke Avenue.

The areas of Sarehole and Wake Green are part of Moseley’s contribution to the literary heritage of JRR Tolkien. He lived within the hamlet of Wake Green that includes Moseley Bog, Green Road and the Ford, Gracewell Road and the Wake Green Road as well as parts of the Millstream Way around Sarehole Mill. These all provided the inspiration for his novels. The attractions are rightly connected together in Birmingham City Council’s literature about JRR Tolkien and his connection to Moseley.

There is no reason why the boundaries demarcating different areas cannot be drawn along the rear borders of gardens and green spaces rather than roads and we can see from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s map that this precedent has already been set. On the map, the road you have chosen to divide appears to be
equivalent to main roads on the map but is actually a single track road for a significant proportion of its length, barely 3.5 metres wide. The enclosed photographs show this. We have enclosed a map with a new boundary that includes all of our community in the Sarehole Residents Association (and the houses in the Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group who have entered their own submission).

Green Road B13, and the residents of Keel Drive and Burke Avenue, should be kept together and be part of Moseley Ward as this makes sense in terms of community, identity and governance. It is a small number of people and will make no difference to electoral parity. A local boundary aims to keep communities and services together. Thus breaking up a cohesive community goes against Local Government guidelines. It will split our representation in the Council, thus ending unified Council Services in the area and potentially increasing costs. Already on the margins of several wards, we are concerned that our interests will be ignored and our access to funding limited unless we are included in a ward that reflects our political and social connections.

Our affinity with Moseley has been partially recognised by placing half of Green Road B13 and Gracewell Road into the Moseley Ward. Keeping communities together makes a huge difference in terms of social cohesion, appropriate political representation and the effective use of limited resources both in terms of time and money.

PLEASE DO NOT DIVIDE US.

Sarehole Residents Association:
The combined residents of Green Road, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive.
Photographic evidence for community cohesion of the Sarehole area

Appendix 5

Sarehole Residents Association: Photographic Evidence

Jubilee Celebrations:
The revised boundaries place the sign in Sparkhill Ward and the green area where the families are playing in Moseley Ward. The families come from both sides of the single track road that is barely 3.5 metres wide and shares a Moseley postcode B13.
Sarehole Residents Association: Photographic Evidence

Pulling together: We are a cohesive community comprising of households from diverse cultural heritages but who share a similar vision and outlook. Dividing this community in two transgresses the LGBCE’s criteria regarding the need for wards to reflect communities and promote good governance. The community as a whole needs to be included into Moseley Ward as this properly represents our political and social affiliations and recognises historical and geographical connections of the area.
Sarehole Residents Association: Photographs

Green Road looking downhill - the cottage on the left has been placed on Sparkhill Ward by the proposals while the houses on the right have been placed in Moseley Ward. The cottage is the former home of Mr Foster, who bequeathed the land for the Foster Trust and the area around Sarehole Mill, which are to the right of the photograph. Houses that are linked historically and socially have been divided by the Boundary Commission's proposals against the aim of community cohesion. The green space in the photograph is used for community events. There is no direct road access to Sparkhill from either end of Green Road.

Green Road looking uphill with the entrance to Burke Avenue (a cul-de-sac) on the right just past the cottage. The house on the left has been placed in Moseley Ward by the proposals, the cottage and houses on the left in Sparkhill Ward. The road is single track and barely 3.5m in width. The community clusters around the green space and is a small enclave of 42 houses that has an historical, cultural and political affiliation with Moseley. Dividing this community transgresses the aim of effective governance.

Keel Drive, a cul-de-sac, as it exits onto Green Rd. It has been placed in Sparkhill Ward by the Boundary Commission’s proposals. The hedge obscures a home on Green Rd. The house on the right, also on Green Rd, has been placed in Moseley Ward. The farm in the background that leads to Sarehole Mill has been placed in Hall Green Ward. All three share cultural, historical and social connections and a B13 postcode.

The upper part of Green Road leading from the Wake Green Road. The left side has been placed in Sparkhill by the proposals. Gracewell Road turns right just below the parked car and leads to the Gracewell Homes and The Foster Trust. This has been placed in Moseley Ward by the proposals. The cottage previously owned by Mr Foster is in the far distance on the left side of the road. This area has a geographical and historical affiliation that is divided by the proposals.
Map of the proposed Northern Boundary of the proposed Moseley Ward showing both areas of concern in relation to the LGBCE’s proposals

1. Boundary proposed by the LGBCE
2. Boundary now proposed by Moseley Communities and Anderton Park Residents’ Group together with Balsall Heath Forum
17 June 2016

Please note: This is the latest version of the Anderton Park Residents' Group submission and should replace the one sent in on June 9th

Dear Sirs

Re: LGBCE further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council ward boundaries – Moseley Ward

I write further to The Anderton Park Residents’ Group’s submission responding to the LGBCE draft recommendations for ward boundaries dated 30.01.16, a copy of which is attached as Appendix 1. That submission was also incorporated at Appendix 14 of the “Response to the Boundary Commission’s Proposed Changes to the Wards of Birmingham by the Combined Community Groups of Moseley” dated February 2016.

Appendix 1 should be read as part of this submission responding to the LGBCE further draft recommendations as our reasons for being included in Moseley ward have not changed and are detailed in Appendix 1. The Anderton Park Residents’ Group wish to fully endorse both our initial response and that of the above Combined Community Groups of Moseley. As you will note from the latter (paragraph 2, page 6 refers), the Combined Community Groups of Moseley also endorse our inclusion into the new Moseley Ward.

In regard to your amended further draft proposal which would include Balsall Heath Park as part of Moseley ward, we fully agree with the Combined Community Groups of Moseley and Balsall Heath Forum that the park should remain with Balsall Heath and should not be included within the eventual Moseley Ward boundary.

In our submission of 30.01.16, our primary concern as expressed was that ‘our triangle’ should be included within the new Moseley Ward. ‘Our triangle’ specifically includes:-

- The North side of Woodstock Road from Yardley Wood Road to Anderton Park Road
- The South side of Yardley Wood Road from Anderton Park Road to Woodstock Road
- Both sides of Anderton Park Road from Yardley Wood Road to Woodstock Road
- All of Cadbury Road

However, in view of the issue of which ward Balsall Heath Park should be in, we are concerned
that the new Moseley Ward boundary should be redrawn in such a way as to fully reflect the boundary map proposed by the Combined Community Groups of Moseley, namely that both Birchwood Crescent (both sides) from Anderton Park Road up to, but not including Birchwood Road, and also Dennis Road (both sides) from Anderton Park Road up to, but not including Anderton Park Schools, be included in the new Moseley Ward.

In order to canvass the opinions of residents of the above specific parts of Birchwood Crescent and Dennis Road, a door to door survey was conducted in early June 2016.

The results of that survey were as follows:-

**Dennis Road**

Of the families/individual residents in the 18 properties, of those who replied (14), 93% (13) expressed a desire to be included in the new Moseley Ward. Their reasons given were very similar to our own, namely local affiliation to Moseley and effective disenfranchisement otherwise.

**Birchwood Crescent**

Of the families/individual residents in the 38 properties, of those who replied (21), 95% (20) expressed a desire to be included in the new Moseley Ward. Their reasons given were very similar to our own, namely local affiliation to Moseley and effective disenfranchisement otherwise.

**Voter numbers**

In regard to voter numbers in our area, i.e. Polling District DDD, we are very concerned that Balsall Heath Park is geographically included in DDD as are Dennis Road, Birchwood Crescent and ‘our triangle’. We understand from communication with the LGBCE Review Officer for Birmingham, Mr Mark Cooper, that Polling District voter numbers are used as the first ‘building block’ when drawing ward boundaries. However we also understand that the LGBCE can cut across polling districts based upon the strength of the evidence submitted by residents. We trust that you will appreciate the strength of feeling of residents expressed in this submission.

For the sake of convenience, I include below current voter numbers obtained from the Birmingham Electoral Office for the relevant roads in our area of concern:-

As can be seen from the above, in order to accommodate the inclusion of the above roads within the new Moseley Ward, this would require the transfer of 543 of voters from the current DDD Polling District. This would reduce the voter numbers in DDD from 1,454 to 911.

**Boundary Maps**

For the sake of convenience and further clarity, I attach Appendix 2, a map showing our endorsement of the Combined Community Groups of Moseley redrawn map of the Northern section of the Proposed Moseley Ward with our recommended boundary line shown in **solid green line**.

We trust that you will fully take into account the above when deciding upon the final Moseley Ward Boundary after the June 20 deadline. We should also like to draw your attention to the fact that our proposed boundary follows the original boundary of Birmingham up to year 1911.

Yours faithfully
John Parkinson – Chair Anderton Park Residents’ Group

Appended:

Appendix 1 Ward Boundaries Consultation - Response from Anderton Park Residents’ Group (sent and received 30.01.16)

Appendix 2 Map showing the Northern section of the Proposed Moseley Ward with our recommended boundary line shown in solid green line and the Anderton Park Residents’ Group area outlined in pink.
APPENDIX 1

Ward Boundaries Consultation - Response from Anderton Park Residents’ Group.

We wish to make our views known to the LGBCE in regard to our specific area – currently part of Sparkbrook Ward.

The Anderton Park Residents’ Group comprises residents from a triangular area bounded by Anderton Park Road, Woodstock Road and Yardley Wood Road and this is the area in question (which we will refer to as ‘our triangle’ in this document).

We acknowledge that whilst ‘our triangle’ is included in both the proposal for the new Moseley Ward proposed by LGBCE and in that of the Moseley Community Groups – and we fully endorse those inclusions – we are concerned that at the last Ward Boundaries Consultation held over the period 2001/03, we were assigned to Sparkbrook Ward instead of the new Moseley and Kings Heath Ward.

This was despite a petition by 105 residents in ‘our triangle’ requesting that we should be included in the latter. I attach a copy of the covering letter accompanying that petition. As you will see, the reasons for our request were clearly set out.

Although that petition (copies of which were sent to the Electoral Commission as indicated) was sent past the deadline for consultation and therefore rejected, recent meetings with residents in ‘our triangle’ confirm that the same concerns remain current. In 2001, our area had originally been included in the boundary revision endorsed by Moseley Form, but due to a lack of direct lines of communication, we were not kept informed of subsequent developments either from Sparkbrook or Moseley forum (as the attached letter outlines) This illustrates the fact that we have effectively been left disenfranchised and without appropriate representation.

Our issues and concerns are more likely to be addressed by Moseley Ward Councillors than those in Sparkbrook.

This is because the issues that are of high priority for Sparkbrook do not generally apply to us (having seen the minutes from the Sparkbrook forum over the last 13 years).

