Local resident submissions to the Birmingham City Council electoral review

This PDF document contains submissions from local residents with surnames beginning with C.

Some versions of Adobe allow the viewer to move quickly between bookmarks.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: John Caffrey
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

It is ridiculous to site Cotteridge School in Stirchley ward. The boundary of Bourrnville and Cotteridge should be at the Breedon canal bridge and run along Lifford Lane to the railway line thereby including Shirley Rd, Dell Rd, Breedon Rd, Frances RD. the first part of Lifford Lane etc in Cotteridge, which is where they are in fact. The boundary changes were supposed to recognise local communities and the current proposal would dissect Cotteridge..

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

The above mentioned areas ie Erdington where I have lived most of my life are known areas why change boundaries now, surely this move to change boundaries would be confusing for residents and would the benefits of such a great change be so beneficial to the people that live in these areas.

I do not wish to be taken out of the Erdington constituency and for my flat to be under another ward.

The boundaries should stay the same.

The finance to change boundaries would be costly and vital and needed services ie closing libraries, shops, libraries and youth clubs and other needed services are being cut whilst closed down boundaries are being cut.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]
Like many residents on the Harborne Rise estate I do not want to be bumped into the Weoley Castle ward. We have been very ably represented by our Bartley Green councillors for many years and I see no good reason for change. We have already had our parliamentary constituency changed too many times in the last 35 years.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: PHILIP CALCUTT
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

We object to any proposal to break the vibrant community of Moseley into different wards. The proposed boundary change, splitting Moseley centre from the surrounding area would undermine local democracy and all the hard work by many organisations and volunteers that has created a special sense of place.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Dear Review officer,

We are aware of your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward in Birmingham.

We live in [redacted], Moseley and object to any proposal to break the vibrant community of Moseley into different wards. The proposed boundary change, splitting Moseley centre from the surrounding area would undermine local democracy and all the hard work by many organisations and volunteers that has created a special sense of place.

Yours faithfully,

Julia Neall, Philip Calcutt
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Daniel Caldwell
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: Conservative Party

Feature Annotations

Annotation 3: Take from Bournville and Cotteridge and move into a Combined Northfield Ward

Annotation 6: Take from Northfield East and move into West Heath

Annotation 8: Possible Bournbrook ward, the rest of the proposed 'Bournbrook and Selly Park' ward would become 'Selly Park'

Comment text:

I would like to start by thanking the Boundary Commission for taking time to review the warding arrangements for the upcoming changes to the electoral structure within Birmingham City Council. However I am concerned at some of the proposed changes which I will outline below. There have been considerable local objections to the original proposals particularly in Erdington and Moseley and I share their disappointment at the proposals and agree that landmarks such as Erdington Abbey and Erdington train station should be in an Erdington ward as well as Moseley Village should be in a Moseley ward. In addition to this it is my view that Winson Green and the Jewellery Quarter are two separate communities and should be split up into two single member wards. I also have concerns over the West Heath ward which does not include the shops that I have always known as West Heath, also omitted is the West Heath Recreation Park which would be a part of a West Heath ward as it is a valuable community recreational asset. See Annotation 6. Also as the proposed Frankley Ward takes in areas outside the parish of 'New Frankley in Birmingham' I think the ward name should include this, having been in discussions with local residents I believe that adding Great Park to the name will best fit this as the boundary includes the Rubery Great Park area, so the ward will become 'Frankley Great Park'. I also noted that the ward in which I will live in will be 'Northfield West', I don't see the need of splitting a Northfield Ward in two and think they should be combined to create a Northfield ward to enable the Northfield East ward to feel a part of 'Northfield'. Having also lived on [Redacted] for 7 years I also feel like I need to comment about the proposals around that area, it has a Northfield postcode and the local area is Northfield and definitely not Bournville or Cotteridge. It is a part of the Bournville Village Trust but then again so are parts of the proposed Westley and Allens Cross wards so this argument is flawed. Therefore the area around [Redacted] to the current ward boundary on Hole Lane should be moved into a combined Northfield Ward. See Annotation 3. As a former student at the University of Birmingham I feel that it would be appropriate to have a council ward devoted to the student population and would therefore split up Bournbrook and Selly Park as they are two separate communities, I would hope that having a student ward would encourage students or previous students to stand and help enhance relations between the students, the university, the city and local residents. See annotation 8. Once again thank you for taking the time to review Birmingham's ward boundaries.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Daniel Caldcutt
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Conservative Party

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 3: Take from Bourneville and Cotteridge and move into a Combined Northfield Ward
Annotation 6: Take from Northfield East and move into West Heath
Annotation 8: Possible Bournebrook ward, the rest of the proposed 'Bournbrook and Selly Park' ward would become 'Selly Park'

Comment text:

I would like to start by thanking the Boundary Commission for taking time to review the warding arrangements for the upcoming changes to the electoral structure within Birmingham City Council. However, I am concerned at some of the proposals which I will outline below. There are considerable local objections to the original proposals particularly in Erdington and Moseley and I share their disappointment at the proposals and agree that landmarks such as Erdington Abbey and Erdington train station should be in an Erdington ward as well as Moseley Village should be in a Moseley ward. In addition to this it is my view that Winson Green and the Jewellery Quarter are two separate communities and should be split up into two single member wards. I also have concerns over the West Heath ward which does not include the shops that I have always known as West Heath, also omitted is the West Heath Recreation Park which should be a part of a West Heath ward as it is a valuable community recreational asset. See Annotation 6. Also as the proposed Frankley Ward takes in areas outside the parish of New Frankley in Birmingham I think the ward name should include this, having been in discussions with local residents I believe that adding Great Park to the name will best fit this as the boundary includes the Rubery Great Park area, so the ward will become 'Frankley Great Park'. I also noted that the ward in which I will live in will be 'Northfield West', I don't see the need of splitting a Northfield Ward in two and think they should be combined to create a Northfield ward to enable the Northfield East ward to feel a part of 'Northfield'. Having already lived on [redacted] for 7 years I also feel like I need to comment about the proposals around that area, it has a Northfield postcode and the local area is Northfield and definitely not Bourneville or Cotteridge. It is a part of the Bourneville Village Trust but then again so are parts of the proposed Woolley and Allens Cross wards so this argument is flawed. Therefore the area around [redacted] to the current ward boundary on Hole Lane should be moved into a combined Northfield Ward. See Annotation 3. As a former student at the University of Birmingham I feel that it would be appropriate to have a council ward devoted to the student population and would therefore split up Bournbrook and Selly Park as they are two separate communities, I would hope that having a student ward would encourage students or previous students to stand and help enhance relations between the students, the university, the city and local residents. See annotation 8. Once again thank you for taking the time to review Birmingham's ward boundaries.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7658
11/02/2016
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

- Why don't the powers that be leave things alone and stop wanting to change every thing they must be bored rich with their jobs to leave things alone.

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

RECEIVED
02 FEB 2016
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

WHAT IS THE POINT IN CHANGING BOUNDARIES WHEN THERE ARE MORE IMPORTANT ISSUES?

FOR INSTANCE, AS MENTIONED (BIN COLLECTION TIMES WERE IN BINBAGS, CRISTINS POLICE TIME) ALSO MANY OTHER THINGS TO NUMEROUS TO LIST. P.S. THE TRAFFIC LIGHTS ON HAYHORN RD. AND KINGSTANDING RD. ARE DANGEROUS. LOTS OF ACCIDENTS.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]

Name:

Address:

Postcode:

Email:

Phone number:
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Yours Sincerely

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]
North Birmingham Community Together

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

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

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

Organisation Name:
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Oscott Ward
Comment text:
I have lived on the Dandywood Estate for a number of years and I was surprised to hear that the Boundary Commission has suggested it should be part of Kingstanding. Dandywood has very little in common with Kingstanding and is much closer to Oscott, which it is currently where it is part of. I would ask that the Commission does not go ahead with its draft suggestion and should return Dandywood to Oscott ward instead

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Dear Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

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

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

Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas and are distinguished from each other by different demographics, housing stocks, community groups, conservation areas and commuting habits. These can be summarised as follows:

**Bournbrook**

- Population: Mainly transient students.
- Housing: Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.
- Conservation Areas: None.
- Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Bristol Road (aka Bournbrook High Street; Bournbrook’s main road) via car and bus routes 61, 63, 64, 144, X64. Additionally, extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38 and 76).

**Selly Park**

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,

Richard Canner
Dear Sir,

As Secretary of Yardley Neighbourhood Forum, I was heavily involved in the last Boundary changes 2004. That was a straightforward Consultation. This is a complete and utter Shambles, how you in handover, can come up with such a ridiculous scheme, leads me, you say you visited the area during you Tour, WHAT BY CAR !!!!

I propose a recommendation, put Yardley West and Yardley East together. 1 Ward. 2 Cllrs. 16,000 People.

Could be called Yardley South. Common Sense.

Same Type of Community, Mixture of privately Semi detached Properties, and Council, at least 4 Schools will achieve electoral equality.

I value Ward is ridiculous, if they are ill, on holiday or no good (I have one like that), who will do the Case work, or held meetings, will only represent one Party Policies, with 2 Cllrs. You have a chance of cross Party Politics.

That means is that 4 Ward meetings, Y. N. F attend, 2 Ward meetings, Yardley North and Yardley South
If your proposal goes ahead, we could end up attending 4 or 5 meetings. What about our time, we don't get paid, I don't think you understand, how a forum works.

We haven't made a submission, as we didn't know of the plans, until the end of December.

I am angry I am yes Birmingham Born and Bread. My Parents before me, I am sick of people in horton, removing Birmingham down, Having been involved with the forum since 1999, working for the resident of my area, I am quite aware, parts of B.C.C. are not fit for purpose of late, Don't blame us all.

I thought we lived in a democracy, not a dictatorship of which this government is trying to will on us.

I gather Greggs Clarke said he will not change his mind, So where does this consultation stand.

Yours Sincerely,
[Handwritten signature]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Catherine Carey
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I attended a meeting on Jan 16th to learn more about the Boundary Commission proposals which drastically affect the ward where I have lived since [REDACTED]. My address is [REDACTED]. I object very strongly to the proposals to the splitting of Moseley into different wards because:- The proposed boundary totally disregards and could well destroy or dismantle so much that the local Moseley community has built up over the five decades I have lived here. There appears to be no consideration of community in creating these new boundaries which appear to follow the geographic lines of railways and roads rather than existing communities which have been lovingly created by dedicated volunteers over the years.

Your proposed changes also fly in the face of your own policy guidelines as well as totally wrecking local governance. What is the point of a new boundary that does not include the two Moseley conservation areas which volunteers and Moseley councillors who care for the environment have worked so hard to establish. Why is Moseley Parish Church and the centre of Moseley not to be in Moseley ward under the new proposals? The same question is also asked concerning other established, well loved and popular Moseley institutions ie St. Columba's church, Moseley Exchange and Moseley Park. Your proposed new boundaries would unnecessarily increase the workload of volunteers, councillors and officers of the newly formed different wards in liaising together in the organising of local events which are loved by the community. In particular I am concerned about the extra work load inorganising Moseley Farmers Market, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley in Lights and Moseley Interfaith Group

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: John Carey
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I object strongly to the proposed boundary changes. Moseley Village is a very old and very respected area. It is unthinkable that the centre should become part of Balsall Heath!! St Mary's Church Moseley has existed for more than 600 years and clearly should be in Moseley. I attended a meeting on January 16th with many others and strongly support the resolutions of the meeting. Dr John R Carey

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

I have been in Erdington for 33 years and I don't want my house put into the area of Stockland Green, on the place I work, Erdington train station. Have the Local Government got better things to do, than break up Boundary lines. By the way our taxes pay them!

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

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

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

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

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

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

Below is a copy of a letter I sent to you a few days ago. I would be grateful if you could give this some consideration.

Yours

Noel Carney

Dear Sir/Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendation for Birmingham City Council.

I understand there is an ongoing proposal for a two-Councillor ward combining Bournebrook and Selly Park.

It is my strong view that this is not in the best interests of either Selly Park or Bournebrook. I believe that two separate wards (Selly Park and Bournebrook) each with their own Councillor would better serve both groups of residents.
Bournebrook and Selly Park are really very different areas and are really distinguished from each other by different housing types, conservation areas, community groups and demographics. i.e

Bournebrook

* Population - Mainly transient students
* Community and Resident groups - Tiverton Area Residents Association only
* Housing - Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as multi occupancy
* Conservation Areas - None
* Community Habits - Travel to/from city centre via Bristol Road (aka Bournbrook High street; Bournbrook's main road) via car and bus routes (61,63,64,144,x64). Additionally, extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38,76).

Selly Park

* Population - Mainly settled families and couples
* Community and Resident groups - Selly Wick Residents, Selly Park Property Owners' Association, Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum, Selly Park Residents Community Association.
* Housing - Mainly detached and larger terraced.
* Conservation Areas - Selly Park Conservation Area, Selly Park Avenues Conservation Area.
* Community Habits - Travel to/from city centre via Pershore Road (Selly Park's main road) via car and bus route 45,47,106. No bus route or stops on local roads.

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

I believe this proposal would result in better more localised representation for people of both Bournebrook and Selly Park and would have no effect on the
proposals for the rest of Birmingham.

I do hope you will give this proposal serious consideration.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Dr Noel Carney

=================================================================
Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

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

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

Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas and are distinguished from each other by different demographics, housing stocks, community groups, conservation areas and commuting habits. These can be summarised as follows:

**Bournbrook**
- Population: Mainly transient students.
- Housing: Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.
- Conservation Areas: None.
- Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Bnsol Road (aka Bournbrook High Street; Bournbrook's main road) via car and bus routes 61, 63, 64, 144, X64. Additionally, extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38 and 76).

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

*Your name*
Dear sir

I am totally opposed to the proposed boundary changes within Birmingham. I am a long time resident in Hall Green, and the area has very little in common with the industrial area of Tysley, which is the ward that is being proposed to take part of the historical area of Hall Green.

Hall Green is characterised as leafy suburban living, with a very diverse population. To change the borders of this area of Birmingham to fit in with someone's agenda to rob us of representation at local level should not be sanctioned by the official opposition. This has the feel of the general attempt by the current government to make sure that there is no opposition to any policy it wants to make. Indeed my adopted home city has borne the brunt of the punitive cuts the this government has placed on opposition councils.

Please revisit the support of this meddling.

kind regards

Adam Carreras-Neal
Dear Sir/Madam,

Local Government Secretary
Birmingham
B2 4JL

I wish to comment on the above matter.

(a) It is quite unreasonable to reduce the number of seats in Sutton Coldfield to 9 from 12. With the increasing population of the outlying areas it should be 11, but not less than 10 in any event. Any thing less than 10 will mean that Sutton Coldfield is under-represented. More importantly because of the 1st past the post system of electors, the Conservative party will be unrepresented in the council chamber as a % of the overall popular vote if this is not done.

(b) There should be no 2 member seats.

May there be all be one member seats only, in Sutton Coldfield, but all over the city.

(c) Very, named after Bishop Vegas, in a name 500 years of history. The name should be continued and one of the wards named after him.
(b) All the most important entrances or facilities should lead to at least one of sewer pits, one from the South. The idea of these being all part of the Cats Head is inappropriate. Responsibility for the same should be an administrator of all sewer, with "Baltimore" keep part of it; ie return to the State 1800.

I hope you will give very careful consideration to my views.

Yours faithfully,

[Black Box]
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Yours Sincerely

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

Business Reply Licence Number
RSSG-ZYZL-EEEC

North Birmingham Community Together
96 Orchard Road
Erdington
Birmingham
B24 9JD
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

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

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

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

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

- Erdington Abbey, Erdington Police Station, Erdington Royal Mail Sorting Office, the historic Erdington Cottages and Osborne School all to be disgraceful removed from Erdington Ward.
- Station Road/Gravelly Lane shopping centre to be broken up into three wards and some nearby roads are being ripped out of Erdington and put in a ward with Spaghetti Junction!
- Proposed Erdington Parking and Conservation zones will be split across multiple wards
- Area around Gravelly Lane, Goosemoor Lane, Jarvis Road, Norfolk and Somerset Roads all to be kicked out of Erdington by the Commission!

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

To help us save our communities, please list some objections in the box overleaf, add your details and return it freepost today!
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: David Carter
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I would like to make an objection to the draft proposals in the sense that they appear inconsistent, illogical and have a blatant disregard for local communities. The proposals to increase the number of Wards is likely to add to bureaucracy and those residents in single member Wards will be at a distinct disadvantage in terms of representation. For example what happens if a single member is ill? There is no alternative for the local resident to approach. This is not the case in a two member arrangement. This clearly indicates that residents of single member Wards will be democratically disadvantaged. The reduction in the number of members also makes Birmingham Councillors representative of many more residents than they are now, and generally speaking the residents per Member is already much higher than in surrounding areas. It could be argued that Birmingham residents are under-represented. Some of the proposed boundaries beggar belief, with a fine example of this where the proposals place the historic heart of Erdington outside the Erdington Ward. To have credibility the boundaries have to have relevance. My concluding suggestion would be to suggest that the current proposals be withdrawn and that there should be a rethink from the start.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: laura carter  
E-mail:  
Postcode:  
Organisation Name: solihull music service

**Comment text:**

Im disappointed that the council are wanting to cut the heart out of Moseley by removing Moseley Village from Moseley! how can this be? It makes no sense to me that the village with its shops, local buisnesses and bars/ restaurants attracting city dwellers out to the suburbs would no longer be known as Moseley but Balsall and canon hill area. As a young first time buyer wanting to settle here it worries me that these changes would be made without thinking about how it would affect the local area and people.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sandra Carter
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

1. Our house - built in 1902 - falls within The St Augustines Conservation area, a historically important part of the city in Edgbaston. 2. The proposed boundary line takes a relatively straight course along the Hagley Road but deviates so that some hotels and business retain their Edgbaston address. Why is this so? 3. Some properties are being taken out of Edgbaston and some of Harborne to be included in the proposed new Edgbaston boundary this seems illogical.
4. I am Birmingham born and bred and feel very proud to live in a lovely long established area of the city, I chose to buy a property in Edgbaston - not Summerfield. 5. Anyone who knows this area of Birmingham instantly thinks of Winson Green when they hear 'Summerfield'. 6. There is no evidence that property prices will NOT be affected by changing the boundary, but I think there is evidence that they will be as Edgbaston properties have always maintained their price due to being a more affluent part of the city. I believe taking my house out of Edgbaston will greatly affect its value.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sara Carter
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

It is unreasonable to change the boundary so that we are in Summerfield because we purchased a house that was in Edgbaston. We expected our address to always remain as Edgbaston. I have always lived in Edgbaston and want to remain so. The boundary that has been proposed isn't even a straight line and clearly prioritises some hotels along the Hagley road. There is no direct need to change the boundary. It will affect our house price. Summerfield is associated with a much more run down part of the city compared to Edgbaston. It is also illogical to move some of Harborne into Edgbaston! Why not just let them be in Harborne and we stay in Edgbaston? Summerfield is also close to Winson Green Prison and we do not want to be associated with that. Please keep the boundary as it is now.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Carter-Wall
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I wish to object to the proposed boundary changes around Moseley which if adopted would nonsensically divide Moseley in two - with Moseley Village centre and Moseley Park not in Moseley!!! If there is a ward called Moseley, how could it possibly not contain the centre of Moseley?! Moseley Village is a popular and successful local centre, with a thriving café culture, nightlife and award-winning Farmers’ Market. It has venues and events that attract people from across the city and further afield. Moseley Village attracts festivals of national significance to Moseley Park & Pool. These plans ignore the historical context of Moseley. These plans would actively sabotage the strategic approach and care that generations of residents, businesses and the Council have taken to conservation, planning, and economic development in this part of the city. There is a strong shared sense place, history, pride and community among the people Moseley - how do these proposals reflect, respect and foster this when they would shatter Moseley in two? Moseley is well known and recognised as one of the most well-regarded and desirable areas of the City - indeed it recently topped national newspaper table of most desirable places to live. These proposals ignore all of this in a way that is simply nonsensical.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

Before I go any further, I would like to invite you to come and have a cup of tea. So that I can show you around our lovely area of Yardley.