In summary:-

- Geographically, we live in Moseley. Our postcode and telephone number code
are for Moseley (B13 and 449 respectively)

- We affiliate far more with Moseley than with Sparkbrook.
- We don’t tend to use the facilities in Sparkbrook.
- We use Moseley for socialising, worship, shopping, cultural activities and also many of our children are educated there.
- We actively participate in all that Moseley has to offer and are enthusiastic supporters of the farmers market and Moseley in Bloom, and various artistic and musical events.

We therefore request that this time around residents/voters in ‘our triangle’ be included in the new Moseley Ward.

Specifically, ‘our triangle’ (Anderton Park Residents’ Group) comprises the following roads:-

- The North side of Woodstock Road from Yardley Wood Road to Anderton Park Road
- The South side of Yardley Wood Road from Anderton Park Road to Woodstock Road
- Both sides of Anderton Park Road from Yardley Wood Road to Woodstock Road
- All of Cadbury Road

Please see the attached map with the boundaries of ‘our triangle’ delineated and shaded green – this is now shown in Appendix 2 outlined in pink

John Parkinson - Chair Anderton Park Residents’ Group

Appended:

Copy of petition to Electoral Commission 2003
Letter from Mr Ahmad, Chief Legal Officer Birmingham City Council dated 12/11/03
APPENDIX 2

Map showing the Northern section of the Proposed Moseley Ward with our recommended boundary line shown in solid green line and the Anderton Park Residents’ Group area outlined in pink.

Boundary now proposed by Anderton Park Residents’ Group together with Moseley Communities and Balsall Heath Forum

Proposed Moseley Ward boundary –

Anderton Park Residents’ Group area -
Appendix 8

Electoral Statistics for The Moseley Communities Proposal for the Two Member Councillor Moseley Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polling District</th>
<th>Total Expected Electorate</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>CSF</td>
<td>28 (small part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG</td>
<td>1,513 (part)</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>1,298 (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSK</td>
<td>3,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDD</td>
<td>543 (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>42 (small part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEH</td>
<td>1,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI</td>
<td>202 (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,516</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DEI figure includes the 98 electors of 213 to 247 Wake green Rd, Green Road and the two cul-de-sacs north of Green Road, Keel Drive and Burke Avenue, into the Moseley Ward.

The CSJ figure excludes 50 electors of the South side of Brighton Rd and its cul-de-sac which would become part of Balsall Heath.

The LGBCE recognises that sometimes the Polling District Boundaries cut communities in two and has on occasions drawn its boundaries to match the communities and not the Polling District Boundaries as these are not directly part of the three criteria for establishing a boundary. We believe that there is a very strong argument for this to happen in some of the Polling Districts above in order to help maintain established community cohesion and for good governance. As they are minor amendments we have ensured that surrounding proposed Wards keep within their permitted electoral figures.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Moseley Tennis Club Calcutt
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: Moseley Tennis Club

Comment text:

Dear Review Officer, Moseley Tennis Club supports the changes to the proposed two-councillor Moseley Ward. Thank you for taking account of all the representations from people and organisations in Moseley. The club supports the minor amendments proposed by the Moseley Society. The amendments demonstrate that the views of local people can positively influence boundary commission decisions.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Habib Ullah
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Naseby youth centre

Comment text:

I am happy to hear that alum rock may not be divided as it is one community. the youth centre has young people attending from the entire proposed Alum rock ward and due to this proposed decision I am delighted as the youth centre can cater to all. Alum rock is one of the communities that is still a close knit society and it is important not to divide it and so we are happy with the decision to unite the ward and not split it as alum rock and saltley wards.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Marcia Greenwood
Sent: 20 June 2016 17:07
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Revised Boundary Commission Reviews

To whom it may concern,

I am the BID Town Centre Manager for Northfield Business Improvement District area in South West Birmingham. I have attached a map of the BID boundary.

Whilst I welcome the revised proposals to keep the Northfield Shopping Centre and Northfield Library within the Northfield Ward, Victoria Common could be split across two wards, namely Northfield Ward and the proposed Bournville & Cotteridge Ward. It is felt that if the common was split between the two wards, with differing priorities, this could affect decision making for this green and open space. I would wish for Victoria Common to remain within the Northfield Ward as it is currently now, as well as within the BID boundary.

With Regards,

Marcia Greenwood
Northfield BID Town Centre Manager

Like us on Facebook – www.facebook.com/ NorthfieldBID
Follow us on twitter - https://twitter.com/@NorthfieldBID

Northfield Business Improvement District (Northfield BID) is registered in England and Wales as number 7889072. Registered as VAT number: 130 9752 18
Where will the BID operate?

The BID will work with and support businesses and organisations across all sectors and the whole of the town centre.

The BID will adopt an inclusive approach to all those which contribute to Northfield’s retail, business and community offer.

The BID will promote Northfield as the principal town centre on the A38 south west corridor.

BID area

Proposed Northfield Business Improvement District boundary

Selly Oak Development

New Sainsbury’s store planned to replace the existing store at the Selly Oak Triangle site, and other ‘out-of-town’ retail development planned. Selly Oak relief road opens Autumn 2011.

Longbridge Development

Planning permission granted for private developers St Modwen to build a new Longbridge local centre, with 24 units of various sizes, set to open in Autumn 2013. New Sainsbury’s store, restaurants and homes also planned. Brownville College relocated to a new £66 million campus in Longbridge in Autumn 2011.
Review Officer: 2 June 2016
Local Government Boundary Commission for England

Thank you for your email regarding further draft recommendations and asking me to comment.

Regarding Oscott Ward. We have been well served by 3 councillors in Oscott and we see no reason to change.
Having looked at the further proposals it seems that we will now have only 2 councillors and even with Bandywood estate moving into Kingstanding ward it will mean that they will have more people to represent.

Not ideal but it is probably the best solution in the circumstances and I understand that no further changes to the proposals published are to be made.

Yours sincerely,

Maureen Byrne (Chair)
Oscott Elderly Residents Group

---

On Tue, May 10, 2016 at 4:48 PM, Mayers, Mishka <mishka.mayers@lgbce.org.uk> wrote:

Oscott Elderly Residents Group

Dear Ms Byrne,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF BIRMINGHAM: FURTHER DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS
Residents of Washwood Heath (Saltley and Alum Rock)

We oppose the proposed boundary changes and cannot see the sense in making these changes! A Single Councillor Ward be better for Community. WE agree with first proposal for Saltley and Alum Rock as a SINGLE Councillor Ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qassim Iqbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassad Ali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizwan Attar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameer Ali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalid Hussain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaz Butt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Yousaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakander Maj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S. Aziz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents of Washwood Heath (Saltley and Alum Rock)

We oppose the proposed boundary changes and cannot see the sense in making these changes! A Single Councillor Ward be better for Community. WE agree with first proposal for Saltley and Alum Rock as a SINGLE Councillor Ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZEL Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHONY Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reza M Nawaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahul Mahmood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJED HOBAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahir Mahmood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQBOD Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noshir Moni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazam Lone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Hassan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents of Washwood Heath (Saltley and Alum Rock)

We oppose the proposed boundary changes and cannot see the sense in making these changes! A Single Councillor Ward be better for Community. WE agree with first proposal for Saltley and Alum Rock as a SINGLE Councillor Ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAFeer HussaAzn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asif Malik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Shou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Ahmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents of Washwood Heath (Saltley and Alum Rock)

We oppose the proposed boundary changes and cannot see the sense in making these changes!. A Single Councillor Ward be better for Community. WE agree with first proposal for Saltley and Alum Rock as a SINGLE Councillor Ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Ziafet Khan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  M. Shakil Mir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents of Washwood Heath (Saltley and Alum Rock)

We oppose the proposed boundary changes and cannot see the sense in making these changes! A Single Councillor Ward be better for Community. WE agree with first proposal for Saltley and Alum Rock as a SINGLE Councillor Ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kasif Nazir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Shukreel Rahman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nazir Bira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Imran Aar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 NAZIR Hossain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 AZIZA Bi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mubeen Ali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mohammed Safraz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sadiq Nazir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Carolyn Hicks
Sent: 14 June 2016 08:25
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary reviews - Moseley, Birmingham

I write in my capacity of Chair of Russell Road (Moseley) Residents' Association. We very much appreciate the degree to which you have amended the proposals following consultation and comment from Moseley residents. The new proposals preserve the integrity of the local community and its amenities; we are grateful for your consideration of these factors which are of enormous importance to this neighbourhood.

We have two outstanding concerns, however:
1. the apparent relocation of Balsall Heath park within Moseley's boundaries; this park should properly be within the bailiwick of Balsall Heath as it is a vital amenity for their residents
2. the reduction of elected representatives from 3 to 2. Our councillors are currently overwhelmed by work this very diverse community generates; to reduce that number will simply mean that seemingly minor issues which serve to maintain the quality of life for residents will be back-burnered. One consequence of this - and it is well-documented - is that minor issues quickly translate into big ones, which have the capacity to undermine social cohesion, neglect the environment and compromise the local amenity. We would urge you to reconsider the number of elected representatives Birmingham requires generally, and this area needs specifically.

However, we would thank you for listening to our concerns, for incorporating these into the revised plans and for recognising the importance of the community voice. Not only are we relieved, but our faith in the democratic process has also been restored!

Professor Carolyn Hicks - Chair, Russell Road Residents' Association

Professor Carolyn Hicks, BA, MA, PhD, PGCE, CPsychol.,
From: Gig Payne
Sent: 19 June 2016 10:23
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: 
Subject: Local Government Boundary Commission proposals submission by

Here is the submission from the Sarehole Residents Association raising our concerns about the latest LGBC boundary proposals, our objection to the way our community has been unnecessary divided and our proposal for our community to be included AS A WHOLE in Moseley Ward.

It contains 5 attachments with text, photographs and diagrams.

The deadline is tomorrow 20/6/16 and I would be grateful if you would forward it as required.

Please acknowledge the receipt of this email.

Gig Payne on behalf of the Sarehole Residents Association.
Sarehole Residents' Association:  
The combined residents of Green Road B13, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive:  
Submission to revise the proposed Moseley Ward Boundary.

The revised proposed changes to the Electoral Wards show many sensible alterations in line with the information provided by Moseley residents. However our enclave in the Sarehole/Wake Green area of Moseley has been left in an untenable situation. The boundary line has been drawn through the middle of our community along Green Road. This means that neighbours who share similar outlooks, interests and geographical location have been put into different wards. The boundary separates a cohesive community who, despite being comprised of families with a range of cultural heritages, identify closely with Moseley and each other. The Moseley Forum included our area in their previous submission and the local residents emphasised their affiliation with Moseley Ward - and their objection to being placed in Sparkhill Ward.

It makes no sense to divide our community. This part of Green Road, that includes two cul-de-sacs, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive, is a small country style lane with a community centred around a communal green space that has accommodated street parties to celebrate national and local events. We have enclosed some photographs that illustrate this.

We share a Neighbourhood Watch and work together to prevent and remediate anti-social behaviour in the area. Our community comprises 11 dwellings in Burke Avenue, 9 in Keel Drive and 22 along both sides of Green Rd. The River Cole divides the Moseley postcode B13 and Hall Green postcode B28. The only exits from Burke Avenue and Keel Drive are onto Green Road and direct access from Green Road is the Wake Green Road and Moseley. Furthermore, due to the historical and cultural links, residents of Green Road, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive turn towards Moseley for their personal, familial and domestic needs. There are no direct road links or affinity with Sparkhill.

In a recent door-to-door survey we were able to speak with 35 of the 42 households in this area (85%). The Boundary Commission’s proposals regarding our community were unanimously rejected. We want to stay together within Moseley Ward.

Our enclave is historically connected to Gracewell and Foster Trusts (located in Gracewell Road that has been included in Moseley Ward) as Mr. Foster, the solicitor who bequeathed the land, used to live in a house on Green Road. His garden extended into what is now Keel Drive. Another house and garden, similar to that on the corner of Green Road and Gracewell Rd used to occupy the area that is now Burke Avenue.

The areas of Sarehole and Wake Green are part of Moseley’s contribution to the literary heritage of JRR Tolkien. He lived within the hamlet of Wake Green that includes Moseley Bog, Green Road and the Ford, Gracewell Road and the Wake Green Road as well as parts of the Millstream Way around Sarehole Mill. These all provided the inspiration for his novels. The attractions are rightly connected together in Birmingham City Council’s literature about JRR Tolkien and his connection to Moseley.

There is no reason why the boundaries demarcating different areas cannot be drawn along the rear borders of gardens and green spaces rather than roads and we can see from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s map that this precedent has already been set. On the map, the road you have chosen to divide appears to be
equivalent to main roads on the map but is actually a single track road for a significant proportion of its length, barely 3.5 metres wide. The enclosed photographs show this. We have enclosed a map with a new boundary that includes all of our community in the Sarehole Residents Association (and the houses in the Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group who have entered their own submission).

Green Road B13, and the residents of Keel Drive and Burke Avenue, should be kept together and be part of Moseley Ward as this makes sense in terms of community, identity and governance. It is a small number of people and will make no difference to electoral parity. A local boundary aims to keep communities and services together. Thus breaking up a cohesive community goes against Local Government guidelines. It will split our representation in the Council, thus ending unified Council Services in the area and potentially increasing costs. Already on the margins of several wards, we are concerned that our interests will be ignored and our access to funding limited unless we are included in a ward that reflects our political and social connections.

Our affinity with Moseley has been partially recognised by placing half of Green Road B13 and Gracewell Road into the Moseley Ward. Keeping communities together makes a huge difference in terms of social cohesion, appropriate political representation and the effective use of limited resources both in terms of time and money.

PLEASE DO NOT DIVIDE US.

Sarehole Residents Association:
The combined residents of Green Road, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive.
Green Road looking downhill - the cottage on the left has been placed on Sparkhill Ward by the proposals while the houses on the right have been placed in Moseley Ward. The cottage is the former home of Mr Foster, who bequeathed the land for the Foster Trust and the area around Sarehole Mill, which are to the right of the photograph. Houses that are linked historically and socially have been divided by the Boundary Commission’s proposals against the aim of community cohesion. The green space in the photograph is used for community events. There is no direct road access to Sparkhill from either end of Green Road.

Green Road looking uphill with the entrance to Burke Avenue (a cul-de-sac) on the right just past the cottage. The house on the left has been placed in Moseley Ward by the proposals, the cottage and houses on the left in Sparkhill Ward. The road is single track and barely 3.5 in width. The community clusters around the green space and is a small enclave of X houses that has an historical, cultural and political affiliation with Moseley. Dividing this community transgresses the aim of effective governance.

Keel Drive, a cul-de-sac, as it exits onto Green Rd. It has been placed in Sparkhill Ward by the Boundary Commission’s proposals. The hedge obscures a home on Green Rd. The house on the right, also on Green Rd, has been placed in Moseley Ward. The field in the background that leads to Sarehole Mill has been placed in Hall Green Ward. All three share cultural, historical and social connections and a B13 postcode.

The upper part of Green Road leading from the Wake Green Road. The left side has been placed in Sparkhill by the proposals. Gracewell Road turns right just below the parked car and leads to the Gracewell Homes and The Foster Trust. This has been placed in Moseley Ward by the proposals. The cottage previously owned by Mr Foster is in the far distance on the left side of the road. This area has a geographical and historical affiliation that is divided by the proposals.
Jubilee Celebrations:
The revised boundaries place the sign in Sparkhill Ward and the green area where the families are playing in Moseley Ward. The families come from both sides of the single track road that is barely 3.5 metres wide and shares a Moseley postcode B13.
Sarehole Residents Association: Photographic Evidence

Pulling together: We are a cohesive community comprising of households from diverse cultural heritages but who share a similar vision and outlook. Dividing this community in two transgresses the LGBCE's criteria regarding the need for wards to reflect communities and promote good governance. The community as a whole needs to be included into Moseley Ward as this properly represents our political and social affiliations and recognises historical and geographical connections of the area.
Map 1: The black circle shows the Eastern Area of Proposed Moseley Ward noted as an area of concern by Moseley Forum in their submission proposals for Moseley. This area is Green Road plus cul-de-sacs Keel Drive and Burke Avenue and 213 - 247 Wake Green Road.

Map 2: Blue dotted line marks the Eastern Section Boundary proposed by the Moseley Communities of Sarehole Residents Association and Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group comprising Green Rd, Burke Avenue, Keel Drive and 213 - 247 Wake Green Road. This line stops the unnecessary division of cohesive communities and supports community development and effective governance.
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Feature Annotations

1: The GREEN line shows a revised boundary line to include the complete community of the Sarehole Residents Association and the Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group in Moseley Ward. It joins the Commission’s proposed red boundary at either end.
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Sarehole Residents’ Association: The combined residents of Green Road B13, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive: Submission to revise the proposed Moseley Ward Boundary. The revised proposed changes to the Electoral Wards show many sensible alterations in line with the information provided by Moseley residents. However our enclave in the Sarehole/Wake Green area of Moseley has been left in an untenable situation. The boundary line has been drawn through the middle of our community along Green Road. This means that neighbours who share similar outlooks, interests and geographical location have been put into different wards. The boundary separates a cohesive community who, despite being comprised of families with a range of cultural heritages, identify closely with Moseley and each other. The Moseley Forum included our area in their previous submission and the local residents emphasised their affiliation with Moseley Ward - and their objection to being placed in Sparkhill Ward. It makes no sense to divide our community. This part of Green Road, that includes two cul-de-sacs, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive, is a small country style lane with a community centred around a communal green space that has accommodated street parties to celebrate national and local events. We have enclosed some photographs that illustrate this. We share a Neighbourhood Watch and work together to prevent and remediate anti-social behaviour in the area. Our community comprises 11 dwellings in Burke Avenue, 9 in Keel Drive and 22 along both sides of Green Rd. The River Cole divides the Moseley postcode B13 and Hall Green postcode B28. The only exits from Burke Avenue and Keel Drive are onto Green Road and direct access from Green Road is the Wake Green Road and Moseley. Furthermore, due to the historical and cultural links, residents of Green Road, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive turn towards Moseley for their personal, familial and domestic needs. There are no direct road links or affinity with Sparkhill. In a recent door-to-door survey we were able to speak with 35 of the 42 households in this area (85%). The Boundary Commission’s proposals regarding our community were unanimously rejected. We want to stay together within Moseley Ward. Our enclave is historically connected to Gracewell and Foster Trusts (located in Gracewell Road that has been included in Moseley Ward) as Mr. Foster, the solicitor who bequeathed the land, used to live in a house on Green Road. His garden extended into what is now Keel Drive. Another house and garden,
similar to that on the corner of Green Road and Gracewell Rd used to occupy the area that is now Burke Avenue. The areas of Sarehole and Wake Green are part of Moseley's contribution to the literary heritage of JRR Tolkien. He lived within the hamlet of Wake Green that includes Moseley Bog, Green Road and the Ford, Gracewell Road and the Wake Green Road as well as parts of the Millstream Way around Sarehole Mill. These all provided the inspiration for his novels. The attractions are rightly connected together in Birmingham City Council's literature about JRR Tolkien and his connection to Moseley. There is no reason why the boundaries demarcating different areas cannot be drawn along the rear borders of gardens and green spaces rather than roads and we can see from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's map that this precedent has already been set. On the map, the road you have chosen to divide appears to be equivalent to main roads on the map but is actually a single track road for a significant proportion of its length, barely 3.5 metres wide. The enclosed photographs show this. We have enclosed a map with a new boundary that includes all of our community in the Sarehole Residents Association (and the houses in the Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group who have entered their own submission). Green Road B13, and the residents of Keel Drive and Burke Avenue, should be kept together and be part of Moseley Ward as this makes sense in terms of community, identity and governance. It is a small number of people and will make no difference to electoral parity. A local boundary aims to keep communities and services together. Thus breaking up a cohesive community goes against Local Government guidelines. It will split our representation in the Council, thus ending unified Council Services in the area and potentially increasing costs. Already on the margins of several wards, we are concerned that our interests will be ignored and our access to funding limited unless we are included in a ward that reflects our political and social connections. Our affinity with Moseley has been partially recognised by placing half of Green Road B13 and Gracewell Road into the Moseley Ward. Keeping communities together makes a huge difference in terms of social cohesion, appropriate political representation and the effective use of limited resources both in terms of time and money. PLEASE DO NOT DIVIDE US. Sarehole Residents Association: The combined residents of Green Road, Burke Avenue and Keel Drive.
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Sarehole Residents Association: Photographs

Green Road looking downhill - the cottage on the left has been placed on Sparkhill Ward by the proposals while the houses on the right have been placed in Moseley Ward. The cottage is the former home of Mr Foster, who bequeathed the land for the Foster Trust and the area around Sarehole Mill, which are to the right of the photograph. Houses that are linked historically and socially have been divided by the Boundary Commission's proposals against the aim of community cohesion. The green space in the photograph is used for community events. There is no direct road access to Sparkhill from either end of Green Road.

Green Road looking uphill with the entrance to Burke Avenue (a cul-de-sac) on the right just past the cottage. The house on the left has been placed in Moseley Ward by the proposals, the cottage and houses on the left in Sparkhill Ward. The road is single track and barely 3.5 in width. The community clusters around the green space and is a small enclave of X houses that has an historical, cultural and political affiliation with Moseley. Dividing this community transgresses the aim of effective governance.

Keel Drive, a cul-de-sac, as it exits onto Green Rd. It has been placed in Sparkhill Ward by the Boundary Commission’s proposals. The hedge obscures a home on Green Rd. The house on the right, also on Green Rd, has been placed in Moseley Ward. The field in the background that leads to Sarehole Mill has been placed in Hall Green Ward. All three share cultural, historical and social connections and a B13 postcode.