Yardley dates back to the Domesday Book and our Church is almost 1,000 years old. Yardley Conservation Area was Birmingham's first.
Please, I beg you not to replace Sandby with Steephill East.

Yours (fingers crossed)

Mary Casey.
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
11th Floor, Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

5th February 2016

Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for
Birmingham City Council

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

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

Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas
and are distinguished from each other by different
demographics, housing stocks, community groups,
conservation areas, and commuting habits. These
can be summarised as follows:

1
Braunbrook

2. Housing: Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
3. Community and Residents Groups: Twerton Area Residents Association only.
4. Conservation Areas: None
5. Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Bristol Road Cafe, Braunbrook High Street, Braunbrooks main road) via car and bus routes 61, 63, 114s, x64. Additionally, extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38 and 76).

Selly Park

1. Population: Mainly settled families and couples
2. Housing: Mainly detached and larger terraced.
5. Commuting Habits: Travel to City using Fishsheare Road (Selly Park's main road) via car and bus routes 45, 47, 14b. No bus routes or stops on local roads.

In terms of defining each ward, I suggest introducing an 'internal' boundary within the proposed two Councillor ward, thus creating two one Councillor wards with no wider impact.
In summary, the proposal I am making will result in better, more localised representation for the people of Bournbrook and Selly Park and will have no effect on the proposals for the rest of Birmingham.

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

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]

Mrs G. Casimir
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: James Cattell
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

The western boundary of Moseley is wrong. Completely wrong. It doesn't include ANY of Moseley Village. I very strongly object to these proposed changes.
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Pascoe, Mark

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 11 January 2016 09:33
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Boundary review - Moseley

From: Audrey Cauthery
Sent: 09 January 2016 12:41
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary review - Moseley

To whom it may concern:
I wish to register my strongest opposition to the proposed boundary changes.

I have lived in Moseley since [redacted], when my husband left the RAF and I have grown old here; both my children lived here. Moseley has been our focal point for all that time, and despite the many changes, it has continued to mean a great deal to us all. In short, we all identify with Moseley as our local community. Splitting Moseley up in the way proposed is neither logical and nor does it reflect the wishes of local residents. It will break up this community, which is valued by everyone who lives here. We are currently represented by three councillors who are grossly overworked. To reduce the number to one will mean that we will suffer a real reduction in the attention we receive. I object, therefore, to the proposed boundary changes and would urge you to take local opinion into account when deciding this matter.

Thank you for your attention to my comments.
Yours faithfully,
Audrey Cauthery [redacted]

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com
To Herman Office (Bham)
Local Govt Boundary Commission for
England,
14 the Floor, Millbank Tower,
Millbank, London SW1P 4QP

4/2/16

Dear Sir,
The ward changes as proposed for the City of Bham

I write as a consultant on changes the LBCG has
proposed for the City of Bham

1 object in respect of ward changes for Sutton, Coldfield,
& the inequitable treatment of that area of the City
viz a viz other areas including inner city wards.
I seek to represent a "strategic" view for the self
interest of Sutton.

My representations are as follows:

1. National government has, reasonably, sought
to regularize constituency voting populations. Whatever the
perceived or real political benefits, the inequalities between
constituency voting population have required review which
is many years delayed & to reflects the nature & scale of
population change across the UK.

2. For whatever reason, perhaps with a political
motivation, the changes which you appear to justify in Bham,
go against the rationality of changes to regularise the size
of wards in population terms. You will be aware of the
considerable variation proposed between same inner city
wards & for example, Sutton Coldfield, one must conclude
that the City Council's suggestion are politically...
motivated a unjustified in need terms. It is surprising the LGBC appears to endorse these politically-inspired inequalities.

3. Based on the upcoming changes in population distribution proposed in the City Council’s Development Plan, there is no justification for reducing the number of councillors’ wards in Sutton.

Regardless of the political differences between parties, one has to locate major new housing to meet the City’s short to long-term needs, a public inquiry has acknowledged that Sutton will be the focus for the major new housing allocations.

Sutton possesses the only major greenfield opportunities.

With housing in the West of the City, the Government is trying to maximise Brownfield development. As Bham, greenfield land is usually in the case of Bham, greenfield land is usually has to contribute to meeting the City’s future needs.

Sutton is the only candidate area to achieve this.

At present, pending final ratification, current City proposals include at least 6,000 new homes in the greenfield area of Sutton. This is likely to be endorsed before final word change are made.

4. It would have been prudent to finalise changes before the Development Plan is adopted during 2016.

5. No part of the City will be able to contribute such a high level of housing. The greenfield area is
at Wednesday. This area is adjacent to the major built-up area of the city, both in terms of housing and employment areas. The city's highest output, largest employment and allocation lies adjacent to the area of Wednesday propose for 6000+ homes.

6. It follows that to meet the City's housing needs, a significant proportion of the new population occupying new homes there will be moving out from other areas of the city, thus invoking population redistribution in the City towards Sutton.

7. In the circumstances, there is an inherent justified logic in not reducing the number of Ward Councillors in Sutton, at the least retaining the existing 11.

8. It is arguable that taking a strategic view, in the light of the scale of new housing in Sutton, a redistribution of existing population, Sutton should have more not fewer Council seats.

9. The City Officers will advise you on the potential timescale in which the new housing will be expected, but a significant addition will be made pre-2020/21.

10. Thus I invite you strongly to consider proposals changes in the context of Sec(8) scheme.

I am happy to substantiate arguments put forward in respect of proposals and evidence to the LCoBC. If it helps in this respect I am at your service but have had a professional career as a town planner a chartered surveyor, during
Government Departments, Ministers & Secretaries of State on development matters, through the RICS or as a professional consultant, e. in numerous cases, through face to face liaison with politicians & senior civil servants as above.

Yours faithfully,

[Name redacted]

 Alam CAUG. BA FRTP1 FRICS.

P.S. As a final point, it would seem counterproductive & unnecessary to argue that changes to reflect new housing should be delayed until the medium-term future. It is sensible to value change comprehensively at one go, rather than delay selective changes for future consideration.
21st January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing with reference to the proposed boundary changes for Birmingham.

I have lived the majority of my life in Moseley and so was both concerned and perplexed to learn of the proposed plans.

The main reason Moseley is such a pleasant place to live is its sense of community. We have a number of well run and enthusiastic organisations who pride themselves on improving the local environment for all its inhabitants and visitors.

On studying the proposed plans, which I find both well thought through and non-sectarian...
I feel driven to write and express my opinion that these plans do not reflect the interests of local people and will in fact lead to confusion. The plans appear to have been drawn upon the basis of equalising the number of electors each councillor represents but with total disregard for the communities affected.

I find it hard to believe that Moreley inhabitants are the only ones upset by these proposals. Why, for instance, do people living in Balsall Heath want Moreley Village in their ward? Why are the two churches of St Mary's and St Anne's now in a different ward to not only the village but more importantly the church school in Oxford Road? Why is Balsall Heath Park in the Moreley Ward, and why oh why are Moreley Village, Moreley Hall Hospital and Moreley Park in Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill!
I am a little unsure as to what the advantages are of these proposals. One thing of note regarding the number of electors, what does this plan achieve? There is no consideration for the local community, its history or even geographical boundaries. Managing areas will be much more difficult as a many areas will cross boundary lines.

I believe these plans are complicated, presumably costly and ill thought through. Birmingham is a living city with very distinctive and diverse areas. These plans will be damaging in so many ways and I urge you to reconsider your proposals.

Yours faithfully
The current proposals fail to take into account any existing physical or social boundaries, and communities are divided from each other and, sometimes, from the ward which bears their name. The proposed reduction in councillors is also of some concern. It is already the case that Birmingham has the most voters per councillor (or, rather, the fewest councillors per vote); any reduction would call into question the democratic legitimacy of any future council. It should not be forgotten that Birmingham City Council is the largest local authority in Western Europe; does it not make sense that that authority with by far the most citizens would necessarily have by far the most councillors. A reduction in numbers for the sake of appearances does not serve to improve governance, and is a most transparent political move. It is unsurprising that the Kerslake Report, itself written by a Conservative, would make proposals which could only serve to limit the powers of other parties. This is simply unacceptable.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Janet Chalmers
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I'm really concerned that [REDACTED], which has always been part of Moseley, would become part of Stirchley under the current proposals. I have lived in [REDACTED] for nearly 23 years and part of its attraction when we moved here was that it is in Moseley. I shop in Moseley and Kings Heath and rarely visit Stirchley, except to pass through. Elizabeth Road is significantly closer to Moseley Village than to the centre of Stirchley. Moseley has an identity as a community that should be reflected in the ward boundary. For this reason I also believe that Shutlock Lane, the lower part of Moor Green Lane and the adjoining roads should be included. Dads Lane should be the boundary.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I would like to strongly oppose the change of Yardley ward to East Stechford ward.

Derek chamber of [Redacted]
1st February 2016

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

Dear Sir / Madame,

Moseley - New Ward Boundaries Proposals

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

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

The proposed boundary would destroy so much that the Moseley community has built up over many decades. The proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines.

Your current proposal would dismantle a very well established community of place and will wreck local governance (local decisions by local people).

The losses that would affect me most are:

- **A Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance**;
- **The partnership between the Moseley Society and Moseley councillors which created two Moseley conservation areas would be broken, and the volunteers who monitor planning applications would have a totally unnecessary increase in their workload**;
- **The work of many years on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in a Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the effort by volunteers and council officers, made to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a time when we have real opportunities to**
accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening of Moseley hinted element of the HS2 connectivity package.

I wish also to register the following:

- The centre of Moseley must be in Moseley Ward;
- Moseley Parish Church must be in Moseley Ward;
- St Columba's Church must be in Moseley Ward;
- Moseley Park must be in Moseley Ward;
- The Moseley Exchange must be in Moseley Ward;
- The incredible number of Moseley volunteers (listed below) who work for the Moseley community to nurture and develop the place they live in and love must not have their workload increased by the need to liaise with different ward councillors and officers. The volunteers may well give up.

- I feel most strongly about unnecessary problems caused for all of the following Groups who have invested so much time and energy in making Moseley a wonderful place in which to live in harmony with all sections of the community and for the greater good of Birmingham:

  Moseley Forum, The Moseley Exchange, The Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Park & Pool, Moseley Interfaith Group, Moseley Festival, Sustainable Moseley, Moseley Arts Market, Moseley Farmers Market along with a number of other groups who are vital to Moseley and surrounding areas.

I hope the contents of my letter will go some way in expressing how I feel and trust that common sense will prevail and that the status quo is enforced.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

H. Champagnet
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Christine Chandler
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: 
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 2:
Comment text:
I recommend that the Quinton boundary be as above. The boundary would remain the same along Lordswood Road and then down West Boulevard, placing the Woodside Farm estate back into Harborne. I fully support the Conservative group proposals for Birmingham City which keep nature communities together.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Georgina Chandler
E-mail: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1:
Annotation 2:
Annotation 3:

Comment text:
The current Quinton ward boundaries are defined by Lordwood Road, Court Oak Road, Tennal Road and Welsh House Farm Road. With Tennal Road and Welsh House Farm Road being as a result of the most recent boundary changes with West Boulevard defining the boundary pair to that. The proposed boundary commission changes moves the boundary way from Lordwood Road and Court Oak Road (Quinton Ward’s boundary from its creation in the 1990s) to Balden Road. The proposed boundary commission changes mean that Quinton is no longer defined by the major roads which have historically defined it. Firstly, Lordwood Road to the east as a major dual carriageway, it defines the communities around it and acts as a natural boundary. It also defines where Hagley Road ends and Hagley Road West begins, the historical point where Harborne Ward ends and Quinton Ward begins. Secondly, Court Oak Road as the main road connecting Quinton and Harborne it provides a natural boundary along the main road, with Queen’s Park helping define the community boundary. The move to Balden Road is also questionable due to its residential nature. A single carriageway road and residential particularity 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 unavoidable it means that Balden Road is not a defining road. It is with this that we recommend that the ward boundaries should be along Lordwood Road and Court Oak Road as is currently the case. Further south Tennal Road, the current boundary contains Harborne Golf course a defining feature of Harborne it is on the same side of the road as houses currently in Quinton Ward however sharing a location with this major part of Harborne. It is also a minor residential road that is normal part of Harborne. The rest of the original boundary is along Welsh House Farm Road which runs alongside Harborne Golf Course. These were added to the Quinton Ward Boundary for the last set of boundary changes. Before the 2002 changes West Boulevard (D4121) formed the boundary for Quinton Ward. This makes a large amount of sense as a Dual Carriageway it creates a natural boundary with traditional Quinton Ward to the West and the Welsh House Farm estate to the East. It also acts as a continuation of the Wolverhampton Road (A4122) which combined with Birmingham New Road (A4123) to the North and the rest of the D4121 to the South connects Southern Birmingham at the Bristol Road in Northfield and Wolverhampton and Dudley via West Boulevard as such this function as a major dual carriageway. It is with this that we also recommend that the ward boundary should run along West Boulevard rather than as it currently does along Tennal Road and Welsh House Farm Road.
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Download

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7591

08/02/2016
The current Quinton ward boundaries are defined by Lordwood Road, Court Oak Road, Tennal Road and Welsh House Farm Road. With Tennal Road and Welsh House Farm Road being as a result of the most recent boundary changes with West Boulevard defining the boundary prior to that. The proposed boundary commission changes move the boundary away from Lordwood Road and Court Oak Road (Quinton Ward’s boundary from its creation in the 1990s) to Belden Road. The proposed boundary commission changes mean that Quinton is no longer defined by the major roads which have historically defined it. Firstly, Lordwood Road to the east as a major dual carriageway, it defines the communities around it and acts as a natural boundary. It also defines where Hagley Road ends and Hagley Road West begins, the historical point where Harborne Ward ends and Quinton Ward begins. Secondly, Court Oak Road as the main road connecting Quinton and Harborne it provides a natural boundary along the main road, with Queen’s Park helping define the community boundary. The move to Belden Road is also questionable due to its residential nature. A single carriageway road and residential property 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 Belden Road is forbidden at the junction, so eastbound traffic must take an alternative route. With this traffic movement unavailable it means that Belden Road is not a defining road. It is with this that we recommend that the ward boundaries should be along Lordwood Road and Court Oak Road as it currently the case. Further south Tennal Road, the current boundary contains Harborne Golf course a defining feature of Harborne it is on the same side of the road as houses currently in Quinton Ward however sharing a location with this major part of Harborne. It is also a minor residential road that is natural part of Harborne. The rest of the original boundary is along Welsh House Farm Road which runs alongside Harborne Golf Course. These were added to the Quinton Ward Boundary for the last set of boundary changes. Before the 2002 changes West Boulevard (D4121) formed the Boundary for Quinton Ward. This makes a large amount of sense as a dual carriageway it creates a natural boundary with traditional Quinton Ward to the West and the Welsh House Farm estate to the East. It also acts as a continuation of the Wolverhampton Road (D4122) which combined with Birmingham New Road (D4123) to the North and the rest of the D4121 to the South connects Southern Birmingham at the Bristol Road in Northfield and Wolverhampton and Dudley via West Boulevard as such this function as a major dual carriageway. It is with this that we also recommend that the ward boundary should run along West Boulevard rather than as it currently does along Tennal Road and Welsh House Farm Road.
This is a picture of Balden Road as is clear it is a residential road and a community within itself.

This is a picture of Court Oak Road with Queen’s Park to the Right. It creates this natural boundary between Quinton and Harborne along with this main road.
This is a picture of Lordswood Road. This is clearly a dual carriageway and a main road running along the edge of Quinton Ward creating a boundary of itself.

These two pictures (above and below) are of the Hagley Road/Balden Road junction as is clear there is no possibility of a right turn onto Balden Road.
This is a picture of Tennal Road, just up from Harborne Golf Course, it is the current boundary of Quinton but as is clear it is a residential community cut in two.

This is the B4123 (West Boulevard) it is a duel carriageway separated by a central reservation. This would form a natural boundary, as it did under previous boundaries.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

The proposed changes have been suggested by people who do not have personal knowledge of the area and its history. As I was born in Sutton Coldfield and have lived over 70 years in Bannersgate I should like to make the following comments: Thankfully the Sutton Coldfield boundary is preserved, for now. However, splitting up Vesey ward into much smaller areas with only one councillor would appear to leave some wards, particularly 'Parkside', vulnerable to being forcibly removed from Sutton Coldfield at some time in the future. At least two attempts have been made in the recent past to change the boundary between Vesey and Kingstanding. They were vehemently opposed by residents in both areas and did not go ahead. I believe most Bannersgate residents would prefer to remain safely connected to New Oscott and Boldmere as in the present Vesey ward, with two councillors. This was the proposal put forward unanimously following the neighbourhood meeting on 28th September 2015 and, I believe, reiterated at the public meeting on 16th January 2016. It's ridiculous that Sutton Park is almost totally in Four Oaks ward although Maney has kept a small part adjoining the ward. Most of the land next to the park where the fence is adjacent to a road is not in Four Oaks (from Queslett Road to Streetly Lane it is not even in Birmingham, let alone Sutton Coldfield). None of those residents will be able to contact their local councillor about any matters concerning the park close to their home. The current Vesey ward boundary keeps the park edge within the ward along Monmouth Drive but along Chester Road North it is already in Four Oaks. The proposal means that the responsible councillor would be based nearly three miles away with constituents who are naturally not concerned with the problems of, for example, unwalkable paths in the south-west side of the park, or problems related to Boldmere Golf Course or with the playground which was partly funded by the Bannersgate Neighbourhood Forum because they rarely venture there. The obvious division is the railway line or else the road between Boldmere and Streetly gates, with the south-western part added to Vesey (or 'Parkside'), giving a means of contact between local residents who use that side of the park and the City Council. Finally, if we have to have the reduced size wards inflicted upon us in spite of overwhelming objection by the residents affected, why does the name have to be changed to the made up one of Parkside from the historical one of Vesey or why not Bannersgate? 'Parkside' could equally apply to Boldmere, Maney, Four Oaks or Streetly or, indeed, towards wards adjoining Rectory Park, New Hall Valley or Pype Hayes Park.
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Hi my mother lives in harborne and the local council want to change to Weoley castle we are not very happy about this my mothers bungalow will depreciate. Why are you going this it will cost an awful lot of tax payers money who thought this was a good idea know wonder people didn't vote the county is in a mess think about common sense. Think about all the young people out of work and the elderly my husband please get your act together give me one good reason for the change without the expense. Thanking you Mrs d I chapman
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Chapman
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Please move the proposed Birchfield / Handsworth ward boundary so that it doesn't split the Handsworth Park between the wards. The easiest way would be to continue the ward boundary along the Hamstead Road from Holly Road to Church Lane.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Simon Charlton
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Responding to the Moseley boundary changes We, Kate and Simon Charlton, strongly oppose the proposed boundary changes. We recognise that changes will have to be made, but to split Moseley effectively into 5 wards and to have to deal with 6 councillors for Moseley wide concerns, is illogical and runs counter to the central government policy of devolving powers to the communities, encouraging social cohesion and involvement in the community. Here we have a very active and tangible sense of community and community spirit, reflected in the existence of local voluntary organisations which work on a Moseley wide basis. These proposals would fragment this, they have clearly been drawn up with no account for the local situation.