The upper part of Green Road leading from the Wake Green Road. The left side has been placed in Sparkhill by the proposals. Gracewell Road turns right just below the parked car and leads to the Gracewell Homes and The Foster Trust. This has been placed in Moseley Ward by the proposals. The cottage previously owned by Mr Foster is in the far distance on the left side of the road. This area has a geographical and historical affiliation that is divided by the proposals.
Sarehole Residents Association: Photographic Evidence

Pulling together: We are a cohesive community comprising of households from diverse cultural heritages but who share a similar vision and outlook. Dividing this community in two transgresses the LGBCE's criteria regarding the need for wards to reflect communities and promote good governance. The community as a whole needs to be included into Moseley Ward as this properly represents our political and social affiliations and recognises the historical and geographical connections in the area.
Jubilee Celebrations:
The revised boundaries place the sign in Sparkhill Ward and the green area where the families are playing in Moseley Ward. The families come from both sides of the single track road that is barely 3.5 metres wide and shares a Moseley postcode B13.
Map 1: The black circle shows Eastern Area of Proposed Moseley Ward noted as an area of concern by Moseley Forum in their submission proposals for Moseley. This area is Green Road plus cul-de-sacs Keel Drive and Burke Avenue and 213 - 247 Wake Green Road.

Map 2: Blue dotted line marks Eastern Section Boundary proposed by the Moseley Communities of Sarehole Residents Association and Lower Wake Green Road Residents Group comprising Green Rd, Burke Avenue, Keel Drive and 213 - 247 Wake Green Road. This line stops the unnecessary division of cohesive communities and supports community development and effective governance.
Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum

June 9, 2016

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

Dear Sir or Madam

Re: Electoral Review of Birmingham: Further Draft Recommendations

Please find attached a submission from the Selly park South Neighbourhood Forum and Selly Park Garden Club to your recent invitation for comments on the above recommendations for the future changes to the electoral arrangements for the representation of the people of this area of Selly Oak to the Local Government of the City of Birmingham.

As will be see from the submission, our comments to the original draft did not seem to be noted but we have included the points in this current contribution and would hope that due attention will be paid to the factors identified.

We look forward to the early outcome to your consultation exercises & trust that the final result will serve the electorate as they deserve.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

J H Williams  Acting Chairman

Reply to:
Miss Jeanne Glenn, Hon. Secretary
Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum & Selly Park Garden Club

Response to the Further Draft Recommendations for the Electoral Review of Birmingham

Our contribution to the previous consultation exercise invitation dated 15th December 2015 was based on opinions from an Open Meeting to discuss the Local Government Boundary Commission’s documents for information submitted to a wide spread of interested parties in our local area. The persons present reflected all sections of our residential suburban area in southwest Birmingham. Our submission to this initial consultation seems to have been lost in the communication system as it did not appear in your published responses from the first consultation exercise. The various opinions have been further discussed by the Management Committee of the Neighbourhood Forum & our present submission is resultant upon these local discussions.

The overwhelming feeling of all the people in our area is a great sadness that the ‘Recommendations’ result in the disappearance of the historical identity of Selly Oak which has been a recognised community for more than a thousand years has been downgraded by your present recommendations to label Selly Oak secondary to Weoley in the title of the Ward. People identify their local area as a long respected mixed nature community attractive to all people in Birmingham and associated with its historical contributions to national life. The proposal to divide the presently accepted Selly Oak Ward into three areas with new titles is universally rejected by residents & others who live &/or work here. These proposals seem to have no relationship to the nature of the present communities other than considering the objective of establishing areas represented by 1 or a maximum of 2 City Councillors based upon a desktop estimate of the number of voters & take little consideration of the actual nature of the communities locally.

Should the recommendations be acted upon the overwhelming wish of people present in our meeting are that the Ward proposed & identified as area 11 labelled ‘Bournbrook & Selly Park’ with 2 Councillors be divided into 2 separate smaller areas labelled ‘Bournbrook’ & ‘Selly Park’ each with 1 Councillor. This would more reasonably reflect the representation & service that we get from our present Councillors. Our suggestion is based on personal experience of the services required by the essentially different natures of these areas & a possible domination of problems associated with the student-orientated nature of Bournbrook. The loss of the actual geographical centre of Selly Oak to ‘Weoley’ (73) & ‘Bournville & Cotteridge’ (12) also bears no relation to the actual relation of communities as they are presently & could be relieved by establishing another triangular Ward based around the historic crossroads at the centre of Selly Oak labelled ‘Selly Oak’ with 1 Councillor. This new Ward would be bounded by the new Selly Oak bypass road & the Lapal Canal cutting & crossing Gibbins Road to Lodge Hill Road to the south &
cross the A38 at the Selly Oak junction proceeding via Oak Tree Lane to Raddlebarn Road thence following Umberslade Road & the Bourne to meet the River Rea near the Pershore Road junction with Cartland Road & proceed to form a multiple junction with the Selly Park, Stitchley, Bournville & Cotteridge proposed Wards. Such an arrangement will actually reflect the real needs of the electorate in this area of Southwest Birmingham, an area that has a dynamic & economic importance to the future of Birmingham & the nation in the 21st century before us.

We trust that the Commission will see the relevance of this proposal to the day-to-day life of the people actually living in this area.

We trust the Commissioners to respect the wishes of the voters who have knowledge of their local environment & wish to be represented by their chosen local Councillor representatives in the local government of our home City & who will be expected to be familiar with the problems & needs of those who have elected them.

John Williams,

Chairman, on behalf of the Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum & Selly Park Garden Club respectively
Birmingham District
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We support the Sparkbrook ward boundaries
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Boundary Commission, Please find Supporting letter to support Sparkbrook Ward proposals attached Regards Siraaj Manir Secretary, Sparkbrook CIC
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RE: Birmingham Boundary Review

To whom it may concern

This now being Sparkbrook CiC’s 3rd submission and the boundaries for Sparkbrook widely supported, we hope that Boundary Commission has confidence that the residents of Sparkbrook approve the proposals set.

Again, we would like to echo previous submissions as consulted with the residents of Sparkbrook Ward and fully support the boundaries put forward by the review.

Regards

Siraaj Manir
Secretary, Sparkbrook CiC

Additional Sources,

Sparkbrook has a proud history that can be traced back over eight centuries, to 1275 AD
http://billdargue.jimdo.com/placenames-gazetteer-a-to-y/places-s/sparkbrook/

The first Parliamentary boundaries for Sparkbrook constituency were created in 1918 and Sparkbrook has continued to keep its identity to date.

There are many community groups working together which could be found here,
http://www.sparkbrook.org/

The Sparkbrook Neighbourhood area is known well, boundaries supported by Birmingham City Council (Farm Park and Sparkbrook North PN8)
To whom it may concern,

Attached are letters from several community groups that have entered statements as part of this submission, they demonstrate the success that your proposals have had in maintaining community identities.

Kind Regards
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

To The Local Government Boundary Commission,

Dear Sir or Madam,

Proposals for new Birmingham City Council ward boundaries in Erdington

The purpose of any local authority boundaries should be the fair representation of the communities within that authority. In a city as wonderfully diverse as Birmingham, and especially in Erdington, this is a task as challenging as it is important.

As I hope you will see, the variety of the community groups and interests that have entered statements as part of this submission demonstrate the success that your proposals have had in maintaining community identities. Not only does this ensure the fair, representative democracy of Birmingham City Council but it strengthens those communities – a goal that should always be to the forefront.

The reduction in the number of councillors from 120 to 101 was always going to lead to contentious decisions being made but we, the community groups of Erdington, are committed to ensuring that the reduction does not lead to a weakening of community identities. Contained in the submission are the individual motivations for our support for your proposals. Collectively these statements are testament to our determination to maintain these identities, which are held in such high esteem. Taken together they represent the bond that we, as proud Brummies, have in our desire for a better, fairer, stronger Birmingham.

Furthermore, we have updated our submissions based on your most recent proposals.

Yours sincerely,
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington
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The Rev Gerard Goshawk, Erdington Baptist Church

TYBURN

I am extremely pleased that the Tyburn Ward has remained unchanged from the previous proposal and wish to re-convey my thoughts on the proposed Tyburn Ward.

This is the area in which I live and I feel that it makes sense to combine the three communities of Birches Green, Erdington Hall and the Limes (where I live). This makes sense to me. Gravelly Hill and Gravelly Hill North between Stockland Green and the Kingsbury Road is a sensible boundary as is the boundary between Erdington and Tyburn, because Birches Green and Erdington Hall are very similar communities with similar needs, so should be in the same ward.

Yours Faithfully

Rev. Gerrard Goshawk
Erdington Baptist Church
Dear Sir/Madam,

As chair of local sports club Erin go Bragh, I think the current proposals make a lot of sense. The club is based on the Erdington area and the Chester Road provides a widely recognised boundary with the Pitts Farm Estate, being seen as distinctly different and understandably part of Pype Hayes. The Kingsbury Road also separates the distinct community of Birches Green.

I currently reside in Stockland Green ward and understand, the logic behind it’s boundaries. Having been a resident for many years I feel part of the Stockland Green Community and recognise it being built around the Green with Gravelly Hill North, six ways, Summer Road, the cross city line and Short Heath Road acting as boundaries. This plan also keeps many of the great Stockland Green community groups together.

I hope this issue can be swiftly sorted so that the city and concentrate on far more important issues.

Yours sincerely

Dennis Neenan
Dear Commissioner,

The residents of Stockland Green that worship at the Slade Road Mosque are happy to endorse your proposal. We love living in such a multicultural Ward, where we can work together with people from different backgrounds across our great Stockland Green community.

Best Wishes

Khalid Mahmood
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to confirm the support of CVCHA for the proposed one-member Castle Vale Ward, in the way in which it has been drawn. I feel that the proposed Ward reflects the community ties and boundaries of Castle Vale very precisely.

Your report stated that the proposed Castle Vale would provides a ward based on clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a strong reflection of community ties. At CVCHA, as stated earlier, we agree with your assessment and endorse the boundaries you have proposed.

Best Wishes
Peter Richmond
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Ray Goodwin, Chief Executive Castle Vale Tenants and Residents Association

To whom it may concern,

I wish to reiterate my previous comments to the Boundary Commission about the proposed Castle Vale Ward.

Castle Vale Tenants and Residents Association feel that the one member ward of Castle Vale drafted by the Local Boundary Commission reflects the community ties and boundaries of Castle Vale very accurately.

Castle Vale has developed a lot in recent years as a local community. Castle Vale is now a distinctive place to live with an obvious community identity that the residents and I are very proud to have helped shape and improve.

The physical boundaries of Sutton Coldfield to the east, the A38 to the north and the authority boundary to the south combined with the community identity of the residents in Castle Vale result in the Castle Vale Tenants and Residents Association fully endorsing the new proposed ward.

Kind Regards
Ray Goodwin
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Felicia Grice, Project Manager Kingstanding Food Community

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for making available information regarding the proposed new arrangements for ward boundaries.

I’d like to confirm my support for the boundary commission proposal to make the Kingstanding ward a 2 councillor area.

I feel that this proposal would reflect the strong local identity of Kingstanding, which has become evident to me while working in the area over many years, and would serve to enhance a sense of belonging and community cohesion.

I am always happy to share my views and experiences of working with local people.

Please feel free to share my contact details.

Kind regards

Felicia
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Lee Parks, Spade, Hammer and Pen Society for the Afro-Caribbean Community

To whom this may concern,

I am writing to you, as the Chair of the Spade, Hammer and Pen Society in Stockland Green and am happy to say that I think you have done a very good job in your proposal at keeping the Stockland Green Community in Stockland Green together.

I know that you have made a minor change to the Boundary from the previous submission, but am very happy to support the current proposal as it keeps the Stockland Green Ward together. Our society is an African Caribbean society based on Slade Road and we very much feel a part of Stockland Green and have done for many years and would like to continue being part of this large and accepting community.

Best Wishes

Lee Parks
Dear Sir/Madam,

As the Reverend for St Mary’s Church Pype Hayes I was very happy that a Pype Hayes Ward has been created. Pype Hayes is a brilliant community and your proposal realises that.

It brings together the Pitts Farm Estate with Pype Hayes, which in my mind is very sensible because we all use Pype Hayes Park regularly, particularly in the summer and this brings us all together.

I thought I should reconfirm my support for your proposals as I know that alternative arrangements have been suggested and this is by far the best.

You have my support.

Reverend Nigel Traynor
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Harry French, Head Teacher Greenwood Academy

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of the families at Greenwood Academy I fully support the boundary for the Castle Vale Ward as proposed in the Boundary Commission report.

Castle Vale has, over the past several years, established a vibrant and united community. The families have formalised and tightened the community bond of our residents.

It is important that our community is represented strongly at City Council and, furthermore, the natural boundary of main roads and the M6 mean that the proposed ward fits well. As a result I fully support the changes that have been proposed.

Kind Regards
Harry French
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Linda Hines, Chair Witton Lodge Community Association

To whom it may concern

As an organisation (Witton Lodge Community Association) we are writing to indicate our support for the boundaries of three of your proposed wards: Kingstanding, Perry Common and Stockland Green. We would also like to thank you for agreeing to our suggestion that all of Witton Lakes should be within the Stockland Green Ward.

The proposed Perry Common Ward, subject to the mentioned minor change, combines the three communities of Perry Common, Wyrley Birch and the New Oscott Estate. All three of the communities engage in work with us at Witton Lodge Community Association, which binds the communities together, as well as the work of other community groups. All of the communities are well defined and have defined boundaries that have be respected by your submission.

We agree with your proposals for the proposed Stockland Green, as it builds the ward around the 'green', keeps the community who identify as living in Stockland Green together and also keeps the green corridor between Brookvale Park and Witton Lakes together. The ward also has the Ward Advisory Board, which many different community groups in Stockland Green are a part of and work well together across the whole of the proposed Ward.

Finally on the Kingstanding Ward, the boundary with the Perry Common Ward along the College Road makes complete sense, as it provides a natural barrier between the community of Kingstanding and the communities in Perry Common. Your ward boundary also makes sense, at it unifies the Bandywood Estate, a historic part of the old Kingstanding estate back with Kingstanding.

In Summary we agree with your proposals, as they best represent community identity.

Regards

Linda Hines
Dear Sir/Madam,

As managing director of Thoughts of Others, a company providing schools and homes for vulnerable children, I deal with families and communities across the city. Having looked at the whole city proposals, they represent the communities well using recognised natural and man-made boundaries.

The main focus of my business is within the Erdington Constituency, based within two wards – Erdington and Stockland Green. The current proposals in this area fit well with the communities I understand.

Our new school on Station Road is situated within the Erdington Ward, which is where it currently sits. Summer Lane, Station Road, The Cross City Line and the Short Heath Road make suitable boundaries between the Erdington and Stockland Green Wards. The proposals for both wards maintain the community identity and integrity of each Ward, particularly the proposed Stockland Green Ward.

Yours sincerely

Jim Sullivan
Managing Director
Thoughts of Others – schools and homes for vulnerable children
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Tom Truman, Training and Employability Officer YMCA

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to you again to confirm my support for the proposed Stockland Green Ward, as it is drawn.

I have worked for the YMCA in Stockland Green for four years and have attended many community events across the entire ward. I have seen first-hand the way the Stockland Green community pulls together for the good of all residents within the Ward.

I would like this to go forward to the consultation

Yours faithfully

Tom Truman
Dear Sir or Madam

I would like to comment on the recent proposals regarding the Ward Boundary of the Stockland Green Ward.

I live on Marsh Hill and regularly use the Post Office on the Green. I also do some wonderful food shopping on Slade Road. I use Gravelly Hill Railway Station to get to my job in the City Centre.

My eldest daughter is a student at Stockland Green Secondary School and my youngest daughter goes to Brookville Primary School.

I think that it is sensible that the areas above are to remain in the Stockland Green Ward as, although diverse areas, they are one community based around The Green.

I Hope that the issues that I have raised will be taken into account when a final decision is made.

Yours faithfully
Collette Elliot (Ms)
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Olusegun Dosumu, BUACK Kingstanding African Community Organisation

To whom this may concern,

My name is Olusegun Dosumu. I am the chair of Governors at Christ the King Primary School, Chair of the BUACK Kingstanding African Community Organisation and a long time resident of the current Kingstanding Ward residing on Sidcup Road. I am a proud resident of Kingstanding and am very pleased with the boundary commission proposals for the area I live in and care about.

I am most pleased that the Bandywood Estate has been reunited with Kingstanding, its natural home. When the original estate of Kingstanding was built the Bandywood was a part of it and a previous boundary review broke this connection, but your plan rectifies this. Reuniting Communities is part of your remit and this is exactly what you have done.

I fully support your proposals.

Yours Faithfully

Olusegun Dosumu
Dear Commissioner

I would like to re-register my approval regarding the proposed boundary changes for Kingstanding. I was pleased to find out that your revised map of Birmingham kept Kingstanding as it was. As Head Teacher at Twickenham Road School it makes sense to make College Road the Kingstanding Ward boundary. Clearly the creation of a new Perry Common Ward on the other side of the College Road is a sensible move. I note that the Bandywood Estate which was part of the original Kingstanding estate when built has returned home.

I support the proposals which create relevant communities and hope that they go through without amendment.

Yours faithfully

Helen Mortiboy
Alison Foden, Manager Home Start

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to support the proposals regarding the boundary changes as they are currently stated. Having worked out of Slade School for many years it is clear the community regards itself as part of Stockland Green. There are a plethora of community associations that have sprung up in the areas that are part of the Stockland Green Ward Advisory Board that my organisation is a member and it would make sense to keep as much of the existing Stockland Green Ward in place as is possible. Keeping the historic green in the centre of the ward, the proposed boundaries are locally recognised with many families of Stockland Green shopping locally and using amenities within the Ward. Gravelly Hill North also acts as a natural barrier between Stockland Green and Erdington Hall, found in the Tyburn Ward.

Now based at Six Ways Baptist Church, in the Erdington Ward is logically based around the High Street, which is seen as a local centre. Six Ways has always been a natural junction between Erdington and Stockland Green and the people we support recognise this.

Kind Regards

Alison Foden
Manager – Home Start
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Kei-retta Farrell, Kingstanding Students

Dear Electoral Commissioner

I live on Hartley Road and am currently studying at Warwick University. I am pleased that the proposal for Kingstanding Ward remains as it was and therefore support it. Any change that emphasises the natural communities of Kingstanding have to be supported and I believe your proposals do this more than adequately.

Yours sincerely

Kei-Retta Farrell
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Rick Savage, Ex British Army Sergeant Major

Dear Sir/Madam,

For three years I’ve had the privilege of living in the Erdington Constituency, Stockland Green ward. Stockland Green has a very strong identity of good working class folk who love their local community, therefore it is imperative that this community continues to flourish.

As an ex-soldier, I know how important it is to get things done right.

I believe the new boundary changes will secure these strong community identities. I am extremely impressed with the proposed new boundaries, they reflect our community identities in Stockland Green and keep the fantastic community together.

Finally, I would like to confirm my support for these proposed changes.

Best wishes.
Rick Savage
Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington

Margaret Goodwin, Warren Farm School

Dear Commissioner,

I am writing to give my support for the new boundaries for the Kingstanding ward, which our school lies in.

I am particularly pleased that the Bandywood estate is being returned to the Kingstanding ward. It is undoubtedly felt to be a part of our local community and it is only right and proper that we share Local Government representation. Both our school and our nearby schools have pupils from across the Kingstanding ward, which itself helps create a community identity, so I am pleased to see that large residential areas and communities are not being broken up simply to fit into convenient political mathematics.

It is always welcome to see the recognition of local people and local groups when making decisions like this and so I urge you to listen to our voices and keep Kingstanding united.

Yours sincerely,
Margaret Goodwin
Head Teacher
Warren Farm School
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: David Jeffery
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Still Waters Community

Comment text:

I am the Chairman of the Still Waters (Wood Lane's name until Victorian times) Community in Harborne representing residents of the following roads - Wood Lane, Elm Tree Road, Woodville Road and parts of Wentworth and Court Oak Roads. We sent a submission that we should return to Harborne Ward - that submission was briefly based on the contention that we were part of Harborne, and always had been until, for political electoral purposes we were move into Quinton. For all other aspects of life we remain in Harborne - shops, churches, schools, businesses, postal address/code, We all feel that we are part of the Harborne community and wish to be represented by a Councillor who represents Harborne's interests. The current recommendation/submission by the Council would achieve our goal and we would support that - we believe that this is also supported by other local interest groups - the Harborne Society, the Beech Lanes Forum and the Labour Party - I speak to many local residents and have never encountered any who do not support the return to Harborne Ward - indeed a surprising number of local residents had no idea that we were part of Quinton Ward! These comments follow on from our original submission. We are pleased that in the current proposals favour our views. At the the risk of being repetetive I attach as a document our original submission forwarded to you by our then Secretary Eric Deeson. David Jeffery, 14th June 2016
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Download
SUBMISSION TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION

New Council Wards for Birmingham

September 2015

We are the Still Waters Community in Harborne, incorporating Wood Lane, Elm Tree Road, Woodville Road, the western end of Wentworth Road and adjacent parts of Court Oak Road. The area is mainly residential but surrounds the Queen Alexandra College Campus, Focus, associated organisations and Queen Mother Gardens sheltered housing scheme. Our name derives from the fact that Wood Lane was originally called Still Waters Lane. Our mission is to share local news, and discuss local issues with local residents. We have been in existence for about 18 months and hold regular quarterly meetings to which all residents are invited and many attend.