It is quite clear that these proposals will be met with opposition from a well organised local community, utilising social media, political campaigns and the courts if necessary. As stated on the LGBC website “[t]he three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation and are to: Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents Reflect community identity Provide for effective and convenient local government” These proposals run contrary to points 2 and 3. They will not reflect community identity, and will make local government ineffective and inconvenient, see the points set out above and below. If these proposals are followed through, they will be exposed to possible judicial review, due to the fact that the Commission are not following through their own criteria. This community has the resources, legal knowledge and motivation to launch such a legal challenge.

Point 1 – Moseley – a historical village

Moseley developed from a rural village into a suburb between 1850 and 1910, stimulated by the new railway line and trams linking Moseley with the centre of Birmingham. Large country estates were split up and sold off for housing developments – notably that of Moseley Hall – which is now used as a hospital. The lake and surrounding parkland also remains thanks to a group of local residents who formed the Moseley Park and Pool Company to save it from development – a group which endures to this day. Birmingham City Council has since established two Conservation Areas in Moseley to help preserve this historic environment:

- Moseley Conservation Area: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleyca
- St. Agnes Moseley Conservation Area: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/stagnesca

Both of the links above include maps that indicate the boundaries of the conservation areas. With this in mind, a Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance.

Point 2 – Moseley – culture and economy

Moseley Village is a popular local centre, with a thriving café culture, nightlife and award-winning Farmers’ Market. It attracts festivals of national significance to Moseley Park & Pool, and contains venues that are recognised across the city, notably the Prince of Wales and Tipu Sultan. It is also a desirable location to base a business, thanks to the Moseley Exchange co-working space, which enables start-ups to have a flexible base while establishing their business. The Moseley economy is recognised in two supplementary planning documents:

- Moseley SPD: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleyspd
- Shopping and Local Centres SPD: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/spdlocalcentres

There is also a ‘living’ Moseley regeneration strategy, ‘Making Moseley’: http://www.moseleycdn.com/sites/default/files/Making%20Moseley_Sep2014.pdf You will note that the Moseley SPD boundary encompasses all of the area of Moseley that sits in the current ward of Moseley & Kings Heath, whereas the Shopping and Local Centres SPD focuses on a more tightly-defined zone around the centre, as would be...
expected. If there is a ward called Moseley, it is unthinkable that it should not contain the
centre of Moseley. It would actively sabotage the thoughtful and consistent approach that
residents, businesses and the Council have taken to economic development in this part of the
city, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the
reopening of Moseley Station as a mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package:

Point 3 – Moseley, a civic legacy, an active community Moseley is not just its buildings, its parks and
its streets. It is its people and what they do, how they shape themselves around the physical
space. Citizens organise themselves around the shared locality of Moseley in myriad ways, to
nurture and develop the place they live in and love: Moseley Forum (inc. Moseley in Lights),
Moseley Community Development Trust, The Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Park &
Pool, Moseley Interfaith Group, Moseley Festival, Sustainable Moseley, Moseley Arts Market,
Moseley Farmers Market, Moseley B13 Magazine. The list is impressive, each group adding
something wonderful and vital to life in the area. There is a strong shared sense of what the
place is, a huge amount of passion and activity around that place – be it cultural,
environmental, economic or social – and these proposals parcel that space up in a way that is
at best bewildering, and at worst, active sabotage of a place that genuinely works very well.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Claire Charman
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I think it is a complete farce to separate Moseley as currently drawn. Our house is in the Moseley conservation area which is now segregated by the false casting of the revised line at the bottom of our gardens and separating the same run of houses along billesely lane. We will be asked to vote for matters within Kings Heath yet intrinsically part of Moseley? Moseley is a community and as such should remain as one ward. Moseley village not even being in Moseley is just a complete farce and will prevent pertinent local issues being addressed or actions by MPs who care sufficiently about Moseley itself.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear sir,

I just learned that our local boundary is being considered to be changed and my road (Reddings Lane) presently is part of Hall Green since these houses were built. I strongly object to the proposed de-link from Hall Green and making it part of Tyseley on the following grounds:

1. I moved here in Hall Green District, cause of Hall Green Junior and Secondary schools and now if this proposal goes through my grandchildren will loose priority to these schools, 2. My car insurance will definitely, in time, be affected, 3. My house price will be affected downward. And most of all, as I am retired getting old, my emotional well being and feeling of loss will be detrimental to my health from all aspects.

Please, please reconsider the plan and leave us being part of B28 Hall Green.

Thanking you in anticipation of you kind agreement to my request.

Yours faithfully

Abdul Malik Chaudhry
The Revue Officer (Birmingham)  
Local Government Boundary Commission of England  
14th floor  
Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London  
SW1P4QP  
18 January 2016

Dear sir/madam

I have lived in [redacted] one of the roads in Hall green Ward, for the past 25 years. Hall Green Ward is completely distinct from that of Tyseley, with distinct features like, Sarehole Mills, its own Retail Hall Green Parade, Hall Green Railway Station, Hall Green Health Centre, Hall green School, South Birmingham collage, plus lots more detached, semi and distinct houses, as opposed to more industrial and terraced housing features, instead please consider, merger with Billsley or Moseley, which would be more compatible. Hall Green has been kept, clean and crime free, by its hard working citizens along with its dedicated councillors. This may get affected with the proposed changes. More over Family, Friends, Utility companies, insurance Companies, Banks, and many other organisation, will look only at the area code, rather than knowing, how different it is physically and in other terms with Tysely. This will also affect property value and insurance premiums.

Please my earnest request is to reconsider, this proposal very seriously.
I am a resident of Hall Green and was appalled when I was notified that my area would go into the new Tyseley ward albeit out for consultation at present. I chose to buy my home in Hall Green because it is such an aspirational ward with its local history and a train station that is a life line for all. I am a hardworking person and have refurbished my home to a standard that has increased in value because of the area. I do not want to be associated to Tyseley as it does not have the community spirit that Hall Green has and my home will be devalued. It would make more sense for less Councillors in Tyseley and for Tyseley to be part of Hall Green.

I am protesting the ward boundary changes and want Hall Green to remain Hall Green, losing Hall Green railway station, Hall Green secondary school, Hall Green United community church and Hall Green parade which is the heart of our community is outrageous.

Usha Chauhan
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: F. E. Chen
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

We believe ward 60 should be called by its traditional name North Edgbaston to reflect its traditional belonging to Edgbaston. Geographically it incorporates Edgbaston Reservoir and St Augustine church of Edgbaston, which many streets south of Hagley road, Edgbaston, are named after. Residents have always referred to this area as North Edgbaston, and a change to its name would lead to a loss of its traditional identity. Further, the new name will discourage aspirational families from moving to this area which has many large and Victorian and Edwardian villas, and consequently affect the viability and value of these beautiful properties. It has taken many years and effort to rehabilitate this area from its past negative reputation and one should encourage the continuing improvement and gentrification of this area. A change in name to Summerfield will associate this area with less desirable addresses of Dudley Road/Winson Green and Ladywood, split it off from Edgbaston south of Hagley road, which ultimately will put off new arrivals to the city from relocating to ward 60. Further, those residential streets around Edgbaston Reservoir, which are currently part of Ladywood but within the new ward 60 would appreciate and benefit from belonging to North Edgbaston rather than Summerfield. In summary, loosing its traditional links with Edgbaston, and associating the area with Winson Green and ladywood, which have very different environments, will be a denial of the improvements that have taken place.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

I have been a resident of Sutton Coldfield all my life which is [redacted] years.

I do not agree with the Whitehouse Common / Walmley area of the Royal Town being changes to Roughley nor the central area being changed to Maney.

I would argue for the proposed 'Roughley' name to be kept as Walmley and the proposed Maney name to be kept as Trinity.

I feel the original names are more representative of the areas they cover.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Cheshire
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Paul Chew
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

The changes to Moseley begger belief. It breaks up a natural community into areas where the "village" will not be a priority for any concillor. This should be reconsidered and the obvious should be done.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal to call where I live "Stechford East".

St Edwigha's Church, together with the Conservation area, has been something we in Yardley cherish very much and have done for many years. Why do you want to change things which mean so much to so many people? Please re-consider.

Yours faithfully,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Pamela Chippendale
E-mail: [obfuscated]
Postcode: [obfuscated]
Organisation Name: [obfuscated]

Comment text:

I'm not proposing any boundary changes as I CANNOT see why these need to be done. I have lived in my property for [ ] years and have had 3 postcode changes already. I currently am listed as living in Springfield, which saw the most dramatic INCREASE in my HOUSE INSURANCE. IS THERE ANY POSITIVE OUTCOME LIKELY FOR THE VOTER (WHICH IS WHO THESE PEOPLE WILL BE REPRESENTING) OR IS IT JUST TO GET DIFFERENT COUNCILLORS AND MP’S ON THE VOTING CARD. I am sure I am not the only person in Birmingham whose insurance will be affected yet again by these type of changes and can you also reassure me that out of the Councillors I am offered there will be someone that can actually deal with local community problems as I haven’t seen any of that yet. Having looked at your map the ward of SPRINGFIELD has completely disapperared (its not been there very long) and TYSELEY now looks enormous. What a waste of council tax payers money yet again.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Pam Chippendale

**E-mail:**

**Postcode:**

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I currently come under Springfield which was created out of nowhere (it was a road and a dance studio originally). Having looked at your proposed map it seems that the area north of the railway line at Hall green would better be served by coming under Hall Green North. In including this area with Tyseley it means that Tyseley would be enormous and I can't see that I would get good representation and access to Local or Parliament representatives should I need to. How can it be democratic to just change the area that I live in, causing problems such as increased insurance etc. Pam Chippendale.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Boundary changes of Hallgreen to Tyseley is a slap on the face of Hallgreen permanent residence. For Gods sake please do not do it. Azad Choudhury. Residence of Hallgreen since 

Sent from my iPhone

On 21 Jan 2016, at 04:57, Ema Choudhury wrote:

Regarding the proposed boundary changes in the Hall Green area - to become part of Tyseley.

I live in the area concerned, my address [redacted], Hall Green. This has been my address since birth. Me and my family have been here 30 years and we are all deeply concerned with the proposed changes. We are from Hall Green and to suddenly change that identity - including the local train station, Hall Green parade etc is an outrage.

I have spoken to other known families in the area and everyone I have spoken to hold the same opinion! This cannot go ahead.

We strongly oppose the proposal to become Tyseley. As permanent residents, we will remain as Hall Green.
The proposed changes will not be welcomed.

Regards
Ema Choudhury
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a resident in the Hall Green ward and would be directly affected by this ridiculous and insensitive proposal to split the ward. This proposal does not consider the identity of the community and endeavours to destroy the essence of the area. Introducing a Tyseley ward which encompasses major Hall Green landmarks such as; Sarehole Mill, The Church of Ascension, Hall Green School all steeped in centuries of history seems extremely bizarre. The station which has been around for over 100 years would now no longer be in the Hall Green ward. Tyseley is an industrial area in Birmingham which does not identify with Hall Green a leafy suburb most notably represented by J.R.R. Tolkien in his famous books. I have lived in this area for many years and associate myself with these landmarks and vibrant multi-cultural community. We have always had strong councillors in Hall Green who have always worked effectively as a team serving the community well. These changes look to disintegrate and segregate the area destroying all the hard work done by the community groups and councillors to create such a great ward forging great community cohesion. I strongly disagree with these proposals and would not support the introduction of a Tyseley ward.

Yours Sincerely

Azizur Choudhury
Regarding the proposed boundary changes in the Hall Green area - to become part of Tyseley.

I live in the area concerned, my address Hall Green. This has been my address since birth. Me and my family have been here 30 years and we are all deeply concerned with the proposed changes. We are from Hall Green and to suddenly change that identity - including the local train station, Hall Green parade etc is an outrage.

I have spoken to other known families in the area and everyone I have spoken to hold the same opinion! This cannot go ahead.

We strongly oppose the proposal to become Tyseley. As permanent residents, we will remain as Hall Green.

The proposed changes will not be welcomed.

Regards
Dina Choudhury
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ema Choudhury
Date: 21 January 2016 at 04:56:10 GMT+6
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Cc: 
Subject: Boundary Changes - Hall Green

Regarding the proposed boundary changes in the Hall Green area - to become part of Tyseley.

I live in the area concerned, my address Hall Green. This has been my address since birth. Me and my family have been here 30 years and we are all deeply concerned with the proposed changes. We are from Hall Green and to suddenly change that identity - including the local train station, Hall Green parade etc is an outrage.

I have spoken to other known families in the area and everyone I have spoken to hold the same opinion! This cannot go ahead.

We strongly oppose the proposal to become Tyseley. As permanent residents, we will remain as Hall Green.

The proposed changes will not be welcomed.

Regards
Ema Choudhury
Dear Sirs,

I write is letter, having learned about the proposed boundary changes for Hall Green, Birmingham, to express my objection and deepest concerns. Firstly I would like to share my disappointment over the lack of local engagement in developing the proposed changes, the changes were a surprise to almost all the residents of Hall Green. In addition, the proposed changes shocked the local community and this was illustrated by the attendances at two local residents meetings.

The most recent meeting on Friday 29th January, where more than 350 residents attended the meeting braving heavy rain and bitterly cold weather. The emotions were high at the meeting where the community expressed their concerns over the proposed (perceived) dictatorial changes, which threatens to rip apart a cohesive community. The proposed changes would appear to have been drawn up by someone sat in a dark room void of human engagement.

I have lived in Hall Green for almost 20 years, and I personally feel aggrieved by the proposed changes in the manner it splits communities, strips Hall Green of its heritage and identity. Landmarks like Hall Green Station, Hall Green School, The Hall Green Parade, Hall Green United Community Church, Sarehole Mill, and the Shires Country Park are integral part of Hall Green’s Heritage. The effect of removing these unique landmarks out of Hall Green and placing them in a different area, to the community, appears to be sacrilegious.

In my 20 years in Hall Green I have witnessed a significant demographic change despite these changes the community have remained cohesive and strong. For most parts this has been facilitated by number of Hall Green community organisations that have worked tirelessly to forge good community links between the different faiths in the community and bridging generational divides. The number of young people and young families in the ward has grown considerably in the last ten years. It is pertinent that a period of real stability is maintained so that the community cohesion in Hall Green can continue to be nurtured and fostered.
In the current environment of central and local government austerity, Hall Green has only a single council asset namely Hall Green Library, which provides community with an irreplaceable service which brings people from all walks of life together. Splitting Hall Green will divide the community and detract from the rich multicultural area that it is today. The rich multicultural and effective community cohesiveness can be witnessed by the existence of numerous religious community buildings.

I together with my community strongly object to the creation of a new Tyseley ward, which encapsulates the historic Hall Green sites. I strongly urge you retain the status quo for Hall Green.

I have little regard for the political rhetoric that is driving these changes. However, I do care very much about the community and the pride I have of Hall Green and its unique landmarks. For this reason I strongly urge you to reconsider the changes.

I do believe the proposed changes will inevitably cause chaos in the way the council is run and the services it provides. I do strongly feel that the changes will undermine the needs of the community.

In the event that the political hunger for change is irreversible, despite the pending disaster, I would support the “Option 3a” proposed by the Birmingham City local councilors that seeks to keep the Hall Green name.

Yours faithfully
Habibur Choudhury
Dear Sirs,

I write this email after learning about the proposed boundary changes for Hall Green, and I feel let down by the Boundary Commission for failing to understand the Hall Green community. Furthermore, sitting in London the commission do not understand the implications of the proposed changes.

The proposed changes removes the Hall Green landmark out of Hall Green and places them in a newly created Tyseley Ward. Landmarks like Hall Green Station, Hall Green School, The Hall Green Parade, Hall Green United Community Church, Sarehole Mill, and the Shires Country Park are keep part of Hall Green. I truly believe it will be a mistake to move these sites out of Hall Green.

Hall Green community is a strong cohesive community, and the proposed changes will tear apart the community. Furthermore, the work of various community groups to maintain this strong community togetherness will be undermined. Hall Green boasts a diverse community, despite this diversity the community identifies itself as the Hall Green community. Splitting Hall Green will split the community.

I do strongly object to the creation of a new Tyseley ward, and strongly urge you maintain the status quo for Hall Green.

Yours truly

Nishath Choudhury
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ravinder Singh Chumber
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Dear Sirs, I am writing to have my say on the boundary changes as they effect me in my area in Handsworth. I am part of the Grove Residents Association and as the Chairman of the East Handsworth Forum. I live in Handsworth too. I am supportive of the changes of the Boundary Commission generally. I also think more natural boundaries should be respected, like rivers and railways. However in my own area of the Lozells & East Handsworth Ward, I am not in favour of having these two areas conjoined. The wealth and good reputation from the Handsworth area has suffered with its link to Lozells, Lozells having drained the wealth and economic success from Handsworth. The fairly affluent area of Handsworth Wood has been kept separate and this has been an act of self preservation on their behalf. This way in the uploaded map as I have uploaded, the boundary would be better and fair.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Cher Bing Chuo
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I fully disagree with the draft proposals which will split up Moseley. This splits up the conservation area which is a source of our community pride and cohesion. The identity of Moseley as a community will be obliterated by such proposed changes.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
31 January 2016

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

Response to Consultation on Proposed Ward Boundaries for Birmingham

Dear Sir/Madam

I am pleased to respond to your invitation to comment on your consultation document.

In summary, we consider that:

1. The benefits of the re-warding are not commensurate with cost of defining and implementing the changes and the extensive, subsequent costs for numerous local and national government departments.

2. The proposal seems to attempt to satisfy its stated objectives in the wrong order. Primary emphasis must be placed on reflecting the interests and identities of local communities and promoting effective local government. The statistical need for each councillor to represent approximately the same number of voters must be considered as a constraint or secondary objective rather than the starting point for any new boundaries.

Elaboration of these two fundamental objections is attached together with some examples from our local community.

Yours sincerely,

Ken Churchill
Hazel Churchill
1. Value for Money

1.1. The Need for Change

Local wards are designed for electing local representatives for local government bodies, the subject of your draft report.

The existing wards in Birmingham were designed on the same principles as the current revision yet the solution is very different. Is it markedly better to have more wards represented by a combination of 1 or 2 councillors rather than a smaller number of wards all represented by the same number of councillors?

Do the changes give undoubted value for money to the residents and taxpayers of the city? The need for change is unproven.

1.2. Benefits and Costs

The report needs to show the balance between costs and benefits of the proposed changes.

Electoral wards/divisions are the key building blocks of UK administrative geography. They are the spatial units used to elect local government councillors in metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts, unitary authorities and the London boroughs.

However, these local wards have many other uses in local and national planning. Census area statistics based on local government wards provide counts of people or households for geographical areas broken down by socio-demographic characteristics such as age, gender or employment.