Residents are concerned that Birmingham City Council now classes our area as Quinton and this has been the case since the last time that the Ward Boundaries were altered, we believe in about 2002. In canvassing opinion for this submission it was apparent that many residents had no idea that the City Council now classes us as Quinton. In all other respects the area
covered by our group is in Harborne and always has been - one resident was born in Wood Lane over 80 years ago and there are many residents who have lived in the roads for over 40 years, all consider themselves Harbornites. We acknowledge that communities change over time and perceptions can vary between individuals as to the nature of those ties, however, we would submit that the community to which we belong is as strong now as it ever was and nothing that has happened recently has changed that.

We welcome the opportunity to "have our say on new council and ward boundaries". We note that the Commission aims to ensure that the new council wards reflect, as far as possible, the interests and identities of communities across Birmingham. We are also pleased that you will take into account local community identities.

We have spoken to local residents in our area and it is fair to say that the majority feel that our local community is Harborne. As mentioned above some had no idea that the Council now lists this as Quinton.

1. Our postal address and Post Code is Harborne "B17, BIRMINGHAM, Harborne, Birmingham." - Wikipedia
2. Our Shopping centre is Harborne High Street
3. For many, if not most, of our Christians, our parishes are Harborne
4. For most of our children, our local schools are Harborne
5. The Queen Alexandra College describe themselves as being in Harborne
6. The Headquarters of the Harborne Parish Lands Charity is in Wood Lane
7. Our telephone codes are "0121 427 (HAR) xxxx" - Harborne
8. Many of us belong to and are active in the Harborne Society
9. Look up Harborne on Google - Wikipedia map shows this area as Harborne
10. Estate Agents refer to the roads we represent as being in Harborne - Zoopla - "House prices in Wood Lane, Harborne, Birmingham B17 9AY".

11. Businesses in our area describe themselves as being in Harborne - e.g. Harborne Chiropractic Clinic.

In short we belong to Harborne - the Village atmosphere is an important part of living here and we are part of that local community. We feel that our elected representative should be representing our interests as members of the "local community of Harborne" in which we reside and not the one up the road!

To answer the specific points raised in the News Release of 21st July:

- We believe that the ward boundary between Quinton and Harborne should be returned to the pre-2002 situation resulting in our part of Harborne being recognised as such for local government purposes as well as all others,
- As is, hopefully, apparent from what has been said above we identify our local community as Harborne - which is where we live.
- Local facilities, shops, banks, farmer's market etc. are in Harborne as are leisure facilities such as the swimming pool and fitness centre.

If you require any further information about our organisation or any of the information set out above then please contact our Chairman whose details are set out above.

David Jeffery - Wood Lane

Eric Deeson - Woodville Road

Lincoln Boffey - Wentworth Road

Lillian Hands - Elm Tree Road
Christine Braithwaite - Wood Lane

Peter Worrall - Wood Lane

The Steering Committee of the Still Waters Community - 20th September 2015
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Alison Moore
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: St Paul's Community Development Trust

Comment text:

As a Children's Centre providing services in Sparkbrook Ward and Balsall Heath Neighbourhood we are extremely concerned about the proposed plans to divide our neighbourhood in two up Moseley Road A435, and put Balsall Heath Park into Moseley ward. As one of the first local Sure Start Programmes in the country and having achieved Outstanding status from Ofsted twice (in September 2014 the only Children's centre group in the West Midlands and only 3 in the country) we can confidently say this decision will have significant detrimental affect on how families access services. There is a natural neighbourhood with long standing partnerships across statutory and Private/voluntary sector that have all contributed to making the services accessible and designed to meet families needs. Families have developed Trust in organisations/partners and services built up over many years and these boundary changes will affect how partners and organisations can integrate their work. WE have been recognised nationally for our work with families and under 5s and the positive outcomes families are making.
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None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Gill Coffin
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: St Paul's Community Development Trust

Comment text:

I am the chair of the Trustees of St Paul’s Community Development Trust, which has as its mission “To work for and with the community in Balsall Heath and nearby areas to help secure better opportunities and quality of life for all”. We have been working in Balsall Heath for 40 years, covering the community on both sides of Moseley Road. We are very concerned about the proposal to divide our community between two wards, along the Moseley Road (A345). The community of Balsall Heath centres on Moseley Road – using the library, swimming baths, shops, and restaurants. We have contributed to the regeneration of Balsall Heath alongside other local organisations, and are proud that our diverse community is now much more prosperous than it was 40 years ago, and that we are able to work together across religious and ethnic differences. Alongside the people of Balsall Heath, local organisations, Councillors, and public services, we have contributed to the ground-breaking Balsall Heath Neighbourhood Plan. That Plan needs to continue to be the focus of one ward. A huge amount of work has gone into creating the Balsall Heath we know today. Dividing it between two wards will undermine that work, and make co-operation with public services and with local Councillors more complex. We therefore hope that the small Balsall Heath Ward of 8,000 electors, as proposed in your draft recommendations, can be expanded to embrace the whole neighbourhood, as it has always been defined. Gill Coffin Chair of Trustees St. Paul’s Community Development Trust
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To the Local Government Boundary Commission for England

Proposals for Ward Boundaries in Birmingham – Balsall Heath, Sparkbrook and Moseley

I am the chair of the Trustees of St Paul’s Community Development Trust, which has as its mission “To work for and with the community in Balsall Heath and nearby areas to help secure better opportunities and quality of life for all”. We have been working in Balsall Heath for 40 years, covering the community on both sides of Moseley Road.

We are very concerned about the proposal to divide our community between two wards, along the Moseley Road (A345). The community of Balsall Heath centres on Moseley Road – using the library, swimming baths, shops, and restaurants.

We have contributed to the regeneration of Balsall Heath alongside other local organisations, and are proud that our diverse community is now much more prosperous than it was 40 years ago, and that we are able to work together across religious and ethnic differences. Alongside the people of Balsall Heath, local organisations, Councillors, and public services, we have contributed to the groundbreaking Balsall Heath Neighbourhood Plan. That Plan needs to continue to be the focus of one ward.

A huge amount of work has gone into creating the Balsall Heath we know today. Dividing it between two wards will undermine that work, and make co-operation with public services and with local Councillors more complex.

We therefore hope that the small Balsall Heath Ward of 8,000 electors, as proposed in your draft recommendations, can be expanded to embrace the whole neighbourhood, as it has always been defined.

Gill Coffin
Chair of Trustees
St. Paul’s Community Development Trust
Dear Sir

Please find attached the response to your 3rd stage of consultation on behalf of Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group.

Yours sincerely
Paul Long

On behalf of Ken Rushton, Chair of SCIRG
Stage 3 Review of SCIRG Submission

Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents’ Group is impressed with how LGBCE have conducted this consultation and have provided a 3rd stage based on feedback, particularly in other areas of Birmingham. In general, we are very happy with the proposals made by LGBCE for Sutton Coldfield and we are again very pleased to see that the views of Sutton Coldfield’s Residents have been taken on board when preparing the boundary review. We can again see that there are considerable similarities between our proposal and that put forward by LGBCE.

Our previous submission supported a proposal by Sutton Coldfield Conservative Association for an 11th councillor in Sutton Coldfield. Our argument was based on there being a need for 10.4 councillors based on the average electorate of 8,000 per councillor. We understand that LGBCE have rounded this down to 10 and accept that on two occasions LGBCE have made it clear that there will be 10 councillors in Sutton Coldfield. We are therefore continuing on that assumption. If LGBCE do decide that there should be 11 councillors, then we would like you to follow our 11 councillor option in our previous submission.

We are aware that the Sutton Coldfield Conservatives have pushed through a motion at the new Sutton Coldfield Town Council to form a working group to establish a proposal for 11 councillors in Sutton Coldfield. This was a motion tabled by a Conservative City Councillor who is also a Town Councillor. As an independent residents’ group, we wish to make it clear that this is a political motivation and has nothing to do with the desires of residents. Residents are happy to settle for 10 councillors. The Conservative group simply want to increase their representation on Birmingham City Council. We do not consider it the role of a Town Council to argue for 11 City Councillors and it is only because the Conservative group have a majority of 18 out of 24 councillors that this motion was passed at Town Council. We have put considerable work into consulting with residents and have provided lots of evidence as to why boundaries should be in specific locations. Therefore, we would see a last minute change to 11 councillors to be unsatisfactory as the boundaries would not reflect the natural communities of Sutton Coldfield.

Taking the LGBCE recommendations in turn, these are the opinions of residents under the umbrella of Sutton Coldfield Residents’ Group:

**Sutton Four Oaks**
We are happy with the southern part of Sutton Park being part of the Vesey and Trinity wards as per the evidence we submitted.

We are happy with the west part of Mere Green shopping centre to the east of the railway line on Belwell Lane being included in the Mere Green Ward as this keeps the shopping community together in a single ward.

**Sutton Mere Green**
We are happy with the west part of Mere Green shopping centre to the east of the railway line on Belwell Lane being included in the Mere Green Ward as this keeps the shopping community together in a single ward.
We originally suggested that Little Sutton Lane should be in a single ward and we are happy that this has been implemented. Ideally it would have been in Mere Green ward, but we acknowledge that there is a number issue with the Roughly ward already being much larger and so we accept the boundary being drawn to the east of Little Sutton Lane.

**Sutton Reddicap**

We accept that there may have been some submissions different to ours that may have requested the roads off Blakemore Drive be in the Roughley ward and so we are happy to accept that the roads north of Rectory Road are not within Reddicap ward but within Roughley ward. Those properties do also have vehicular access to the Whitehouse Common area via Sentry Way and so there is a good argument for them to be in the Roughley Ward. This should also solve the problem raised by the Sutton Coldfield Conservative Association who suggested it was necessary to have an 11th councillor for Whitehouse Common and we believe that this change now means the 11th councillor is no longer needed. It will also mean that other communities are not divided up by trying to create a ward simply to have an 11th councillor.

We notice that with the line along Rectory Road, St George’s Close is a bit out on a limb. Although its back gardens are joined with back gardens in the Roughley Ward, its vehicular access is into Reddicap ward and so we would propose that St George’s Close remains within the Reddicap ward because its shared community is with Reddicap. The area highlighted in yellow should be in Reddicap ward.

We recognise you have tried to keep all properties on both sides of Rectory Road within the Reddicap boundary, but we can see that there are 4 properties that have slipped the net and have their access drive from Rectory Road but have been included in the Roughley. A satellite view is shown together with yellow highlights recommending the properties we believe should be within Reddicap ward. On the satellite image, the arrow points to the access drive.
**Sutton Roughley**
We have already commented on Little Sutton Lane and Rectory Road above.

We are happy with both sides of Bedford Road being part of Trinity ward as per the evidence we submitted.

**Sutton Trinity**
We are happy that this ward will now be named Sutton Trinity per the evidence we submitted.

We have commented on Bedford Road, Beeches Walk, Driffield, Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls, Maney Hill Road and Sutton Park in other areas of this document.
**Sutton Vesey**
We are happy with a single ward covering the Boldmere, Banners Gate and New Oscott communities as per the evidence we submitted.

We are happy with the southern part of Sutton Park being part of the Vesey ward as per the evidence we submitted.

**Sutton Walmley & Minworth**
We are happy with Bishop Walsh Catholic School being included in the Wylde Green ward as per the evidence we submitted. However, in drawing the boundary line, you have cut across the school’s playing fields. Could the school’s playing fields please be included within Wylde Green ward too. Area shaded in yellow to be included in Wylde Green ward.

**Sutton Wylde Green**
We are happy with Bishop Walsh Catholic School being included in this ward as per the evidence we submitted. However, in drawing the boundary line, you have cut across the school’s playing fields. Could the school’s playing fields please be included within Wylde Green ward too. Area shaded in yellow to be included in Wylde Green ward.

We are happy with the inclusion of both sides of Maney Hill Road in this ward as per the evidence we submitted.

We are happy that both sides of The Driffield is now in a single ward as per the evidence we submitted.

We are happy that Beeches Walk is now in the Trinity ward as per the evidence we submitted.

We would recommend that Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls is included in Wylde Green ward as its entrance is onto the Jockey Road which is opposite Goldieslie Road. There are many concerns with parking in the area by parents and no stopping restrictions have been put in place on Jockey Road and Goldieslie Road in order to alleviate this. It is more likely that residents from Wylde Green will want meetings with the school and so it would be appropriate that a single councillor covers both the school and residents in order for effective governance. Area shaded in yellow to be in Wylde Green ward.
ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS FROM SCIRG

**Vesey / Trinity – Somerville Road**

In our previous submission, we provided evidence that at a meeting of the Boldmere and Vesey North neighbourhood forums, there were over 20 votes against Somerville Road being included in Vesey ward because it was felt it belonged more in the town centre / Trinity area. Similarly Digby Road, joining The Driffold has more shared facilities with Trinity than it does with Vesey Ward. The average electorate per councillor for Vesey is 7,970 and Trinity is 7,335. We therefore maintain our suggestion that both sides of the Somerville Road and roads to the east of it be part of Trinity Ward. Area shaded yellow to be in Trinity Ward.

**Walmley / Reddicapp – New Hall Valley**

As per our original submission, the area highlighted in yellow is part of the New Hall Valley. The rest of the New Hall Valley is within the Sutton Walmley and Minworth wards and so it would make sense in terms of governance of the area that this part of the New Hall Valley is also within Walmley & Minworth ward. The New Hall Valley links to New Hall hotel to the east and New Hall Mioll to the south and then continues further to the south of Wylde Green Road all the way through to Pype Hayes Park in Pype Hayes ward.
**Wylde Green / Walmley – New Hall Valley**
LGBCE have followed a water course for this boundary but this has now split the New Hall Valley nature reserve. The railway line is a more natural border as to the west of the railway line is a golf course and to the east is the New Hall Valley. The area highlighted in yellow on the map should be in Sutton Walmley & Minworth as otherwise it is a part of the New Hall Valley that is completely isolated and not accessed from Wylde Green, but from Walmley & Minworth.

**Reddicap / Walmley & Minworth – Ox Leys Road Area**
The map to the right has 3 arrows which indicate where there are properties in the Walmley & Minworth Ward which have a far more natural community with Reddicap ward.

1. Properties off Springfield Road opposite Langley Hall Road which have no link to Walmley.
2. Old Langley Hall accessed by Ox Leys Road which connects to Reddicap via Reddicap Heath Road.
3. Langley Park House as 2 above.
4. Brookhurst Farm accessed from Lindridge Road which links onto Reddicap Ward but then goes onto North Warwickshire so there is no link at all with Walmley.

We recommend that the yellow area be part of Reddicap ward for community reasons and that the A38 and Ox Leys Roads are used as natural boarders. Numbers 1 and 4 above are far more critical than 2 and 3. Satellite images are shown below.
1

2 and 3

4
Reddicap / Walmley & Minworth – Reddicap Heath Road

The map below shows properties to the south of Reddicap Heath Road that have been included in Walmley & Minworth. We would recommend that the boundary would fall more naturally along the back of gardens for Walmley & Minworth as properties on opposite sides of Reddicap Heath Road have a shared community in terms of the 2 secondary schools, the recreation ground, Falcon Lodge Chapel, the Anvil Pub and local shops at the junction with Ox Leys Road. The only access from Reddicap Heath Road to the Walmley & Minworth ward is via the island at Ox Leys Road. We recommend therefore that the yellow highlighted area below be included in Sutton Reddicap Ward.
Four Oaks / Mere Green – Four Oaks Railway Station

The arrow below points to Four Oaks Railway Station. As per our previous submission, it is a major commuter station and access to it is from Station Drive. The LGBCE proposal suggests putting half the station in Mere Green and half the station in Four Oaks. It makes sense that the station be in Four Oaks. We can see there is a case for the flats to the East of the station to be in Mere Green rather than Four Oaks due to their access road being in Mere Green. We can also see the railway line would normally be a natural boundary, but in this case would strongly request that the station itself be within the Four Oaks ward as this is where it is accessed from. It also makes sense that Four Oaks station should be within Four Oaks ward. The satellite image below shows where we would suggest the boundary lies and we recommend that the yellow highlighted area on the LGBCE map below be included in Four Oaks ward.
Roughley
As this ward covers areas of Roughley, Whitehouse Common and Harvest Fields, we would recommend naming it Sutton Moor Hall so as to encompass all areas rather than just the northern part of the ward which is named Roughley.

Greenbelt Development
We ask that LGBCE be mindful that there are 6,000 homes planned in the Walmley & Minworth ward that will be built on Greenbelt Land to the East of Springfield Road and Webster Way. This development goes until 2031. As these homes are developed, a further review of this ward will be necessary, although there is no need in the period to 2021.

Sutton Coldfield Parish Council Proposals
We previously submitted that the Parish Council boundaries need to be reviewed. LGBCE’s proposals for Parish Councillors include a proposal for 24 councillors representing 8 wards (10 city councillors). This number of 24 has been arrived at by following the reorganisation order by Birmingham City Council which the Steering Group for the Town Council has been advised is temporary until a review by LGBCE. Birmingham City Council have never provided a coherent justification for the number 24 but SCIRG has been happy to accept the number of 24 based on the original warding arrangements of 4 wards with 6 parish councillors per ward in order to get the town council off the ground for elections in 2016. The local governance review was therefore based on OLD data for the old pattern of 4 wards. Although Birmingham could conduct another governance review, it would make more sense for the boundaries for Parish wards to be decided by LGBCE.

This arrangement of 24 councillors does not work in the long-term for elections from 2018. This works out at 2.4 councillors per community / city councillor which clearly is not practical. The proposals from LGBCE include the following number of councillors per ward and calculations show how disproportionate the representation each councillor has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Parish Councillors</th>
<th>City Councillors</th>
<th>Electorate 2021</th>
<th>Electorate per Parish Councillor 2021</th>
<th>Compared with Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Oaks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8129</td>
<td>4065</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8524</td>
<td>4262</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddicap</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8133</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8814</td>
<td>2938</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8274</td>
<td>4137</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15940</td>
<td>3188</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmley &amp; Minworth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16891</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylde Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8123</td>
<td>4062</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the number of residents each parish councillor would have to represent ranges from 2938 to 4262 which is -25% to 19% from the average. Based on an acceptable level of 10% from the average, this is unworkable with 24 Parish councillors.
We therefore recommend that there are 20 Parish councillors with 2 councillors per ward (except Walmley & Minworth and Vesey where there would be 4). What we definitely want to see are small wards representing local communities and therefore we are reasonably happy with the proposal for 8 wards. However, there are opportunities for further separation of the wards into smaller Parish wards which could include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Ward</th>
<th>20 Parish Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vesey</strong></td>
<td>LGBCE’s original proposal for Boldmere ward to be named Boldmere and to have 2 Parish Councillors. Within LGBCE’s original proposal for Banners Gate ward, approximately East and West of Avery Road. West to be named Banners Gate and East to be named New Oscott.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four Oaks</strong></td>
<td>North of Belwell Lane to be named Bracebridge and South of Belwell Lane to be named Doe Bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maney</strong></td>
<td>West of the A5127 and shopping centre to be named Plantsbrook and East of A5127 including shopping centre to be named Sutton Town Centre or Maney or Trinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mere Green</strong></td>
<td>Approximately South of Gibbons Road, Sherifoot Lane and Holy Lane to be named Mere Green. North to be named Hill Hook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reddicap</strong></td>
<td>East of B4148 and North of Reddicap Heath Road to be named Falcon Lodge or St Chads. Remainder to be named Rectory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roughley</strong></td>
<td>North west of Weeford Road to be Roughly. Remainder to be Whitehouse Common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walmley &amp; Minworth</strong></td>
<td>North West of A38 to be named Thimble End. Area shown in yellow on map below to be named Walmley Village and to have 2 Parish Councillors. Remaining area to East of Pype Hayes Golf Course and south west of railway line through to East of the city ward to be named Minworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wylde Green</strong></td>
<td>Approximately South of Kempson Avenue and South East of Green Lanes to be named Wylde Green Centre and area north to be named St Peter’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of these parish ward boundaries should separate roads along the middle but should separate by gardens and include cul-de-sacs on opposite sides of roads where appropriate.

Considering the fact that the original boundary review did NOT include Sutton Coldfield Parish Wards and in order to provide further consultation with residents, we would highly recommend that an initial proposal for Parish Wards including maps and exact number of councillors with number of electorate per councillor be put forward by LGBCE. **There should then be another 8 week period of consultation for residents of Sutton Coldfield to feedback on the proposals for Parish wards on the understanding that city wards have at that point been fixed and confirmed.** These proposals can then be considered by residents.

We would also ask LGBCE to evaluate the number of residents per councillor in other large parish councils and the number of councillors likely to be required for standard committees so that a justification can be given as to the number of councillors required for Sutton Coldfield.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sarah Edwards
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: The Chamberlain Highbury Trust

Comment text:

The Chamberlain Highbury Trust are pleased with the draft recommendations following the initial consultation and our submission to the consultation. Originally our Trust would have been split across 3 wards and now under the revised proposals will remain in the Moseley Ward. We look forward to the outcome which we hope will not deviate from the present draft which is being considered up until 20th June. We look forward to the outcome in September 2016.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Please find attached the response from The Moseley Society in support of the Combined Moseley Community response submitted by David Isgrove

Fiona Adams
Secretary, The Moseley Society
Dear Review Officer,

I am writing on behalf of the Moseley Society to support the proposed two-councillor Moseley Ward and to thank you for taking account of the representations from people who live in Moseley. We believe that if a few very minor amendments can be made, the proposed new Moseley Ward will:

- Meet the electoral equality criteria
- Reflect community identity and will also
- Provide for effective and convenient local government.