These census area statistics are fundamental in health and social care, education, housing and many commercial sectors for a multitude of local, regional and national planning purposes. They support many information and planning systems in these sectors. Having been involved with planning for health and social care for many years we understand the implications in terms of both cost and timescales of changes to local ward boundaries. Such planning often involves historical trends. Changing local boundaries curtails their usefulness whilst awaiting detailed calculations of ratified historical populations, maybe going back 20 or more years. This delay renders many system inadequate for several years whilst new figures are prepared and then incurs enormous costs in system changes within both government and commercial organisations.

When wards are smaller, population-based data becomes potentially disclosive, and so unusable, when analysing all but the most common social circumstances and medical conditions. In the past, there has been a tendency for rural wards to consist of smaller populations than urban wards. Our professional recommendation is to make the rural wards larger not the urban ones smaller so that they become more uniform.

Change to boundaries means local and national costs of implementation plus significantly larger costs elsewhere. The Boundary Commission should consider, estimate and report the wider national cost, ultimately borne by all tax payers, as part of its recommendations.

The consequences of changing any geographical boundaries are generally much greater than the benefits of the change for a single purpose. Please leave the boundaries alone.
2. Objectives of the Report

2.1. Summary

Everywhere in the report, the objective "to provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters" is listed as the first. This priority and the pre-eminence given to numbers of electors in the reports strongly suggests that the Boundary Commission's main focus is foremost on the statistics and not on the communities and their residents.

The report should be restructured to list this as the last of the main objectives not the first and to focus discussion on existing communities that have developed over generations of local residents.

2.2. Reflecting Communities

The views of local residents across many parts of Birmingham seem to mirror those that have been discussed in our own locality of Moseley. We know many local organisations have also communicated with you on the splitting up of a strong and active community across four proposed wards. Ward boundaries divide our community rather than encompass it. This seems a clear example of the boundaries and populations coming first, ahead of unifying the community and its council representation.

2.3. Promoting Effective Government

Local government cannot be as effective with natural communities divided across electoral wards with a consequential need to involve several councillors, each with priorities towards other communities. Specific examples for Moseley are noted in Appendix A.

2.4. Size of Proposed Wards

2.4.1. Number of Councillors

Impending and future changes to the number of councillors and adjustments to ensure that councillors represent roughly equal numbers of electors can more easily be achieved by combinations of ward and proportional vote representatives without the need to continually realign ward boundaries.

2.4.2. Single and Multiple Councillor Wards

Changing to a mixture of 1 and 2 councillor wards from a structure of equal numbers seems a retrograde step. Voting mechanisms are entirely different for a single and multiple councillor wards.

2.4.3. Size of Proposed Wards

On current populations, the proposed wards give a variation of electors per councillor [-30.0% to 17.6%] no better than for the current wards [-25.5% to 11.6%]. On 2021 projections, the variation for proposed wards [-8.4% to 9.4%] appears less than current wards [-14.2% to 14.6%] but that is totally dependent upon uncertainty in future projections for small areas. Given the variations in ward voter turnout across the city, size differences of plus or minus 15% seem acceptable. Why change the boundaries at all?
Appendix A - Moseley Examples

National Recognition

In 2015, Moseley was recognised as the best place in Britain for city living, according to the Sunday Times (1). Moseley’s biggest asset, according to the newspaper survey, is outdoor access with the 215-acre Cannon Hill Park with its lakes and formal gardens designed in the Victorian era and the small Moseley Park which is run by a trust. The judges based their results on hard data looking at schools, crime rates, house prices and transport links, as well as expertise and knowledge of the panel.

The Guardian headed its list of "Where should I live in Birmingham? Find your part of town" (2) with Moseley. It comments that if pubs and parks are high on your list of desirables, Moseley certainly delivers. In an earlier article in its Money section "Let's Move to: Moseley Birmingham" (3), the Guardian extols the virtues of Moseley’s housing with acclaim such as "What streets! What houses!"

The Moseley Farmers' Market is the only farmers' market in the UK to have won the prestigious award twice (2009, 2012) from FARMA - the National Farmers' Retail & Markets Association.

Moseley facilities not in proposed Moseley Ward

Evidence of shared community facilities being split between wards rather than meeting the boundary Commission's objective to "reflect community identity" include:

- Moseley Village - the heart of Moseley (Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill)
- Moseley Park and Pool (Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill)
- Moseley Hall Hospital (Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill)
- Moseley Farmer's Market (Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill)
- Moseley Post Office (Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill)
- Moseley Medical Centre (Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill)
- Moseley Golf Club (King's Heath)
- Moseley Bog and Nature Reserve (Sparkhill South)
- Birmingham Moseley Rugby Club (Billesley)

Moseley Community

Moseley Village is the centre of a vibrant community serving residents within a radius of around two kilometres. The proposed boundaries locate the centre of Moseley at the edge of the Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward fragmenting both the Moseley and the Balsall Heath communities.

The importance of the Moseley economy is recognised in two Birmingham City supplementary planning documents (SDP):

- Moseley SDP (4) - the first community led SPD in Birmingham, providing a leading example of how communities can play a more active role in shaping their area
- Shopping and Local centres SDP (5)
Both recognise Moseley Village as the centre of the surrounding Moseley community.

Residents of Moseley organise themselves to support and enhance the cultural, social, economic and ecological environment they live through thriving organisations centred on Moseley Village such as:

- The Moseley Society
- Moseley Forum
- Moseley Community Development Trust
- Moseley in Bloom
- Moseley Park and Pool
- Moseley Festival
- Sustainable Moseley
- Moseley Farmers' Market
- Moseley Arts Market
- Moseley Interfaith Group
- Moseley B13 Magazine

References

(1) http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tol/sto/style/homes_and_gardens/best_places/article1527439.ece; March 2015
(4) http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleypdc
(5) http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/spdlocalcentres
Please accept this written submission as a serious argument against the present proposals put forward by the Boundary Commission on proposed changes to the Northfield Ward.

The proposals will if approved disconnect and destabilise the community of persons at the very heart and centre of the Northfield and West Heath community. The Victoria Common (commonly known to residents as Northfield Park) is linked by footways within metres from vital sources of activity and education such as The Northfield Adult Education Centre, The Northfield Ecocentre, Friends of Victoria Common (organisation), The Northfield Shopping Centre with all its businesses, Northfield Pre-school Nursery, St. Laurence Schools, and The Royal Orthopaedic Hospital Northfield. The Victoria Common is a well-loved and well-used park area which geographically sits at the heart of the above listed organisations which surround it. Each and all are entwined in services and business connectivity, as many residents who use one organisation have a high probability of using another surrounding and including Victoria Common. The sports activities and horticultural work are all interlinked with those organisations and staff, parents, adults, resident children and volunteers who are already embedded in those organisations and services. The Northfield Shopping Centre as part of the BID (Business Improvement District) Northfield, also work alongside Friends of Victoria Common for the residents, particularly within the Summer months in organising major events and carnivals. To disconnect Victoria Common and place it within Bournville and Cotteridge Ward severs community connection and leaves future planning and organisation vulnerable. The Royal Orthopaedic Hospital although serving patients far and wide has particular car parking arrangements with The Northfield Town Shopping Centre thus community linking.

St Laurence Infant and Junior Primary Schools are also located on the periphery of Victoria Common. As part of their education they have strong links with the Friends of Victoria Common and The Northfield Ecocentre as part of community links/sustainability studies. These schools’ Church, the historic St. Laurence Church is located nearby and under the present Boundary proposals will become a separate ward to the very faith schools it represents. The proposals present possible unrest with parents and community groups due to possible future effects on school admissions and cohort displacement.

Northfield Train Station has opposing wards dependant on which entrance to the station is being used; i.e. either Quarry Lane entrance which is the proposed Northfield West ward or Station Road entrance which is the proposed Northfield East ward. Identity for travellers
and business commuters migrating into the area should remain in one consistent ward, the
Northfield Ward.

The Austin Village (Northfield East in the proposals) which has its own Preservation
Society has strong community links with the Austin Social Club (Northfield West in the
proposals). Austin Village with its high proportion of elderly residents use facilities and
retail facilities in the Northfield Town Shopping Centre. Also primary and secondary
students migrate from the proposed West ward into schools located in the proposed East
ward. Consistency should prevail in keeping the East and West as one complimentary
Northfield Ward, again alleviating any unrest with school admissions and admission
boundaries. West Heath Park located in the proposed Northfield East ward could then be
located within West Heath ward thus keeping a commonality of identity.

Mr and Mrs Clancy

Residents
Dear Sir

I am totally against the proposed new boundaries for wards in Hall Green. Hall Green has a strong sense of community and whilst it has undergone great demographic changes in recent years, various community organisations have worked hard to forge good community links between different faiths and different generations. There has been a Hall Green Residents Association for 90 years and a strong community group (We are B28). People strive to come and live in Hall Green to benefit from its excellent schools and community spirit. I have lived in Hall Green for 48 years (in several different houses). I grew up in Hall Green, met my husband in Hall Green and returned to Hall Green to start a family and raise our children. I have also worked in Hall Green in the library -our major council asset – for 35 years.

Tyseley is an industrial district and the people of Hall Green ward have different needs to those in the Tyseley ward – neither will be best served by being combined. I find it quite ludicrous that a handful of people can ‘visit’ Hall Green and then feel qualified to make decisions about the ward. Putting parts of Hall Green into Tyseley will not improve electoral equality – the 3 councillors who represent Hall Green ward have done so very well for a long time and all live in Hall Green themselves. It also seems very unfair that Birmingham already has so few councillors compared to other local authorities and yet you propose to pare the number down even more so.

We are Hall Green and want the status quo to remain.

Regards

Veronica Claridge
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ann Clarke
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I attach my letter containing my proposal for the Acocks Green Ward in response to the Boundary Commission's draft proposals for the Birmingham City Council Wards.
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Birmingham Ward Boundary Submission
Acocks Green Ward

I have lived a good part of my life in Acocks Green and for most of my adult life I have been involved in local political and community organisations. Therefore, I was so pleased when the Boundary Commission united both parts of Acocks Green into one ward in 2004, i.e., no longer split by the Warwick Road.

I remember the difficulties which arose when Acocks Green’s northern boundary was last moved to Hobmoor Road and was, therefore, dismayed to learn the Boundary Commission draft proposals had moved my part of Acocks Green B27 postcode (railway line to canal) into a new ward called Yardley West and, once again, linked it with Hay Mills, parts of Tyseley and Yardley. This part of Acocks Green has very little in common with these other areas, especially the wide expanse of industrial land between Wharfside Road and the Small Heath Highway.

Since 2004, Acocks Green has become truly integrated and several community ventures have been set up or strengthened including the Village Partnership, Acocks Green Focus Group, Westley Vale Millennium Green and RHS Village in Bloom (winning Bronze in 2013 to Gold in 2015).

Acocks Green is one of the urban villages which make up the conurbation of Birmingham and needs to be kept as a whole.

I am a member of Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum and with other members get involved in activities across the Ward. We also work well with our sister neighbourhood forum Fox Hollies Green.

The Acocks Green Focus Group is working with the City Council Planning Department on the proposed Acocks Green Conservation Area based on the Victorian and Edwardian architecture which evolved around Acocks Green railway station and would be split into two wards by your draft proposals. Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum members have also had a lot of input into this project.

Along with others, I support the proposal that the northern boundary of Acocks Green ward is moved back to the Grand Union Canal and the some 4,000 voters in polling districts CAH and CAJ be retained in Acocks Green Ward. The Fox Hollies Road would be the western boundary with the southern and eastern boundaries remaining as before. The areas west of Fox Hollies Road (polling districts CAA and CAC with approximately 4,000 voters) would move into the new Yardley West which could be more suitably named Hay Mills and Tyseley. Residents of the Yarnfield estate in polling district CAA have always considered themselves as living in Tyseley. The above proposal would not affect other ward boundaries in your draft proposals.
I believe the above proposal for the new Acocks Green Ward incorporates the Boundary Commission’s three aims (1) ward size, (2) reflects community interests and identities, and (3) promotes effective/convenient local government.

As an aside, there is already an old geographical area called South Yardley and perhaps it would be more relevant to keep this area alive by renaming your new ward of Yardley East as South Yardley.

I trust you will be able to look favourably on the above proposal.

Ann P. Clarke
Dear Sir,

25th January 2016

With reference to the proposed change in Boundary titles, I wish to declare my objection to the loss of YARDLEY in favour of Stechford East.

Yours sincerely,

B.W. Clarke. (Mr)
25th January 2016

Dear Sir,

With reference to the proposed change in Boundary titles, I wish to declare my objection to the loss of YARDLEY in favour of Stochford East.

Yours sincerely,

J. Clarke
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** James Clarke  
**E-mail:** [Redacted]  
**Postcode:** [Redacted]  
**Organisation Name:** [Redacted]  

**Comment text:**

I live in the Jewellery Quarter of Birmingham and am concerned at the plans to move this area from Ladywood ward to Winson Green. The Jewellery Quarter is a residential area of the city centre, like much of Ladywood. It fits this ward. In contrast Winson Green is more of a suburban area and as such has little in common with the Jewellery Quarter. I feel it would be a mistake to make this change and that it would lead to residents of the Jewellery Quarter not being as well represented on the city council as they currently are. The Jewellery Quarter and areas around St Pauls Square should remain part of Ladywood ward.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Peter Clarke
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: N/A

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 3: Banners Gate
Annotation 4: New Oscott College

Comment text:
This area should be included in the proposed new ward "Parkside" ward. It contains the Banners Gate entrance to Sutton Park which provides the main amenity space for residents living in the ward. These residents will be most interested in any future changes in this area as it directly affects them. They will also be the first to report any maintenance problems or anti-social behaviour occurring here to their elected members. Sutton Park should not be (almost) entirely contained within Four Oaks Ward. New Oscott College is an important feature of the area and should be included in the New Oscott/Banners Gate ward. It has no association with Perry Common. The name "Parkside" is meaningless and has unnecessary political connections. Locally this area is known as "New Oscott" or "Banners Gate" and either of these names should be used instead.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Peter Clarke
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: N/A

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Boldmere Golf Course & Boldmere Sailing Club
Annotation 3: Boldmere Gate

Comment text:
Sutton Park is a hugely significant part of the Boldmere community. There are businesses and amenity space on the periphery of the park around Boldmere Gate which are very important to the Boldmere community including Boldmere Golf Course, Boldmere Sailing Club, Miller & Carter restaurant and the amenity space immediately inside the Boldmere Gate entrance of the park. Any problems caused by or suffered by these operations will be most important to the Boldmere community and will likely be discussed at Ward meetings. Even more significant is the possibility for any changes to anything in this area, which would be of great interest to the Boldmere community, and indeed the emerging Boldmere Neighbourhood plan identifies this area as having potential to provide amenity enhancements to the Boldmere community. This area is within easy walking distance from the main commercial centre of Boldmere and is used by local Boldmere schools and community groups. A proposed Neighbourhood Plan boundary has been drawn, presented to Sutton Coldfield Town (Parish) Council and submitted to Birmingham City Council. This map can be viewed here: http://www.boldmere.org/

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
This area is definitely part of Cotteridge not Stetchley. It contains Cotteridge School which historically is linked to Cotteridge Park. The canal forms a barrier with Stetchley and children living in this area all attend Cotteridge School, which is a major feature of the Cotteridge settlement. At the south of this area is Cotteridge Rd, Laurel Rd etc who's buildings are synonymous with others in Cotteridge and different from Stetchley, and within a very short walk of Cotteridge shops. Issues important to local residents include Cotteridge School, the Grant Arms pub and other shops and it is important they are represented by elected members. The current boundary slices through an established row of shops along Pershore Rd. Any future plans for this area need to include all local businesses and therefore it is sensible to keep them within the same political area. I support the name "Bournville & Cotteridge".

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Roger Clarke
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I have seen references to many of the ridiculous outcomes of the proposed changes to council ward boundaries in Birmingham. Here's another one: I live in [REDACTED], Cotteridge but, under the proposed changes, I would come under Stirchley Ward. I find this objectionable because I don't live in Stirchley and there is a ward that describes where I do live much better - ie. Bournville and Cotteridge. The natural boundary between Stirchley and Cotteridge has always been the Worcester and Birmingham Canal and this should continue. But not only would my Cotteridge home end up in Stirchley Ward but so would Cotteridge Junior and Infant School in Breedon Road. The two communities of Cotteridge and Stirchley have always been distinct and these ill-thought out proposals will simply have the effect of causing resentment amongst the citizens of Birmingham. Retaining the geographical identities of Birmingham's communities should be given far more importance than simply counting houses. Please think again!

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Rebecca Clarke
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I object to the new proposed ward boundary for Boldmere Sutton Coldfield. The existing Sutton Vesey Ward includes an area of Sutton Park, which is primarily and almost exclusively used by residents within the Sutton Vesey Ward, and yet it appears that in the new boundary proposal the none of the Park is included within the ward boundary. As there is not any population there appears to be no justification of it been removed from our community and given to Four oaks Ward. As a regular user of the local park with my two young children I only ever see member of my local community.. I never see residents of Four Oaks or any other communities using this space. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan boundary for Boldmere includes an area of the Park, and it seems unfair to remove Boldmere from the area surrounding Boldmere Gate. Maney Hill Ward have been allowed to keep an area of the Park, so why haven’t we been given the same right!

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** Richard Clarke
- **E-mail:**
- **Postcode:**
- **Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

Not having Moseley Village and all its aspects in the planned Moseley Ward neglects the culture history and the essential qualities of what makes Moseley different and will also split the conservation area. Moseley has built up links between various local government bodies and voluntary bodies and this would be destroying that relationship that has been built up over the years. We strongly object to the intrusion by the commission which can only dilute the good work been undertaken over generations. Whilst the electoral equality will be equalised the community identity will not be retained as Moseley will loose boundaries which will make it much smaller and less of the community which care about being retained in it. Effective and convenient, local government whilst being the case at the moment, ie provided for by various Moseley societies, the Moseley Forum/ the Moseley Regeneration Group / the Moseley Society to name but three will be undermined by shrinking the Moseley Ward to the proposed boundary changes. On this basis we strongly reject the proposed changes.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

As I live in a listed cottage dating from 1640! which is one of the first dwellings in Erdington. I am extremely concerned that a decision made by the council has not taken this into consideration when altering the boundaries. This also means Erdington station will have to change its name which seems totally ridiculous. I am very concerned about the proposed boundaries and do sincerely hope that it doesn't happen!!!

Yours Sincerely,

[Blank]
North Birmingham Community Together

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

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

Personal Details:

Name: william clarke
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: -

Comment text:

I have looked at the proposals for Moseley and am truly horrified at what is proposed. I have lived in Moseley for over forty years. There is a wonderful sense of community within Moseley and a strong sense of identity. It is a thriving community with numerous community groups and associations run by local people. The central focus for the community is Moseley Village and is the heart of the community. The proposals will destroy the geographical basis of "Moseley", splitting it between several wards and in the longer term will affect negatively the way the local community works. I am reluctant to use emotive language in a response to an official consultation but the proposals are truly awful. They may meet your first criteria that each councillor represents approximately the same number of voters. Further criteria are stated as, "We also aim to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities as well as promoting effective local government". These proposals will not meet these criteria and I strongly oppose the proposals for Moseley.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Robert Clark  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]  
Organisation Name: I am a resident but am Chairman Yardley Conservative Association and a committee member of Yardley Forum

**Comment text:**

**Uploaded Documents:**

[Download](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7639)
Proposals for Birmingham Council Boundary Changes 2016

I am Chairman of the Yardley Conservative Association. I have been a resident of the Yardley constituency since 1978 apart from four years in Manchester in the eighties. I am an active member of the Yardley Forum which looks at local services and planning with a view to representing the views of the residents. The Forum has held a recent meeting on the Boundary Changes and my views include items mentioned in this meeting by residents and Councillors.

The boundary changes proposed divide the city into 101 wards. The increase in numbers of wards means the names have become inappropriate or at least incorrect and confusing. The area I am concerned about is the existing Constituency forming Yardley made up of Acocks Green, South Yardley, Stechford and Yardley North and Sheldon Wards.

The new Stechford East, as with the last Boundary change, has included the Parish Church of Yardley. This Church has formed a centre for Yardley since 972, it is more correctly known as St Edburgh’s but this does not stop it from being Yardley Parish Church. The area around Yardley Church is the first Conservation area in Birmingham created in 1969. The Yardley area was a much larger parish reaching to Yardley Wood and was a separate council until 1911 when it was incorporated into Birmingham. The historic heritage of Yardley makes it an area well known and respected by the residents and voters. The correct naming of areas as well known as Yardley is of a high importance to them.

In the last Boundary change this part of Yardley was again to be known as Stechford. At that time the name was changed due to pressure from residents to Stechford and Yardley North to correctly show their perceptions. I would ask for the name to be amended from the proposed Stechford East to just Yardley North as much of the Stechford area is no longer in the proposed area. I am surprised in view of the last Boundary re-naming of the area this matter has arisen again! I would suggest, as fully inclusive, the area is called Yardley North and Stechford North falling much more in line with the existing name and resident’s perception.

Stechford East should just be Stechford, again a locally recognised area. This area has a Stechford War Memorial and contains Stechford station a well used and known line for residents to the NEC and City Centre. I would suggest a name of Stechford and Yardley East to be fully inclusive.

Yardley West is locally known as Hay Mills and the renaming will cause confusion and not represent the local people’s perceptions at all. The name is clearly shown on the boundary map. The new area will include part of Tysley, another well known area. This name is clearly shown on the map. I would suggest Hay Mills and Tysley as the name.
Yardley East is known as South Yardley and the map and a local area sign does show this. The sign is situated in Church Road just after the Yew Tree Island and opposite the local Primary School, Yardley Junior and Infants. The map clearly shows South Yardley and this should be the name.

I believe that the naming and division of Acocks Green is causing problems for the residents and they have made substantial representations themselves. As they are the local residents and know their area well I would ask you to consider their suggestions which knowing the main people and local forum representatives I would support.

It is a worry that as the area to become the new Parliamentary Yardley will not be looked at until much later in 2018? The new ward boundaries and names will help the Boundary Commission select the wards to be included if the names have been correctly sorted out. The proposed wards names would mean the area that is presently the parliamentary constituency of Yardley would no longer be clearly reflected and the Boundary Commission for the new Constituency would not have a cohesive and appropriate guide. This may produce a Yardley Constituency that does not reflect the resident’s perception in both local and General Elections.

I understand that the changes will not disenfranchise any voters but they do have a perception of the area they live and vote in. The Commission will run the risk of people being allocated to inappropriately named areas and producing a resentment that may make them unlikely to exercise their vote. They will not see the new area as “their area” and this could affect the incentive for them to vote not seeing the new area as “theirs”.

I trust you can see the merits and reasons for my name proposals. I hope you will consider changing them to the area perceptions and clarity of residents/voters of Yardley.

It would seem that many locals do not know of the Boundary Changes and I would ask the existing requirement on the Council to advertise in a local paper under the regulations should be revised. I would suggest the Council Website, Facebook and other modern communication systems should be included to widen the local residents/voters awareness of a forthcoming Boundary Change.

Robert M Clark
Chairman Yardley Conservative Association
Committee member of Yardley Forum
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Laura Clay
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

It is utterly ridiculous to draw a boundary for Moseley which excludes its High Street, known as Moseley Village, its park which is called Moseley Park and several of its very well-known residential roads. The people of Moseley are very proud of this Birmingham suburb which operates almost as a village, hence the name Moseley Village. Its residents have a strong sense of community and loyalty to Moseley - people generally don't leave once they have lived here. Altering the boundaries will completely change the dynamics of this historic suburb. Please reconsider.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: MARIA CLAYTON
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: Tile Cross Neighbourhood Forum

Comment text:

I am a resident of Tile Cross and a member of the Tile Cross Neighbourhood Forum please see below our objections to the proposed Boundary change for Glebe Farm and Tile Cross. The proposed Boundary change for Glebe Farm and Tile Cross has now got parts of Stechford & Yardley North, Ward End and Alum Rock Wards included in the proposed changes. These areas have never been part of Glebe Farm or Tile Cross and I am very surprised that it is being proposed by the Commission. I feel these areas would be better shared by the Saltley, Ward End and Alum Rock Wards; these are very small wards especially Alum Rock and I am surprised at how small these wards are in contrast to the proposed Glebe Farm and Tile Cross Ward. The natural Boundary is the River Cole/Kingfisher Project; realistically it should be Stechford Retail Park that would include some part of the Stechford & Yardley North Ward and the Railway Line up to Lea Hall Train Station. In your Proposing New Wards Guidance 2015-08-04 PDF Document; How to propose a pattern of Wards; part 3 Promoting effective and convenient local government and reflecting electoral cycles page 11 Size of Ward or Division – You state "We will look at the geographic size of the ward or division and try to ensure that it is not so large that it would be difficult for a Councillor to represent. Similarly, in urban areas, a ward might be so small in area that its Councillor might not be able to contribute effectively to the wider business of the council." and page 12 'Detached Ward' – you state that "We are sometimes presented with proposals to include two geographically separate areas in the same ward or division. We will not usually accept a proposal of this kind as it is unlikely to meet our criteria for promoting community identity and interests or delivering effective and convenient local government." I think that this proposal falls into these categories and my views are shared by others' within this Community. If you realistically think about it you are proposing to split residents from Stechford & Yardley North, Ward End and Alum Rock Wards (Which the above statement is also relevant) and putting them into Glebe Farm and Tile Cross; actually you're splitting 3 Wards and putting them all into another Ward. This is clearly completely contradictory to what your statements above are stating in your criteria. I hope you will consider my views has valid points and take note of your own set criteria as mentioned above; when making your decisions on the proposed Boundary changes. There are also plans to build 250 – 300 Homes on the old Sewage Farm Site; which could potentially see 1,000 – 1,500 new residents added to the Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Ward. Has this been taken into account when assessing the number of residents for each ward? Will the new people moving in have any connections with the local Community? In the 'Birmingham Ward Draft recommendations 2015' Summary under Analysis and Draft Recommendations on page 14 it states: Ward Name: Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Number of Councillors: 2 Variance 2021: 6% Description: This ward includes the communities of Glebe Farm, Kitt’s Green and Tile Cross, bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the south and the River Cole to the north. Detail: We received five submissions that commented on this area of Birmingham, including four detailed proposals for warding arrangements. The proposals that we received for this area differed quite significantly. In considering our draft recommendations for this we visited this part of the city in order to observe the evidence received. As part of our deliberations we examined whether we could identify two single-member wards of Glebe Farm and Tile Cross. However, we could not identify a sufficiently clear boundary between the two areas that would provide an acceptable level of electoral equality. Accordingly, we propose a two-member Glebe Farm & Tile Cross ward based
on one of the submissions that we received. We consider that this ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria in terms of both reflecting community identity and providing a good level of electoral equality, while also allowing for effective and convenient local government. There is no mention in these statements regarding including parts of the Stechford & Yardley North, Alum Rock and Ward End Wards in this proposed Ward. This is very misleading to residents and interested parties and I would like to know why this information has been omitted. I am also concerned of the lack of literature through residents’ doors from the Boundary Commission explaining these proposed changes and the lack of consultation via Ward Councillors with their electorate. Please see the uploaded Map of the proposed Glebe Farm and Tile Cross Ward with the highlighted areas shaded in. There is a problem with uploading the map but you can refer to copies already sent from other residents. Thanks

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Friday 5th February 2016

Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

My concerns are about the proposal to split the existing ward of Selly Oak in the way in which the review has detailed. I regret the loss of the name of Selly Oak in the new structure. Selly Oak is a long established area of the city and one with which citizens of Birmingham readily identify. The proposals appear to be chiefly a numbers game and do not take into consideration the important element of geographical and historical identity. This is a problem which is manifest in the proposals for other parts of the city as well, Moseley being one of the most extreme examples.

Next I wish to concentrate on the proposed two-Councillor ward of Bournbrook and Selly Park.

I strongly support an alternative proposal of a ward for Bournbrook and a separate ward for Selly Park, each with one Councillor, would better serve the interests of both groups of residents.

Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas and are distinguished from each other by different demographics, housing stocks, community groups, conservation areas and commuting habits. These can be summarised as follows:

Bournbrook

- Housing: Many properties classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.
- Conservation Areas: None.
- Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Bristol Road via car and bus routes 61, 63, 64, 144, X64. Additionally, extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38 and 76).

Selly Park

- Housing: Few properties classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Selly Park Residents Community Association, Selly Park Property Owners' Association, Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum, Selly Wick Residents.
- Conservation Areas: Selly Park Conservation Area, Selly Park Avenues Conservation Area.
- Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Pershore Road (Selly Park's main road) via car and bus routes 45, 47, 106. No bus routes or stops on local roads.
In terms of defining each ward, I support the idea of introducing an ‘internal’ boundary within the proposed two-Councillor ward, thus creating two one-Councillor wards, as shown on the accompanying map.

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

Returning to the question of Selly Oak and local identity, I go on to propose a Selly Oak and Bournbrook ward under the new plan. I believe the proposals that the southern-most part of the existing Selly Oak ward on either side of the Bristol Road, which is essentially the heart of historical Selly Oak, would be put into Bournville & Cotteridge and Weoley wards. I would make a counter proposal that the existing southern and south-western boundary is maintained thus keeping the parish church and Selly Oak park within the new Selly Oak ward.

I do hope that you will give these counter proposal proposals serious consideration.

Yours faithfully,

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

Friday 5th February 2016

Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

My concerns are about the proposal to split the existing ward of Selly Oak in the way in which the review has detailed. I regret the loss of the name of Selly Oak in the new structure. Selly Oak is a long established area of the city and one with which citizens of Birmingham readily identify. The proposals appear to be chiefly a numbers game and do not take into consideration the important element of geographical and historical identity. This is a problem which is manifest in the proposals for other parts of the city as well, Moseley being one of the most extreme examples.

Next I wish to concentrate on the proposed two-Councillor ward of Bournbrook and Selly Park.

I strongly support an alternative proposal of a ward for Bournbrook and a separate ward for Selly Park, each with one Councillor, would better serve the interests of both groups of residents.

Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas and are distinguished from each other by different demographics, housing stocks, community groups, conservation areas and commuting habits. These can be summarised as follows:

**Bournbrook**

- Housing: Many properties classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.
- Conservation Areas: None.
- Commuting Habits: 'Travel to City Centre using Bristol Road via car and bus routes 61, 63, 64, 144, X64. Additionally, extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38 and 76).

**Selly Park**

- Housing: Few properties classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents' Groups: Selly Park Residents Community Association, Selly Park Property Owners' Association, Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum, Selly Wick Residents.
- Conservation Areas: Selly Park Conservation Area, Selly Park Avenues
- Conservation Area
- Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Pershore Road (Selly Park's main road) via car and bus routes 45, 47, 108. No bus routes or stops on local roads.

RECEIVED 15 FEB 2016
In terms of defining each ward, I support the idea of introducing an 'internal' boundary within the proposed two-Councillor ward, thus creating two one-Councillor wards, as shown on the accompanying map.

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

Returning to the question of Selly Oak and local identity, I go on to propose a Selly Oak and Bournebrook ward under the new plan. I believe the proposals that the southern-most part of the existing Selly Oak ward on either side of the Bristol Road, which is essentially the heart of historical Selly Oak, would be put into Bournville & Cotteridge and Weoley wards. I would make a counter proposal that the existing southern and south-western boundary is maintained thus keeping the parish church and Selly Oak park within the new Selly Oak ward.

I hope these counter proposal proposals serious consideration.
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

All the implications a border change would bring and inconvenience
eg. Higher car’s house insurance
devaluation of property (change of postal code would bring in fees to re-pay)
(D) change of driving licence, etc. (insurance) change of details etc.
An fees would be incurred. No to border change.

I’ve lived in Erdington 57 years and strongly object to the proposals. Will the council compensate for any of the above? I think not.

Yours,

[Name]

[Address]

[Postcode]

[Email]

[Phone]
Annotation 1: New North Boundary for Edgbaston

Comment text:

I should like to object strongly to the proposed change to the existing boundaries of Edgbaston and the creation of a Summerfield ward. We moved to Edgbaston 16 years ago and have seen the area develop into a highly respected community with close links to the areas of Edgbaston south of the Hagley road. With regard to the questions raised: 1. Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities? No, the people living in Edgbaston North of the Hagley road are clearly a core component of Edgbaston both in their life styles and socioeconomic structure. 2. How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Moving the proposed boundary between Edgbaston and Summerfield north to include the reservoir as drawn on the map would be a much better reflection of the local community and would achieve significantly better electoral equality. Reducing the western and eastern limits of Edgbaston south of the Hagley road would also fit with the requirement to reduce the size of the ward without impacting on electoral equality. 3. Are the names of the proposed wards right? No, Summerfield is inevitably going to be associated with Summerfield Park which although an important recreational facility is in need of much restoration, to label areas of Edgbaston such as the reservoir as Edgbaston North will have a massive impact on the area and make it much less attractive to professional residents. The draft recommendations from the Boundary Commission to Birmingham City Council at point 12 state: "There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on those issues." In fact it is clear that no attempt has been made to obtain any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. I have seen copies of letters from two local estate agents that clearly state this could not be further from the truth. Birmingham is a vibrant, successful and rapidly changing city. Areas such as Edgbaston with their unique housing and social structure attract external investment to the city. The proposed boundary changes will undo much of the beneficial developments that have taken place over the years. Local and central governments all too often hide behind the protective wall of 'public consultation'. I hope very much that response from so many of the affected residents is heeded and given due recognition.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Tom Clutton-Brock
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

**Annotation 1: Proposed North boundary for Edgbaston**

Comment text:

I should like to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed change to the existing boundaries of Edgbaston and the creation of a Summerville ward. The area of Edgbaston north of the Hagley Road has existed since the early 1900s and has developed into a close-knit community. With regard to the specific questions raised, 1. Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities? Definitely not, the community of Edgbaston North of the Hagley Road is closely aligned with the rest of Edgbaston both in the demographics of its population, community engagement, employment and social structure. Over the 15 years we have lived here the community has changed beyond all recognition and now is indistinguishable from the rest of Edgbaston in terms of the community and quality of living. 2. How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Moving the proposed boundary between Edgbaston and Summerville north to include the reservoir as drawn on the map would be a much better reflection of the local community and would achieve significantly better electoral equality. Reducing the western and eastern limits of Edgbaston south of the Hagley road would also fit with the requirement to reduce the size of the ward without distorting electoral equality. 3. Are the names of the proposed wards right? No, Summerville is inevitable going to be associated with Summerville park which although an excellent recreational facility is in need of much restoration, to label areas of Edgbaston such will wind the clock back 20 years and completely fail to reflect the very different communities that have grown up. I note that the draft recommendations from the Boundary Commission to Birmingham City Council at point 12 states: "There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums". You have seen copies of letters from two local estate agents that this could not be further from the truth. Birmingham is a vibrant, successful and rapidly changing city. Areas such as Edgbaston with their unique housing and social structure attract external investment to the city. The proposed boundary changes will undo much of the beneficial developments that have taken place over the years. Local and central governments all too often hide behind the protective wall of "public consultation". I hope very much that response from so many of the affected residents is heeded and given due recognition.

Uploaded Documents:
None uploaded

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7215

03/02/2016
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

The historical heart of Erdington would be lost. Rail Station, Churches, library, swimming pool, schools. All appreciated and should be retained.

Yours Sincerely

[Name redacted]

[Address redacted]

[Postcode redacted]

[Email redacted]

[Phone number redacted]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mark Cobham
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I moved my family to Birmingham on retiring from the [position], as I'd secured a new career in the area. We rented accommodation for 12 months while we searched for a permanent home, and deliberately looked at houses within Yardley. We found a place on [address] and moved in [number] years ago. We chose Yardley and nowhere else owing to its character and rich heritage, and would feel very disappointed to see a name change that would see the loss of Yardley's long standing culture. Thank you

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Re Draft Recommendations for new ward boundaries

Dear Sir/Madam

My late wife and I came to Birmingham from London in 1972 to work at The General Hospital. In 1973 we moved into the pleasant and welcoming community of Moseley and have remained here since. Moseley is not only a well defined and integrated neighbourhood today, but has a long heritage preceding that of adjacent areas.

We have over the years been involved in voluntary activities encompassing local amenity groups, the church, community building and gardening projects and trusteeship of Moseley Park and Pool Trust. Our children went to primary school in Moseley and participated in scouting and guiding in Moseley. These points and others demonstrate our commitment to the integrated community of Moseley as it is. Balsall Heath is a separate place and Cannon Hill a mound within Moseley on which Cannon Hill House was erected and remains.

The proposal to split Moseley into five is destructive bureaucratic vandalism without any respect to the integrated community which exists today and has done so for centuries.

I register my total rejection of the proposals and along with so many others agree that they must be dismissed.

Yours faithfully

Roy Cockel
Retired consultant physician
Dear Sir,

I am writing to protest about the changes being proposed by the Boundary Commission to Hall Green and Moseley Wards in Birmingham. With all due respect, it appears that whoever drew up this plan has little knowledge of the area being sliced up.

Tyseley is a large industrial area frequented by large 40 ton vehicles and other heavy duty traffic etc. It sits conveniently on the A45 Coventry Road which is a multi carriageway from the motorway system. It works quite well. However, I have come across foreign speaking lorry drivers who have landed up on the A41 Warwick Road and the A4040 Fox Hollies Road, looking for Tyseley, Amington Road, which is the centre of the Tyseley estate.

I would ask you to consider if these same lorry drivers (non English speaking) were to head for a Tyseley which stretched across the A34 Stratford Road (another motorway connection), what sort of chaos that might cause.

The A34 Stratford Road is a very busy and relatively 'bottlenecked' route, unsuitable for heavy lorries, in my opinion. It includes the Parade, Hall Green. It is self-evident at certain times of the day, at various points Hall Green Parade, Shirley High Street and Robin Hood Island are totally inadequate and could be said to be dangerous if expected to accommodate more heavy lorries looking for Tyseley. By stretching the Tyseley area across this main route we could even have lorries jammed under the small railway bridge at the island at the bottom of Sarehole Road. The Stratford Road on the Parade narrows down to single lanes both in and out of the city. Fox Hollies Road leading from Hall Green to Tyseley narrows down to a single lane which is totally unsuitable for heavy lorries.

Industrial parks have been built near to the motorway system on the A34 Monkspath and this makes sense. Tyseley sits on the A45, a purpose-built road built to take heavy-duty lorries in and out of the city from the motorway system. The A34 from the motorway system is not suitable for heavy lorries, especially in this part of Hall Green. Please do not give this type of traffic the chance of looking for Tyseley in Hall Green.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sir,

After receiving a letter from our local Labour councillors regarding the proposed boundary changes to Hall Green, I attended the meeting at Highfield Hall on the 29th January where I found out a lot more about these proposed changes. I was also given a leaflet by We Are B28, again explaining these changes.

I have heard nothing officially from the people responsible for these proposed changes and if our local councillors and We Are B28 had not been in touch I, along with most of the Hall Green people I have spoken to, would have known nothing. Why is this?

You have stated three main considerations for these proposed boundary changes:-

1. To improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents.
2. Reflect community identity.
3. Provide effective and convenient local government.

In order to achieve your first consideration you appear to have done this by ignoring both your second and third points.

The new boundaries you are proposing take absolutely no account of community identity (point two). Hall Green has been a thriving community for a very long time - my time as a resident of Hall Green goes back many years and I know many residents with even longer links.

The road, Dunsmore Road, was built in Hall Green in 1904; Hall Green Parade was built in 1913 and Sarehole Mill is one of the most famous Hall Green icons, being linked world-wide to JRR Tolkien.

We have a settled and diverse community which reflects our area extremely well and carving Hall Green into three pieces - one of them called Tyseley - will certainly not do our community identity any good at all. Are you aware that you will be joining a residential community (Hall Green) to a mainly industrial community (Tyseley)!

Your third point to provide effective and convenient local government will not come into this. We will have less councillors to represent us and if we are placed within Tyseley boundaries the local Advice Surgery will move more than likely further into Tyseley.

At the moment we have three councillors whose Advice Surgery is within easy reach of all Hall Green residents (judging by the turnout at the meeting in Highfield Hall where their surgery is held). They have served us well and the service you will be replacing them with will be a poor shadow of what we are used to. This can only be in response to government cuts as an over-worked councillor who will not be able to be ill or absent will not be as effective as our three who can interchange for all our benefits.

I wonder if the London people who looked at the boundary maps saw just politics and not people. How can Hall Green Parade, Station and School (to name but a few important sites) now be in Tyseley? It will confuse local people
and I dread to think what visitors to the City (particularly those who come especially to visit Sarehole Mill with its world-wide Tolkien connections) will think.

I would like to register my objections to these proposed boundary changes. I do, however, support the alternative solution to the division of wards, we will retain the name Hall Green and become Hall Green North, Central and South thus retaining our community identity and proud history.

Yours faithfully
Susan Coffey,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Desmond and Kathy Cole
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

This proposed change to the boundary of Moseley is wrong I believe. Moseley has a village feel to it and is a strong and vibrant community. Splitting the ward as proposed would diminish this and separate people. The ridiculous thing is that the centre of Moseley including the parish church, crossroads and some shops are not in the proposed area. There is much volunteer activity devoted to Moseley and over the years the area has been improving in different ways because of the coherence of the area. The community activity is a benefit to the city, and this comes from the sense of togetherness in Moseley that could be lost of the area is split in the way proposed.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that The Boundary Commission is considering plans to alter the district of Yardley to be known in future as Stechford East.

Yardley is a very Historic district within the City of Birmingham it is home to the Yardley Parish of St Edburgha’s and the Conservation area of Yardley. The Church was there before Christopher Columbus discovered America, surely the name of Yardley should remain. The new Boundary should be called Yardley and not East Stechford.

We are losing a lot of Old districts and this should stop. Would you like Westminster to be called Thames North East South or West. The Historical names should remain.

Regards Barbara Coleman
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Robert Coleman
E-mail: 
Organisation Name: The Conservative Party

Feature Annotations

Map Features:
Annotation 2: City Centre and Jewellery Quarter Ward
Annotation 3: Edgbaston Reservoir
Annotation 4: Summerfield Park
Annotation 5: Edgbaston
Annotation 10: Hodge Hill
Annotation 14: Newtown and Aston
Annotation 15: Moseley Village
Annotation 16: Ladywood
Annotation 17: Bromford

Comment text:
City Centre and Jewellery Quarter Ward The city centre and Jewellery Quarter are surrounded, in part, by the inner ring road. This acts as a physical barrier and forms the ward boundary in my proposal. Due to the presence of the dual carriageway, the interaction of residents with those outside of the ring road is limited. Moreover, residents who live in the city centre/Jewellery Quarter are far more reliant on public transport hubs/local amenities due to the number of residents who are in possession of a car (23%). Therefore, they are more likely to travel to work via local transport hubs within the city centre, or utilise local amenities such as the shops on New Street or in the Bull Ring (City centre) or on Warstone Lane (Jewellery Quarter). Separately, The Jewellery Quarter benefits from the presence of a local authority conservation area which is also respected in this proposal and is situated to the north west of the draft ward boundary. Ladywood My proposal for the Ladywood ward focuses on the community surrounding the Birmingham Canal lanes and basin. This Ladywood community is a growing community and the centre of the ward is focused on the presence of a high volume of local amenities and retail/entertainment venues on Broad Street which sits at the heart of this proposal. Large parts of this draft ward are populated by new developments which are similar in character and design, with space set aside for the expansion of residential areas – particularly as there are a further 6000 homes that may be introduced onto greenbelt land within the Sutton Coldfield Ward. Moseley Under the current proposals the 'Moseley' ward, does not include Moseley Village. See alternative plan above Hodge Hill, the focus of the Hodge Hill ward is centred around the Fox and Goose shopping centre which is the economic heart of the community. Bromford current benefits from the presence of local amenities on Collingbourne Avenue and Bromford Drive. This provides a communal centre for residents in the two communities which are separated by Bromford Road.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Robert Coleman
E-mail: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: The Conservative Party

Feature Annotations

- 4: Summerfield Park
- 5: Edgbaston Reservoir
- 6: Ladywood
- 8: Edgbaston
- 15: Moseley Village
- 16: Ladywood
- 17: Bromford

Map Features:

Annotation 2: City Centre and Jewellery Quarter Ward
Annotation 3: Edgbaston Reservoir
Annotation 4: Summerfield Park
Annotation 5: Edgbaston
Annotation 6: Hodge Hill
Annotation 7: Newtown and Aston
Annotation 8: Moseley Village
Annotation 9: Ladywood
Annotation 10: Bromford

Comment text:

City Centre and Jewellery Quarter Ward The city centre and Jewellery Quarter are surrounded, in part, by the inner ring road. This acts as a physical barrier and forms the ward boundary in my proposal. Due to the presence of the dual carriageway, the interaction of residents with those outside of the ring road is limited. Moreover, residents who live in the city centre/Jewellery Quarter are far more reliant on public transport hubs/local amenities due to the number of residents who are in possession of a car (33%). Therefore, they are more likely to travel to work via local transport hubs within the city centre, or utilise close local amenities such as the shops on New Street or in the Bull Ring (City centre) or on Warstone Lane (Jewellery Quarter). Separately, The Jewellery Quarter benefits from the presence of a local authority conservation area which is also respected in this proposal and is situated to the north west of the draft ward boundary. Ladywood My proposal for the Ladywood ward focuses on the community surrounding the Birmingham Canal lanes and basin. This Ladywood community is a growing community and the centre of the ward is focused on the presence of a high volume of local amenities and retail/entertainment venues on Broad Street which sits at the heart of this proposal. Large parts of this draft ward are populated by new developments which are similar in character and design to Sutton Coldfield. Significant under representation of residents is common under the current proposals in Sutton Coldfield. I believe that the current proposals do not leave significant room for population growth or the expansion of residential areas – particularly as there are a further 6,000 homes that may be included onto greenbelt land within the Sutton Coldfield Wards. Moseley Under the current proposals the 'Moseley' ward, does not include Moseley Village. See alternative plan above Hodge Hill, the focus of the Hodge Hill ward is centred around the Fox and Goose shopping centre which is the economic heart of the community. Bromford current benefits from the presence of local amenities on Collingbourne Avenue and Bromford Drive. This provides a communal centre for residents in the two communities which are separated by Bromford Road.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Robert Coleman
E-mail: 
Organisation Name: The Conservative Party

Feature Annotations

Annotation 2: City Centre and Jewellery Quarter Ward
Annotation 3: Edgbaston Reservoir
Annotation 4: Summerfield Park
Annotation 5: Edgbaston
Annotation 10: Hodge Hill
Annotation 14: Newtown and Aston
Annotation 15: Moseley Village
Annotation 16: Ladywood
Annotation 17: Bromford

Comment text:

City Centre and Jewellery Quarter Ward - The city centre and Jewellery Quarter are surrounded, in part, by the inner ring road. This acts as a physical barrier and forms the ward boundary in my proposal. Due to the presence of the dual carriage way, the interaction of residents with those outside of the ring road is limited. Moreover, residents who live in the city centre/Jewellery Quarter are far more reliant on public transport hubs/local amenities due to the number of residents who are in possession of a car (23.3%). Therefore, they are more likely to travel to work via local transport hubs within the city centre, or utilise close local amenities such as shops on New Street or in the Bull Ring (City centre) or on Wardstone Lane (Jewellery Quarter). Separately, The Jewellery Quarter benefits from the presence of a local authority conservation area which is also respected in this proposal and is situated to the north west of the draft ward boundary. Ladywood My proposal for the Ladywood ward focuses on the community surrounding the Birmingham Canal lanes and basin. This Ladywood community is a growing community and the centre of the ward is focused on the presence of a high volume of local amenities and retail/entertainment venues on Broad Street which sits at the heart of this proposal. Large parts of this draft ward are populated by new developments which are similar in character and design. Sutton Coldfield Significant under representation of residents is common under the current proposals in Sutton Coldfield. I believe that the current proposals do not leave significant room for population growth or the expansion of residential areas – particularly as there are a further 6000 homes that may be introduced onto greenbelt land within the Sutton Coldfield Ward. Moseley Under the current proposals the ‘Moseley’ ward, does not include Moseley Village. See alternative plan above Hodge Hill, the focus of the Hodge Hill ward is centred around the Fox and Goose shopping centre which is the economic heart of the community. Bromford current benefits from the presence of local amenities on Collingbourne Avenue and Bromford Drive. This provides a communal centre for residents in the two communities which are separated by Bromford Road.
Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Please, please, please, let common sense prevail - there is nothing to be gained, regarding the proposed changes. Surely the time and money spent would be better used on something worthwhile.

Margaret Coles.
10-01-16.

The Review Officer,
Birmingham Boundary Commission

Dear Sir, I have lived in Moseley for many years, it is a wonderful area with a tremendous community spirit with many different people helping to keep it beautiful, Farmers Market, Britain in Bloom etc. I object to The Village centre and park being called Cannon Hill & Balsall Heath when it is clearly in Moseley. I hope this new boundary will not happen.

Yours truly,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sam Collenette
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live on the Parklands estate near Handsworth Park and believe the boundary should divide between Handsworth and Birchfield along Hamstead Road. Splitting the park will cause administrative and financial difficulties without creating any benefits. I live in Handsworth move the boundary to Hamstead Road.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Louise Collett

E-mail: [redacted]

Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name: [redacted]

**Comment text:**

I strongly disagree with the proposals to change the boundaries of the current Moseley Ward. I feel that the proposals ignores the strong community identity of Moseley, and that this should be preserved.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Mr Colley

You are responding to a consultation being undertaken by a different Boundary Commission. I have copied this reply to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), so that they are aware of your comments.

On 8 February 2016 at 08:59, Derek Colley wrote:

AT present, Moseley is a coherent community whose residents share a lot of common interests.

The changes proposed split the present ward into four segments and amalgamate each segment with neighbouring areas, totally different in character, which generally have interests of their own. They thus deprive Moseley residents of the possibility of electing councillors to represent their common interests.

The new proposals should be rejected and replaced by ones that keep the Moseley area as a unified whole.

D C Colley,
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Some Body with no Brains

STUPID

Yours Sincerely

Name:- CHRISTINA & MARK COLLICK
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-

RECEIVED
09 FEB 2018
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced its draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I have always been in Erdington, and I wish to remain my postal address will always be Erdington.

Yours Sincerely,

[Signature]

Name: __________________________
Address: _________________________
Postcode: _______________________
Email: __________________________
Phone: __________________________
Dear sirs
I am writing to you to express my fears for the Hall Green area with you proposal to change the name of our ward to Tyseley. I am writing because I cannot see any value in calling us Tyseley and putting many Hall Green landmarks into this new ward. I would back the proposals put forward by the local Labour party which I think suits your needs and ours also.

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

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to object to the Boundary Commission’s proposals for a Yardley West ward in Birmingham and support an alternative that is being put forward.

Although I appreciate that the Commission has responded positively to local requests for a 2-Member ward for Acocks Green to enable the retention of integrated community links across the Warwick Road, the use of the Chiltern railway line as a boundary undermines that. The 4000 voters between the railway and the Grand Union canal, and east of Stockfield Road, are a fully integrated part of Acocks Green, including many local activists, as the railway has never been seen as a barrier locally.

Given that some voters have to be shed from the current Acocks Green ward to achieve electoral equality I support the idea that Olton Boulevard East would be a better cut-off, with properties to the south of it forming a single-Member Fox Hollies Ward. This would reinstate the historic name for that area and would form a distinctive community, being almost entirely inter-war Council-built properties. It includes Fox Hollies Leisure Centre, Fox Hollies Forum (run by the Fox Hollies Community Association), Fox Hollies Park (with its recently established “Friends”) and Fox Green Crescent to the west of Fox Hollies Road. For electoral equality it would require the Polling District CAE to be moved into a Hall Green ward, but that area has more in common with that ward, being mostly privately-built semi-detached properties the same as those south of School Road, and with the same B28 postcode and Hall Green address.

This would leave the remainder of the currently proposed Acocks Green ward to be merged with the proposed Yardley West ward to create a new 2-Member Acocks Green ward. Acocks Green has it the past encompassed Hob Moor Road (and beyond) but crucially this time it would cross the Warwick Road to facilitate those integrated community links originally sought. Again to ensure electoral equality both sides of Spring Road and roads off it to the south would need to be brought in to this proposed ward, but this would be possible, indeed desirable,
following the transfer of CAE and internal changes in the Hall Green wards.

I would oppose any attempt to remove the Yarnfield estate from Acocks Green ward as it has clear social and economic links to the “village” centre. Such a solution would also leave the Fox Green area “orphaned” at the end of a long thin ward with no direct public transport links to its far end.

Yours Sincerely
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Julia Collins
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

B31 Longbridge Lane is split into 2 different wards with these proposals. This makes any planning proposals and traffic issues difficult. Neither the new town centre, or Longbridge station comes under Longbridge. How confusing is that. Longbridge station on one side of Longbridge Lane is Northfield East. Get off the train at Longbridge in Northfield East to go over the road to Longbridge town centre which is West Heath. It is not Northfield Lane East, OR West Heath lane. It is Longbridge Lane. All of our local history links us to Longbridge works. Northfield East is non discript, certainly not a place to identify Longbridge Lane by.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:**  
Lance Collins

**E-mail:**  

**Postcode:**  

**Organisation Name:** None

**Comment text:**

I and my wife are most unhappy about proposals to push us into the Weoley Castle Ward - we bought our house in with the postcode - HARBORNE RISE in HARBORNE not WEOLEY CASTLE!!! In fact, we'll look at the possibility of joint Legal Action with our neighbours against the Boundary Commission or individuals responsible for these proposals, particularly for the likely drop in value of our properties. We presume the Boundary Commission has the funds in place to compensate every property - probably 200 or more affected by these proposals?

Looking at the boundary map, we should be in HARBORNE - the boundary looks distorted, Weoley Castle Ward should stop at Barnes Hill Island and California Way.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear sirs

I am writing to you to express my fears for the Hall Green area with your proposal to change the name of our ward to Tyseley. I am writing on my own behalf and on behalf of the Warwickshire GAA. Many of our 2700 members live in Hall Green and we cannot see any value in calling us Tyseley and putting many Hall Green landmarks into this new ward. I would back the proposals put forward by the local Labour party which I think suits your needs and our also.

Michael Collins
Secretary
Warwickshire GAA
From: Paul Collins  
Sent: 07 February 2016 22:00  
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk  
Subject: Comment on Recommendations for the Further Electoral Review (FER) of Birmingham City Council- Proposed new Moseley Ward

Dear Sir/Madam

I write to object to the boundaries of the proposed new Moseley Ward within the Birmingham city area.

I understand the need to equalise the number of voters within each ward and accept that some change may be required, however I object on two basic grounds that fail to meet the considerations set out in the legislation, namely:-

1) The new ward with boundaries as drawn would not reflect community identity. Moseley is an old village now ‘swallowed up’ by Birmingham, but it retains a strong identity, sense of place and community. The proposal runs roughshod over these in an arbitrary fashion, with key parts of Moseley being excluded from the new ward, in particular but not excluding the commercial village centre with its pubs and shops; the two main parish churches; the Moseley Hospital (historically the old manor house); Moseley Bog and Moseley Park. Conversely, areas that were never Moseley are being included, such as Balsall Heath Park.

2) The new ward with boundaries would not ‘provide for effective and convenient local government’. Under the proposal, many organisations (such as the Moseley Society) would need to deal with five wards and six councillors. The two conservation areas would be split into half. The Balsall Heath Neighbourhood Plan (adjacent to ‘existing’ Moseley) would be divided in two. The key local planning policy document, the Moseley Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), would cover an area that would be divided between at least two wards and the Shopping and Local Centres SPD, which covers the village centre, whilst referring to Moseley, would cover an area mostly or entirely no longer in Moseley.

In summary, leaving aside their administrative function, wards (like parishes where they exist) are symbolically and emotionally vital to local people in terms of creating a sense of place, history and belonging. The proposed new Moseley Ward fails in key ways to support these important things. Moreover as I have stated above it fails to achieve two of your main considerations in conducting electoral review.

I therefore ask you to revisit the boundaries of the proposed new Moseley Ward and to use the opportunity to do something positive.

Yours faithfully, Paul

Paul Collins
Hi,

I and my family are residents of the current Hall Green ward in Birmingham, my postcode is [REDACTED].

Under the proposed changes to the Local Government wards, I and several hundreds, if not thousands of residents will be arbitrarily allocated to a new area, Tyseley.

This is not a sensible and rational decision as it allocates our group of residences into an area that has no association with the community that I, my family and other residents that are affected by the proposals have currently and historically with the new boundary proposed.

To move our local government area by a distance deprives ourselves of our right to endeavour to continue our current local community, which involves schools, faiths, security and health of all concerned.

Please accept this email as a request to review the boundaries that are adversely affected by your proposals and let us continue with being a Hall Green local government ward.

Ian and Theresa Comerford
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Yours Sincerely,

[Stamp: RECEIVED 05 FEB 2015]
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

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

Personal Details:

Name: Madeleine Comley
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I live in [redacted]. I do not recognise or belong to a community within the proposed Summerfield Ward. My family have lived in Edgbaston for 40 years and previously I went to St Pauls School in Vernon Road Edgbaston for 7 years. I recently retired from Birmingham University, Edgbaston, where I worked for 23 years. Throughout these years I have used shops in Harborne, especially Marks and Spencer, Waitrose, Boots etc. I use Harborne for banking and Post Office services. We use bars and restaurants in Harborne. My children attended schools, Station Road and Lordswood School, in Harborne. Health services are provided for us in Edgbaston, namely the Womens Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The swimming Pool where my children learned to swim is in Harborne and tennis clubs my family belong to are in Edgbaston and Harborne. So for my family and I a ward composed of North Edgbaston and Harborne would better represent my community. For these reasons I am opposed to the proposal to put me in Summerfield ward. I would like to be given more choices as to the new name. I am also opposed to these changes being rushed through. I did not receive sufficient time or information to adequately respond to these proposals. I have seen no evidence to support the claim that property prices will be unaffected. Any such evidence should have been disseminated. Where is this evidence?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Amy Commander
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

This tool is far too difficult to use - not user friendly! So I haven't managed to draw any boundaries. My feedback is that roads in Moseley should be in the Moseley ward, especially Moseley village. These include Alcester Road, Trafalgar Road, Woodbridge Road, Chantry Road, Reddings Road, Wake Green Road. It's important that Moseley is maintained as a ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 14 January 2016 16:27
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Yardley

-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Commander
Sent: 14 January 2016 16:23
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Yardley

We have had notification from our Lib Dem Cllr Neil Eustace that you are proposing to call our area of Yardley - Stechford East?? We strongly oppose this move!! This suggestion is outrageous. This is a very bad mistake by Labour- and will most definitely show in the next local election- well done Labour

Yours sincerely,
Members of Bilton Grange Road.

Sent from my iPad
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Gareth Compton
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

1. Erdington Railway Station
2. Erdington High Street
3. Erdington Tram Terminus and Coat of Arms
4. Erdington Abbey
5. The Victorian housing part of Erdington
6. Old Court Lane cottages
7. 17th Century Erdington Cottages
8. Erdington Parish northern boundary
9. Erdington Parish eastern boundary
10. Erdington Parish Church - St Barnabas
11. Erdington Library, a listed building
12. Erdington Fire station, a listed building
13. Erdington High Street, which the commission is proposing to split between two wards
14. Rookery House

Map Features:

Annotation 1: The main Erdington Community
Annotation 2: Topcroft Estate
Annotation 3: Old Erdington Tram Terminus and Coat of Arms
Annotation 4: Erdington Abbey
Annotation 5: The Victorian housing part of Erdington
Annotation 6: Old Court Lane cottages
Annotation 7: 17th Century Erdington Cottages
Annotation 8: Erdington Parish northern boundary
Annotation 9: Erdington Parish eastern boundary
Annotation 10: Erdington Parish Church - St Barnabas
Annotation 11: Erdington Library, a listed building
Annotation 12: Erdington Fire station, a listed building
Annotation 13: Erdington High Street, which the commission is proposing to split between two wards
Annotation 14: Rookery House

Comment text:

Dear Commission, Although no longer living in Birmingham, I still work in the City. I spent five years working with community groups in Erdington between 2006-2011. What struck me was the community spirit and clear sense of identity. I was therefore shocked to read in the local papers that the Erdington community is proposed to be broken up, with even the historic core around Station Road to be ripped out of Erdington. I have therefore felt compelled to submit a plea to keep the historic Erdington together. I understand that there may be political reasons why the MP and City Council would want to break up this historic community but, surely that cannot be an acceptable reason for the commission to break up a community that has been together since the doomsday book. Erdington is in fact older than the now more famous Sutton Coldfield community further north. I have listed above the main area that would call itself Erdington, the Victorian

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7732

11/02/2016
part of the ward and some of the main iconic buildings, the Top Corft Estate and the High Street. I would ask that all these areas should be retained within any Erdington Ward as they are what brings the community together. Yours Gareth

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Dear Commission,

Although no longer living in Birmingham, I still work in the City. I spent five years working with community groups in Erdington between 2006-2011. What struck me was the community spirit and clear sense of identity. I was therefore shocked to read in the local papers that the Erdington community is proposed to be broken up, with even the historic core around Station Road to be ripped out of Erdington. I have therefore felt compelled to submit a plea to keep the historic Erdington together. I understand that there may be political reasons why the MP and City Council would want to break up this historic community but, surely that cannot be an acceptable reason for the commission to break up a community that has been together since the doomday book. Erdington is in fact older than the now more famous Sutton Coldfield community further north. I have listed above the main area that would call itself Erdington, the Victorian

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7732

11/02/2016
part of the ward and some of the main iconic buildings, the Top Corft Estate and the High Street. I would ask that all these areas should be retained within any Erdington Ward as they are what brings the community together. Yours Gareth

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Erddingon is a historic area dating back to before the Civil war. Its name should be retained. If the area is too big why not divide the area into 3 or 4 and call them Erddington North, Erddington South, Erddington East, and Erddington West. We live on the corner of xxx and xxx opposite Short Heath Park. We are 3 miles away from Stockland Green. The majority of properties in Stockland Green appear to be multi occupancy houses. Our area is more family houses both privately owned or rented. We therefore do not feel that our local concerns are the same as those in Stockland Green. We have more in common with Oscott or Short Heath.

We bought our house because it was in Erddington and are concerned that lumping our area with Stockland Green will affect house prices and insurance payments. Erddington as a ward is well known by the electors. We fear that these changes will mean we are being represented by councillors who will not be reflective of our views and concerns.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]
North Birmingham Community Together

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
From: coney stuart
Sent: 30 January 2016 16:29
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Erdington Community

I have always lived in Erdington and now I am being told that I will now live in Short Heath.

I am never going to accept that I live in Short Heath. Plus, last time I checked Stockland Green was a large crossroad and by the time I got to six ways ERDINGTON I had left any trance of Stockland Green.

I object to the proposed plans and to put more of an effort in putting time and energy into more meaningful work such as schools and hospitals.

Regards

Stu Coney
Dear Sir/Madam Re: Ward Boundary Proposals in Birmingham Longbridge disappears (was the failure of the car industry such an embarrassment that this is necessary), the Jewellery Quarter (centuries-old site of fine jewellery craftsmanship) vanishes into Winson Green (ironically the ward that contains the prison), and Moseley, recognised nationally by the Telegraph as one of the most cohesive and vibrant communities in the country, is sliced in four like a pizza. If the proposals for boundary changes in Birmingham were not so potentially damaging and disrespectful to its citizens, they would be laughable. These proposals are not only unacceptable for our local community of Moseley, but Birmingham as a whole. The stated three prime criteria of the review are to improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents, reflect community identity, and provide for effective and convenient local government. It is clear from the proposals that only the first of these has troubled the minds of the planners. The reputation of planners to respect and recognise the needs of local communities is not strong at the best of times and the proposals for Birmingham do not in any way help your case. My family and I live in Moseley. If these changes are approved this will soon no longer be the case. Our section of Moseley, which contains Moseley Park and Pool (home of the Moseley Festivals), Moseley CDT, Moseley Village Centre and Moseley Hall Hospital, will instead find itself in Cannon Hill and Balsall Heath ward. Balsall Heath is itself a vibrant community with a strong identity entirely distinct from Moseley. At the recent community meeting in Moseley, attended by over 400 concerned residents, fellow Birmingham citizens from Balsall Heath spoke from the floor and made it clear that they see no more logic in these changes than the residents of Moseley. All at the meeting voted against the proposed changes. Please see sense, and go back to the drawing board. The easiest of the three criteria to achieve is equality in voter numbers between the wards. It is also the least important. Community and fair local government are much more important; just because they are difficult does not excuse their being ignored in this clumsy manner. The Moseley community have already made much more sensible proposals for the revision of the boundaries, which builds on community and effectiveness and is a much better balance between the criteria. These proposals strive to respect all the communities of this great city in a constructive way. The planners would be well advised to look more closely for solutions from within and across the communities to which these changes will apply. Yours faithfully, Dr Maurice and Mrs Caroline Conlon
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Myra Connell
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

As a Moseley resident, I would like to say that while I support the aim of making representation fairer so that councillors across the country represent equal numbers of electors, the proposals for Moseley absolutely do not fit with the aim of maintaining community cohesion. As explained in detail in the representation from the Moseley Society, Moseley has a hugely active community, and a strong identity. Under the current proposals, not only are there absurd anomalies - such as that the centre of Moseley village and the park are not in the Moseley ward - but more importantly, the members of all the local societies such as the Moseley Society, which keep this community cohesive, will have to liaise with up to five different councillors, none of whom will have the full interests of Moseley at heart. I urge you to reconsider the proposals and keep this vibrant community alive. Please do not destroy something that is so rare, so much loved, and so much a force for good.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Review Officer (Birmingham)

I am contacting you to express my concern about the proposed changes to boundaries which will mean that my house on [redacted] will be in the new Tyseley ward. I believe that you should reconsider the proposals as it threatens the local identity of Hall Green and just does not make sense to call this area Tyseley, an area which includes Hall Green Parade, Hall Green School, Hall Green Railway Station and Hall Green United Community Church. It also threatens to confuse the local geography of the area.

I hope you will consider my concerns when looking again at these proposals.

Yours

Mrs Carol Conroy
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: MARO COOKE
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Mrs M T Cooke  5/2/2016 Dear Sir, I write to voice my objection to the proposed boundary changes in Birmingham, which includes the division of Edgbaston, and my property becoming part of Summerfield ward. There has been no proper communication or consultation - I only found out by word of mouth and social media. This breaches my electoral rights. 3 questions are posed to residents to justify their opinions: 1 – Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities No they do not. Edgbaston is nationally and world renowned. It has a brand based on Birmingham University, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, King Edward’s Schools, Edgbaston Cricket ground and the Edgbaston Priory Tennis Club, as famous as Bourneville or the Jewellery Quarter. It is a community which has grown up thronging on and populated by academic and professional excellence. It is a very desirable place for families to live. With HS2 coming, it will become a commuter outpost for London and Manchester. It is the jewel in central Birmingham. The local schools, churches, shops, pubs, and golf club are all central to this sense of community. I have lived or worked in Edgbaston for 30 years since arriving as a student, and my 3 children have been born and brought up in this thriving local community. Summerfield is an altogether different community based further north-west, with a different social, economic, racial and ethnic mix. The housing, schools, architecture, social and leisure amenities and parks are totally disparate from Edgbaston. If two such culturally diverse communities are forced together, then it is likely that neither will receive the representation which satisfies those poles. This cannot serve democracy, and will unfairly penalise the smaller number of current Edgbaston residents who will fall into Summerfield, whose opinions will be drowned out by the much larger current Summerfield population. 2 – How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Electoral equality is best served by leaving the current boundaries as they are around Edgbaston. As stated above, it cannot be fair to move residents to a totally different culturally, and therefore likely politically, electoral area. If Summerfield needs to expand, it would be far more appropriate for it to do so to the north and west, where the communities are more culturally and socioeconomically consistent with Summerfield. 3 – Are the names of the proposed wards right? No. Edgbaston is a famous historic area. Historical names are derived from hamlets, villages, geographical and industrial features. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England based at Millbank Tower in London claimed in an email to a local resident that no evidence existed to suggest that boundary changes would have any effect on local residents’ communities or property values. This is simply because it has not been sought. This means that the ‘consultation’ is fundamentally invalid. Discussions with local estate agents have revealed that none has been approached for their opinion, which is that community identity will be severely affected, and house process etc will fall in ‘North Edgbaston’. I ask Birmingham City Council to listen to its residents. Many have voiced their opposition to the artificial division and merging of local communities for minimal electoral administrative gain. This cannot be good for community cohesion at a time of potential racial and ethnic division. I thank you for your attention to my comments. Yours sincerely, Maro Cooke

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Nicholas Cooke
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

Please find attached my comments.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Dear Sir,

I am writing to you in order to voice my objection to the proposed boundary changes in Birmingham, which will see the division of Edgbaston and the expansion of Summerfield to include the home in which I grew up, amongst many other ridiculous repositioning of historic villages and centres of urban community.

I am, quite frankly, extremely angry that there has been absolutely no communication, let alone consultation, on these changes whatsoever. Were it not for a local residents’ action group being formed by word of mouth and social media, this would not have come to my attention at all and changes would have been made, potentially affecting the identity of the community in which I grew up, and electoral reform unduly influencing the balance of democratic election in future. The very fact that I have received no publicity or even communication of any kind on this matter breaches my electoral rights.

Mark Pascoe, Review Officer, Local Government Boundary Commission for England based at Millbank Tower in London recently emailed a local resident explaining that no evidence existed to suggest that boundary changes would have any effect on local residents’ communities or property values. He stated that no research had been carried out to actually assess what consequences might arise. Absence of evidence in such a manner must mean that a potential change cannot be pushed through and that the ‘consultation’ is null. Research carried out with local estate agents by local pressure group North Edgbaston Residents Group, has shown that no opinion was sought from these local experts, who indeed confirmed that taking residents out of Edgbaston and putting their properties into Summerfield would have a detrimental effect on property value and mortgage application.

3 questions are posed to residents to justify their opinions. I will answer each in turn:

1 – Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities?

No.

Edgbaston has an identity which is nationally and world renowned, based on Birmingham University, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, King Edward’s Schools, Edgbaston Cricket ground and the Edgbaston Priory Tennis Club, to name a few. It is a community which has grown up thriving on and populated by academic and professional excellence. Although the Hagley Rd runs through the ward, properties north of this have the same architecture and residential mix as to the south of it, and indeed still remain south of Edgbaston reservoir. The local schools, churches, shops, pubs, and golf club are all central to this sense of community. I spent the formative years of my life in this community and owe so much to the atmosphere and sense of unity which is so inherent within it. To break up such a diverse yet cohesive
community for the sake of a seemingly pointless political re-juggle is nothing short of ludicrous.

Summerfield is an altogether different community based further north-west, with a different social, economic, racial and ethnic mix. The housing, schools, architecture, social and leisure amenities and parks are totally disparate from Edgbaston. If two such diverse communities are forced together, then it is likely that neither will receive the representation which satisfies those poles. This cannot serve democracy, and will unfairly penalise the smaller number of current Edgbaston residents who will fall into Summerfield, whose opinions will be drowned out by the much larger Summerfield population.

**2 – How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality?**

Electoral equality is best served by leaving the current boundaries as they are around Edgbaston. As stated above, it cannot be fair to move residents to a totally different culturally, and therefore likely politically, electoral area. What is the driver to reduce councillor numbers? Financial? Political? The proposed changes include areas of Harborne moving into Edgbaston, Quinton into Harborne, and Bartley Green into Quinton. The end result is a 10% slice of Edgbaston being ‘sacrificed’. It does not make sense to shuffle all of these boundaries, with each and every community being divided, and subsequently reallocated.

If Summerfield needs to expand, it would be far more appropriate for it to do so to the north and west, where the communities are more culturally and socioeconomically consistent with Summerfield.

**3 – Are the names of the proposed wards right?**

No.

Edgbaston is Edgbaston right up to Edgbaston reservoir. Historical names are derived from hamlets, villages, geographical and industrial features. Political wards are rooted in these origins.

The Edgbaston community has voiced its opinion, to the extent now that it would be negligent of the City Council to ignore the increasing cries of objection. As such, I request the Birmingham City Council consultation should listen to its residents, who across the city have voiced their opposition to the artificial division and merging of local communities for minimal electoral administrative gain. We live in a multicultural society where a sense of local communities is what binds together the fabulous city the Birmingham has become. Our future is very much under threat, where cultural, racial and political divisions have the potential to divide rather than define our home. North Edgbaston should stay within its community.

Yours sincerely,

Nicholas Cooke
Mr P W Cooke 31/1/2016 Dear Sir, I write to voice my objection to the proposed boundary changes in Birmingham, which will see the division of Edgbaston and the expansion of Summerfield to include my own property, amongst many other ludicrous repositionings of historic villages and centres of urban community. I am extremely angry that there has been no communication, let alone consultation, on these changes whatsoever. Were it not for a local residents’ action group being formed by word of mouth and social media, this would not have come to my attention at all and changes would have been made, potentially affecting the identity of the community in which I have lived for 30 years, and electoral reform unduly influencing the balance of democratic election in future.

The fact that there has been no consultation nor publicity reaching my doorstep fundamentally breaches my electoral rights. Mark Pascoe, Review Officer, Local Government Boundary Commission for England based at Millbank Tower in London recently emailed a local resident explaining that no evidence existed to suggest that boundary changes would have any effect on local residents’ communities or property values. He stated that no research had been carried out to actually assess what consequences might arise. Absence of evidence in such a manner must mean that a potential change cannot be pushed through and that the ‘consultation’ is null.

Research carried out with local estate agents by local pressure group North Edgbaston Residents Group, has shown that no opinion was sought from these local experts, who indeed confirmed that taking residents out of Edgbaston and putting their properties into Summerfield would have a detrimental effect on property value and mortgage application. I understand that 3 questions are posed to residents to justify their opinions. I answer each in turn: 1 – Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities No they do not. Edgbaston has an identity which is nationally and world renowned, based on Birmingham University, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, King Edward’s Schools, Edgbaston Cricket ground and the Edgbaston Priory Tennis Club, to name a few. It is a community which has grown up thriving on and populated by academic and professional excellence. Although the Hagley Rd runs through the ward, properties north of this have the same architecture and residential mix as to the south of it , and indeed still remain south of Edgbaston reservoir. The local schools, churches, shops, pubs, and golf club are all central to this sense of community. I have lived or worked in Edgbaston for 30 years since arriving as a student, and my 3 children have been born and brought up in this thriving local community. Summerfield is an altogether different community based further north-west, with a different social, economic, racial and ethnic mix. The housing, schools, architecture, social and leisure amenities and parks are totally disparate from Edgbaston. If two such culturally diverse communities are forced together, then it is likely that neither will receive the representation which satisfies those poles. ‘A compromise is where everyone gets what no-one wants’. This cannot serve democracy, and will unfairly penalise the smaller number of current Edgbaston residents who will fall into Summerfield, whose opinions will be drowned out by the much larger current Summerfield population. 2 – How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Electoral equality is best served by leaving the current boundaries as they are around Edgbaston. As stated above, it cannot be fair to move residents to a totally different culturally, and therefore likely politically, electoral area. What is the driver to reduce councillor numbers? Financial? Political gain? The proposed changes include areas of Harborne moving into Edgbaston, Quinton into Harborne, and Bartley Green into Quinton. The
end result is a 10% slice of Edgbaston being 'sacrificed'. It does not make sense to shuffle all of these boundaries, with each and every community being divided, and subsequently reallocated. If Summerfield needs to expand, it would be far more appropriate for it to do so to the north and west, where the communities are more culturally and socioeconomically consistent with Summerfield. 3 – Are the names of the proposed wards right? No. Edgbaston is Edgbaston right up to Edgbaston reservoir. Historical names are derived from hamlets, villages, geographical and industrial features. Political wards are rooted in these origins. I request the Birmingham City Council consultation should listen to its residents, who across the city have voiced their opposition to the artificial division and merging of local communities for minimal electoral administrative gain. We live in a multicultural society where a sense of local communities is what binds together the fabulous city the Birmingham has become. Our future is very much under threat, where cultural, racial and political divisions have the potential to divide rather than define our home. North Edgbaston should stay within its community. I thank you for your attention to my comments. Yours sincerely, Peter Cooke

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
-----Original Message-----
From: Eileen Rita Cook
Sent: 07 January 2016 15:33
To: reviews <reviews@lbce.org.uk>
Subject:

Meirion Jenkins.

Yes we are in favor of having 11 councillors for Sutton Coldfield.

JJ&ER Cook.
Dear sir/madam,

I understand there are proposals to reduce the number of councillors in Sutton from 12 to 10 as part of the boundary review.

I would wish to log my objection as I believe that the population numbers of Sutton would justify 11 rather than 10 members. The later would leave the interests of Sutton Coldfield under represented.

Many thanks

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

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

Regards
Peter & Olive Cooper
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

These changes remove iconic buildings out of Erdington and do not make sense

Yours Sincerely

Name:-- Olivia Peter Cooper
Address:--
Postcode:--
Email:--
Phone number:--
North Birmingham Community Together

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

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

Personal Details:

Name: Margaret Copeland
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I am a resident of Park Hill which is in Moseley and feel strongly that any changes to local government boundaries need to take into account the strong local identity of Moseley Village. Dividing the village into several new local government areas does not make any sense and would be counter intuitive to the strong sense of local identity enjoyed by the current Moseley Village. The views of local people as expressed clearly at the Moseley Society meeting in January 2016 should be given the utmost importance if any new boundary changes are to be successfully implemented. The support and agreement of the local communities is vital for successful change, Mrs Margaret Copeland

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jenny Corless
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Member of the Brandwood Forum

Comment text:

I live in [REDACTED] which is off Broad Lane which it is proposed will be in the new Monyhill ward. However it is separated from the rest of the Monyhill ward by the Stratford canal- I feel it would be better if the canal was the boundary between the proposed wards of Brandwood and Monyhill. I hope consideration will be given to my suggestion. My comments are supported by the Brandwood Forum

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Alan Cornfield  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]  
Organisation Name: ATC Handyman Services  

**Comment text:**

I strongly support the work of the Balsall Heath forum. This group has developed vital regeneration projects over the years that supports all sectors of the community. The changes would be extremely detrimental to these communities.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
To: The Planning Office
Birmingham

28 January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a family of three living in Yarley for 25 yrs, we write to raise our objections to the proposed boundary changes which would see Yarley disappear.

This historic village predates its entry in the
Domesday book and has been a conservation area for many years. No changes look like changes for its own sake not motivated by making Stourley an even larger ward and not smaller for ease of management, as was the reason given for removing Yarley from the map.

Too much history is dismissed in the name of progress with no benefit to anyone.

My husband Robin and myself have been proud residents of Yarley for 40 yrs and our son Chris has spent 25 yrs with us.

Please reconsider your plans do not scrap Yarley and note our objections to the scheme.

Yours sincerely,

J.S. Coons, M.T. Coons, M.E. Coons
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because: I am a resident living in Perry Common since early 1970s. A passionate voter and tax payer, which councillors and government benefit from. Now local government are trying to break up areas to make it easier for themselves. Areas where history tells us of King Charles覆盖 road across these areas many years ago which were farm land commands all of historic values. The names of these historic areas must not be destroyed to give governments an easy run to get more votes. Please do not break up these areas and the heritage once gone will be gone forever.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted]

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

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

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

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

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

I have lived in Yardley for approx 40 years and I would like to remain in Yardley. The proposed boundary change to Stechford East is not exceptable for me and the people of Yardley. Please reconsider these boundary changes.

Eric Cotterell
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stewart Cotterill
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I am very happy with the new proposed wards.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted]

Address

Postcode

Email

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
13th January 2016

Dear Sir,

Having lived in Yardley for many years I am strongly opposed to the suggestion to change the boundaries and lose the historic name of Yardley.

I do not wish the place where I live or St Edburga’s Church and Conservation area to be in Stechford East.

Yours sincerely
14th January 2016

Dear Sir

Having lived in Yardley for many years I am strongly opposed to the suggestion to change the boundaries and lose the historic name of Yardley.

I do not wish the place where I live or St. Edburga's Church and conservation area to be in Stechford East.

Yours Sincerely
Mr Leon L Cousins 26th January 2016 To whom it may concern Submission re Proposed Birmingham Boundary Changes I am a resident of Edgbaston and object to the proposed boundary change that will remove my house from the Edgbaston ward and place it in a newly composed ward of Summerfield. This is my detailed submission that my area should stay part of its historic and important Edgbaston community. My submission contains response to the 3 criteria on which you invite comment. It also contains other points that I believe to be relevant and the Boundary Commission (BC) should be willing to consider in the interests of a fair and genuine consultation process. I have had some involvement with North Edgbaston Residents Group (NERG), for which you should by now be familiar with having received correspondence from the founder of this group. The core leaders of NERG have undertaken considerable research, met with our MP and communicated variously with local councillors to ensure that we can help our neighbours be fully informed and best able to respond. Publicity and Communication of the Process I was not made aware of the consultation by any formal means. There was no communication by post, leaflet drop or email. I have been unable to establish how the BC communicated the review to residents of Birmingham. Deirdre Aldren, my ward councillor wrote in an email to NERG that the BC was supposed to lead on publicity and gave Birmingham City Council assurances of this. Birmingham City Council did not make any communication that I am aware of. We understand that there was some local press however I do not take a local newspaper. At NERG’s public meeting on 12 January a show of hands from the 70 or so attendees confirmed that they only knew of it due to communication efforts of NERG. It is my personal contention and that of NERG that this failure to communicate properly with the residents is an unacceptable failure of the consultation process. Consultation Criteria The Draft Recommendations set out the 3 key consultation points. I respond to those subsequently in this submission. However I questioned the validity of the content of paragraph 12, specifically: “There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues” A NERG member Heledd Najib, a barrister, wrote to the BC on this matter. Her email and the response from review officer, Mark Pascoe confirms that, as we suspected, no evidence was sought. As a local resident with a job and other commitments to manage, I do not have the time or the skill to seek evidence. It would be unreasonable for the BC to expect us to do what it has failed to do. In law when there is not specific evidence to hand or obtainable, expert opinion is sought and given credence. Consequently, we have statements from the owners of the two foremost longstanding Residential Property Agents, Robert Powell & Co and Hadleigh. They note that they are entirely agreed that there will be an adverse impact for our area of Edgbaston if it comes out of the Edgbaston ward. They are specific on the ward point. It is my contention that this statement at paragraph 12 is highly misleading as it implies that evidence has been sought when in fact it hasn’t. It is unfairly drafted and an unfounded statement and as such it is unreasonable for evidence or expert opinion on this area to be ignored or discounted. Whilst I have no intention of moving any time soon, house moves are not always predictable and many residents will have mortgages that may need renewing and valuations are relevant. The proposed boundary change will, according to expert opinion, have a detrimental impact to our home saleability and it is unfair that so many should lose out
financially in this way due to an arbitrary split in our community when there are other ways to achieve the aims without this consequence. The BC must consider that this is a risk and it is fundamentally unfair to discount this matter. Criteria 1 – Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities? Dealing with the legislative requirement to reflect community identity. The proposed ward of Summerfield is a combination of parts of Birmingham that are economically and socially diverse without current connection. The part of Edgbaston that falls north of the Hagley Road has nothing in common with Winson Green, Ladywood etc. There would be no community identity. There would be no hub to the ward and it would not have any recognition for its residents as a community or be understood as an area of Birmingham. Edgbaston is a community in itself. The Hagley Road is now a substantial major artery for the city but it is traversed many times a day by North Edgbaston residents as we travel to the university, hospitals, shops, sports clubs, doctors, dentists and schools of Edgbaston that we work at, visit or socialise with. As do I. It’s a brand, it’s a location, and it’s a community that is recognisable outside of Birmingham or even the UK. I am proud to live in Edgbaston and, proud of my neighbourhood and my neighbours who have worked hard to look after and improve their local community, driving out some anti-social issues that were a problem locally some years ago. The Edgbaston brand has been key to the improvement locally that has created a pleasant, safe part of the wider ward and it is questionable whether this could continue to be the case if removed from the ward. Sadly other parts of the proposed Summerfield ward are very different with differing value systems. Summerfield as a proposed ward fails to deal with the legislative requirement to reflect community identity. Criteria 2 – How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Dealing with the legislative requirement to improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents and also for the provision of effective and convenient local government. The need to reduce the ward size of Edgbaston is understood by NERG and myself. However, the proposed ward is being added to at its western boundary with parts of more modern Harborne that are part of the Harborne community. It seems that this is at the expense of our area which is part of original Edgbaston. Withdrawing the Harborne addition is my recommendation. Maintaining or improving electoral equality is more than just a numbers game. It is giving an electorate the opportunity to self-determine by recognising communities. If a ward is just geography, self-determination and equality is unlikely. A polarised ward such as the proposed Summerfield would be highly difficult to represent. The disparity in the electorate socially and economically would create that difficulty. That would be unfair on the electorate. The Edgbaston ward is currently able to elect fair representation for its community which shares value systems and needs. The proposed ward should not include North Edgbaston as it would not improve electoral equality in the area and may adversely impact equality. Edgbaston ward size can be managed by removing the proposed Harborne inclusion and would therefore continue to provide fair representation for the electorate whilst achieving effective and convenient local government. Criteria 3 – Are the names of the proposed wards right? Summerfield might work the ward if it did not include north Edgbaston. Summerfield is not acceptable as a name to me as a resident of Edgbaston, specifically North Edgbaston. It has no sense of area. It conveys nothing about location. I have given consideration to being part of a small ward called North Edgbaston as an alternative to being part of Summerfield however, the removal of North Edgbaston from Edgbaston seems unnecessary given that it should be possible to keep Edgbaston intact by not adding odd bits of other well defined communities, specifically Harborne. The BC appears to have produced various ward names that are unnecessary proposed changes to well understood locations and communities of Birmingham. Redrawing of the wards should focus on identifying communities and not splitting them up. I respectfully ask the BC consultation gives full and genuine consideration to my submission in relation to maintaining North Edgbaston within the Edgbaston ward for all the grounds set out but most particularly on the grounds of preserving a historic, well defined and well understood community. Yours sincerely Leon L Cousins

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
We understand that it may be proposed to join Selly Park and Bournbrook into a single 2-councillor ward.

The two areas are significantly different in character. As you will be aware, there are a high proportion of students in Bournbrook, whose needs are different from the needs of the settled family area of Selly Park. It is not difficult to imagine that representing students' needs will soak up a great deal of councillor time, and that Selly Park will lose out.

A much better plan would be for the two areas to be separate, with a single dedicated councillor for each.

Please take this view into consideration when making your decision.

Jennifer & Russell Cousins
Selly Park
Dear Sir,

Hall Green Birmingham Boundary Change Proposals

I am writing to express concern about the proposed boundary changes drawn up by the LG Boundary Commission following the Kerslake Review and specifically the proposal to allow parts of Hall Green to come under the new ward of Tyseley.

I find this baffling as Hall Green and Tyseley have nothing in common (other than being in Birmingham). Hall Green is a tree-lined inter-war suburb comprising of attractive 1920s/30s semis and pleasant shopping areas and Tyseley is an industrial area with some terraced housing stock and nothing much to recommend it.

The LGBCE website states that the changes should ‘reflect the interest and identities of local communities’. These changes do not as there is no closeness of communities or common identity.

One gets the impression that someone sitting in an office has just drawn a line on a map without knowing the first thing about the areas concerned.

Please give this some consideration as to go ahead with these proposals would just confuse the local geography and have a negative impact on the local identity of the parts of Hall Green affected.

Yours sincerely

John Cowdrey
Dear Sir,

**Hall Green Birmingham Boundary Change Proposals**

I am writing to express concern about the proposed boundary changes drawn up by the LG Boundary Commission following the Kerslake Review and specifically the proposal to allow parts of Hall Green to come under the new ward of Tyseley.

I find this baffling as Hall Green and Tyseley have nothing in common (other than being in Birmingham). Hall Green is a tree-lined inter-war suburb comprising of attractive 1920s/30s semis and pleasant shopping areas and Tyseley is an industrial area with some terraced housing stock and nothing much to recommend it.

The LGBCE website states that the changes should ‘reflect the interest and identities of local communities’. These proposed changes do not as there is no closeness of communities or common identity.

One gets the impression that someone sitting in an office has just drawn a line on a map without knowing the first thing about the areas concerned.

The fact that Hall Green station, Hall Green Parade, Hall Green Stadium and Hall Green United Community Church are affected suggests this should be looked at again more carefully.

Please give this some consideration as to go ahead with these proposals would just confuse the local geography and have a negative impact on the local identity of the parts of Hall Green affected.

Yours faithfully,

John G Cowdrey
Map Features:

Annotation 1: This is (also) Moseley - In fact it is the main part of Moseley
Annotation 2: This is Balsall Heath
Annotation 3: City Center Ward

Comment text:
1 & 2 - Moseley and Balsall Heath boundaries bear no relation to those above. 1 - This area includes the main part of Moseley - it has Moseley Village, Moseley Park, the site of the planned Moseley rail station, etc. It should be included along with existing Moseley boundaries. 2 - see SBC Neighborhood plan area http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/balsallheathcp. This is the 'plan area' as decided by the people of Balsall Heath in an election. Not respecting the plan area would be democratically illegitimate and disrespectful to the hard work of the local community. 3 - Create a city centre ward - it is completely different issues and population to the rest - (not labeled) Notwithstanding that the Jewellery Quarter has not cultural or other association with Winson Green - why have you grouped this area under the name 'Winson Green' the name of which is very strongly and negatively associated with the Prison (HMP Birmingham). Retain the name Hackley at least for this Ward - but better see 3 above

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jennifer Cox
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Private resident

Comment text:

I understand that it is proposed that Yardley is now to be called Stechford East. I have lived in Yardley all my life that is  years and would hate the name to be changed. Yardley's history goes back over 1,000 years. The Norman church which is protected in Church Road has always locally been called Yardley Old Church. Yardley dates back to before the Domesday Book and surrounded by history. I want to save historic Yardley that I have known all my life. Too many things now are disappearing and we are losing so much of our heritage - please don't let it be Yardley. In fact many very often our postage address is being classed as Sheldon instead of Yardley and I know that this upsets a great deal of people. I am sure that many of us who have lived in Yardley for many years will be extremely upset if Yardley becomes East Stetcherd. Please I beg you help us to retain the historic name of Yardley which is a very important part of my life. To lose Yardley for me and I know many others would be to to lose my past and that which is a part of who I am. I also feel it is quite unnecessary. We have always been Yardley and I appeal to you please let it continue to be Yardley. Thank you very much. From Jennifer Cox, someone who loves Yardley, all its history and all that it still stands for.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I strongly object to the Boundary Commission’s proposals to remove those of us living between the London railway line and the Grand Union canal, from the new Acocks Green ward into a new Yardley West ward.

This doesn’t make sense to me from a community point of view as all of us, as residents in this area, strongly identify as living in Acocks Green. We are separated by the dual carriageway (Stockfield Road) from Tysoley and Hay Mills and have no community connection with them whatsoever.

Also we are part of Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum which looks after our interests but this will be very difficult to administer if it’s area is divided between three wards.

Both Acocks Green Police Station and Acocks Green Baptist church will no longer be in Acocks Green.

This proposal has not taken into account the views and feelings of the people of Acocks Green and should be scrapped.
Local Government Boundary Commission  
Birmingham New Council Ward Boundaries draft proposals
Proposed ward for this address - Boldmere Ward

Dear Commissioners,

I would like you to take into account the following:

1. The land opposite Monmouth Drive has covenants placed on it, details of which are contained in the deeds of the properties on this road. Please see enclosed photocopy of the original plan, Monmouth Drive follows the southern boundary of the red/blue outlined areas.

In the draft proposals part of this land has been placed in Maney Ward and part in Four Oaks Ward. It is important that this land is in the same ward as the property which faces it so that we are aware of any issues which concern it. The land is connected with this road. In the current ward boundaries this is recognized and should be respected
in the new proposals.

There are only one or two properties on this land so inclusion does not affect population numbers significantly.

(2) I would prefer the use of VESEY WARD (the historical name) rather than Boldmere Ward.
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

We have a post code of B44, which is Kingsstanding but -
- for voting we are under Oscott Ward
- for our Elec supplier we are under Great Barr
- for our Gas supplier we are under Perry Barr
Please no more additional confusion.

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

Mrs Alexandria Craney

RECEIVED
29 JAN 2016
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

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

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

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

**Save our local community now by filling in the offer and returning ASAP!**
I am very concerned about draft boundary recommendations for Moseley, Birmingham. The idea that Moseley would come under five ward boundaries with six different councillors would result in our being marginalised and ignored. At present we are a very cohesive community.

Regards,

Angela Crawshaw
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: chris crean
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Dear Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. The proposals you have brought forward have produced a huge amount of anger and concern amongst many people within Birmingham. Some may think of many of those views as too parochial for a process such as this. However this should not be the case; identity does matter whether for the City as a whole or the place within the City where people live and to which they relate. There is also a feeling that Birmingham is for one reason or another being targeted and that this could be a process which other unitary metropolitan local authorities may have to face in the near future. There is also the issues of lower per voter representation than at present and moving from thirds up voting pattern to all up every four years. There is a huge amount of change of the election boundary horizon. There is a vote on our membership of the European Union in this parliament. There are parliamentary constituency boundary changes muted in 2018 or at some time before the next election. At present with the City there is a neat fit between the wards, the constituencies and indeed our European region. Why are we starting with the local reorganisation first? Surely a local reorganisation would make sense, if ever it would, once those changes have been implemented. Then any changes that were to be made or were felt necessary could have some relationship to those new constituencies if and when those rearrangements are made. There is a feeling within the City that Birmingham is being used as a trial area and if this process is successful a similar process might well be inflicted upon other metropolitan areas. Can you reassure that this is not the case and that Birmingham is a special entity and if so explain just why this is so? These proposals are not satisfactory for the City nor the citizens of this City. I urge you to put these proposals on hold, start afresh and take this process forward as part of a wider explanation and review of our representation to the UK Parliament as well as our City Council. Yours sincerely Chris Crean

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Jerry Cregan
Sent: 19 January 2016 16:32
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Moseley, Birmingham West Milands-Proposed Boundary changes

As residents of Moseley for many decades (some 120 years between the 3 of us) we have read which increasing concern the proposals for Moseley contained within the LGBC document.

It seems to us that two of the three main considerations as stated on your website have either not been addressed or in the worst case indeed ignored.

Firstly, the proposals would certainly not ‘Reflect community identity’. Anybody familiar with ‘our Moseley’ would surely be aware of the appalling consequences of these proposals. Within ‘our Moseley’ we have established over many many years a number of community groups, each who have focussed various on aspects of Moseley life and have achieved national recognition. Our community groups include The Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Regen Group, Moseley Faith Groups and Moseley Businesses. ALL of these groups would be defunct under these proposals. In addition we have a nationally recognised and award winning Farmers market. Finally, Moseley was recognised in The Telegraph as the ‘Best urban’ place to live in the country and the LGBC plan now proposes to destroy it!

Secondly, the proposals would certainly not ‘Provide for effective and convenient local government’. We are currently represented by 3 local councillors who represent the whole ward. Under the new proposal we will have 6 councillors who will each represent 1/6th of the ward. How can that lead to effective and convenient local government when dealing with issues covering the whole of the existing Moseley?

Finally, We cannot stress enough how upset, disappointed and fearful the people of Moseley feel with these proposals.

We would ask that you look very closely at the proposal which the Moseley Community Groups will be submitting to the LGBC and that you take on board the views of the people of Moseley.

Regards

Jerry Cregan and Lynn Browning both of Robert Andrews of

Robert Andrews of
Dear Sir/Madam

We would like to express our opposition to the boundary changes affecting Hall Green.

We have lived in Hall Green for over 30 years and value the community spirit neighbourliness and friendships we have made during that time.
We accept that our