The minor amendments that we hope can be made to the proposed Moseley Ward have been set out in the response from the Combined Community Groups of Moseley submitted by David Isgrove.

In the east we ask for the inclusion in Moseley Ward of 213-247 Wake Green Road and also of both sides of Green Road and the two cul-de-sacs off it – Burke Avenue and Keel Drive. We support the cases put forward by both groups of residents. One day there should be a Blue Plaque on 245 Wake Green Road in honour of Joy Fifer who ‘saved Moseley Bog’ and in the process started the urban wildlife movement.

We do not think it will provide for effective and convenient local government if half of Green Road and the two cul-de-sacs are excluded. The people living there will have to go into Moseley Ward when they go to vote and ward based services such as refuse collection will want to treat this area as part of the new Moseley Ward and deal with the bins on both sides of the road, and the cul-de-sacs off it, in one operation. The ford across Green Road provides an unusual natural barrier but the centre of Green Road is a far from natural barrier.

Not many households are involved but the people definitely identify with and feel that they all live in Moseley.

In the north we see that instead of dividing polling district DDD in order to include the parts of that area where residents definitely think they are in Moseley, you have chosen to include the whole of DDD into the new Moseley...
Ward. However this means that several roads with B12 postcodes where residents identify with Balsall Heath, and also Balsall Heath Park, have been put into the new Moseley Ward. Other polling districts have been split in order to create the proposed Moseley Ward and we hope that DDD can also be split as suggested in the Combined Community Response from Moseley. We know that Balsall Heath Forum remain very unhappy with the proposed Balsall Heath and Sparkbrook Wards and this suggestion has been made in conjunction with Balsall Heath Forum – which has produced the first Neighbourhood Plan in Birmingham.

Thank you for listening to and taking account of almost all our concerns regarding the previous proposals. We look forward to 2018 with a two-councillor Moseley Ward that for the first time since the 1970s includes the whole of Moseley.

Yours faithfully

Fiona Adams MBE
Secretary, The Moseley Society
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Lynn Williams
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Tower Block Action Group

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: BErdington
Annotation 2: Jarvis Road Tower Blocks
Annotation 3: Perry Common

Comment text:

We ask the commission to have an Erdington Ward based on the proposal drawn above. This ward would best represent the community of Erdington ensure that all of the historic Erdington is retained in the same ward so protecting our brilliant community spirit. Erdington is a historic place with a stretch of listed buildings from the Coat of Arms and tram terminus, Sutton/Birmingham Road to the Yenton Pub to Orchard Road, down Orphanage Road, up to the Abbey and then past the Erdington Cottages down to the junction of Gravelly Lane. As the heart and sole of the community a proposal which split these would rip apart our community and destroy its character. Everyone in our road would describe themselves as part of Erdington please ensure we remain part of Erdington. We also support the North Birmingham Community Together submission for the boundary changes, which brings together groups from across North Birmingham. Thank you.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Dear Sirs

On behalf of members of the True Harborne Group I attach copies of letters signed by concerned residents regarding the proposed boundary changes.

Regards

True Harborne Group..
Dear Sirs

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes

I am glad to see that this local area bounded by Hagley Road, Lordswood Road, Balden Road and Court Oak Road is going to be included in the Harborne Ward and not in Quinton. I feel the current proposal in this respect is correct. Please make sure that it is included in the Harborne Ward.

Date ...........................................

Signed ........................................
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14th Floor  
Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes

I understand Mr ROK of [redacted]  
Postcode [redacted]

Would say that I am glad to see that this local area bounded by Hagley Road, Lordswood Road, Balden Road and Court Oak Road is going to be included in the Harborne Ward and not in Quinton. I feel the current proposal in this respect is correct. Please make sure that it is included in the Harborne Ward.

Date 19/6/16

Signed [redacted]
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes

I .................................................of .............................................
............................................. Postcode ..........................................

Would say that I am glad to see that this local area bounded by Hagley Road, Lordswood Road, Balden Road and Court Oak Road is going to be included in the Harborne Ward and not in Quinton. I feel the current proposal in this respect is correct. Please make sure that it is included in the Harborne Ward.

Date ..........................................

Signed: .............................................
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14th Floor  
Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes

I, [REDACTED], of [REDACTED] and Postcode [REDACTED],

would say that I am glad to see that this local area bounded by Hagley Road, Lordswood Road, Balden Road and Court Oak Road is going to be included in the Harborne Ward and not in Quinton. I feel the current proposal in this respect is correct. Please make sure that it is included in the Harborne Ward.

Date 19 June 20...  
Signed [REDACTED]
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes

I .............................. of ........................................
Postcode ........................................

Would say that I am glad to see that this local area bounded by Hagley Road, Lordswood Road, Balden Road and Court Oak Road is going to be included in the Harborne Ward and not in Quinton. I feel the current proposal in this respect is correct. Please make sure that it is included in the Harborne Ward.

Date ........................................

Signed ........................................
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs,

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes

I .................................................. of ..................................................
Postcode ........................................

Would say that I am glad to see that this local area bounded by Hagley Road, Lordswood Road, Balden Road and Court Oak Road is going to be included in the Harborne Ward and not in Quinton. I feel the current proposal in this respect is correct. Please make sure that it is included in the Harborne Ward.

Date ........................................

Signed ........................................
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes

[Redacted]

Would say that I am glad to see that this local area bounded by Hagley Road, Lordswood Road, Balden Road and Court Oak Road is going to be included in the Harborne Ward and not in Quinton. I feel the current proposal in this respect is correct. Please make sure that it is included in the Harborne Ward.

Date 20/06/2016

Signed [Redacted]
We (the Walmley Residents Association) are happy with the LGBCE proposals for the boundary changes for Sutton Coldfield.

Guy Roberts  
Chair  
Walmley Residents Association
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mariam Khan
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Washwood Heath Housing Liaison Board

Comment text:

I am writing this submission to express the views of the Washwood Heath HLB who have residents who live in different parts of the ward, including the tower blocks on Cottsmeadow Drive and Gumbleberrys Close. The local members of the HLB have expressed concerns about the future of the HLB as in the proposed changes, they will be moved into an entirely different area - away from Ward End and into Tile Cross and Glebe Farm Ward. This is something that the members do not want to happen and would like to express that they would rather stay within the ward end ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Kuldip Sangha
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Wentworth Way Residents Association

Comment text:

I, as the chairman of our residents association, fully support your Further Draft Recommendation and accept Wentworth Way, St. Andrews Close and Vale Close to be part of Harborne Ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir or Madam,

Thank you for your letter dated 10th May 2016 inviting West Midlands Fire & Rescue Service to respond to the new draft recommendations.

We would like to take this opportunity to reiterate the points made in our previous submission on the 8th January 2016 and attach a copy hereto.

Please acknowledge safe receipt and let us know if we can be of any further assistance.

Yours faithfully,

Asif Afsar
Principal Officers Policy Advisor
Strategic Hub
West Midlands Fire Service
Subject: Consultation Response - Electoral Review of Birmingham City Council Draft Recommendations
Importance: High

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find attached West Midlands Fire & Rescue Service's submission to the above consultation.

Please acknowledge safe receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Asif Afsar
Principal Officers Policy Advisor
Strategic Hub
West Midlands Fire Service

West Midlands Fire Service

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the information contained in this e-mail is confidential and is intended only for the named recipients. You must not copy, distribute, or take any action or reliance upon it. Any unauthorised disclosure of the information contained in this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received it in error please notify us immediately on 0121 380 6067 or return it to postmaster@wmfs.net and then destroy it.

The information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information is legally exempt from disclosure, the confidentiality of this e-mail and your reply cannot be guaranteed.

Any opinions expressed in this e-mail (including attachments) are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of West Midlands Fire Service unless confirmed by a communication signed on behalf of the Chief Fire Officer.

West Midlands Fire Service information is available from http://www.wmfs.net

This footnote also confirms that this e-mail message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses but does not guarantee that it is free from viruses and you should check all e-mail and attachments with your own anti-virus systems.
Dear Sir or Madam,

**Electoral Review of Birmingham City Council**

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to be consulted upon draft recommendations for change in respect of Birmingham City Council’s electoral arrangements.

Please find attached West Midlands Fire & Rescue Services return to the above consultation.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me using the above details.

Yours faithfully,

Phil Hales  
Deputy Chief Fire Officer  
West Midlands Fire & Rescue Service
West Midlands Fire Service (WMFS) has considered the draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Birmingham City Council and can confirm that the greatest impact will be the internal changes required to the delivery of its services and the electronic systems which facilitate this in order to adapt to the proposals.

Perhaps the greatest impact will be the impact on the prevention based activities which are administrated for using the current ward based boundaries. These would require re-alignment to divide the new proposed wards between WMFS’s 38 community Fire Stations.

With respect to electronic systems, WMFS will seek to manage the impact by adapting systems to take into account the revisions made to the wards. The impact on vehicle mobilisation and fall back systems will also need due consideration.

However, taking the above into account WMFS is confident that any changes necessitated by this electoral review will not unduly or adversely impact upon the services it delivers or its local partnership arrangements.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sue Thompson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Woodbridge Cornerstone Residents Association

Comment text:

Woodbridge Cornerstone Residents Association in Moseley thanks you for listening to all the comments about proposed boundary changes. We are happy with the revised changes

Yours sincerely
Sue Thompson
Chair, WCRA

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
We are largely happy with your proposals for Wylde Green Ward. We do however have some reservations/comments as follows:- • We are concerned about the inclusion of the properties in Beeches Walk and Driffield on the northern boundary in WG due to this area's proximity and relationship with Sutton Central/Trinity. • We are happy with Bishop Walsh Catholic School being included in WG ward. However, in drawing the boundary line, you have cut across the school’s playing fields. Could the school’s playing fields please be included within Wylde Green ward too? This has been detailed in the general comments submitted by SCIRG page 4. We would also like to support the following comments and request made by the SCIRG in relation to the new Parish Wards:- “Considering the fact that the original boundary review did NOT include Sutton Coldfield Parish Wards and in order to provide further consultation with residents, we would highly recommend that an initial proposal for Parish Wards including maps and exact number of councillors with number of electorate per councillor be put forward by LGBCE. There should then be another 8 week period of consultation for residents of Sutton Coldfield to feedback on the proposals for Parish wards on the understanding that city wards have at that point been fixed and confirmed. These proposals can then be considered by residents”. We look forward to the final recommendations in September. Many thanks, Pat Brown WGNF Secretary

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded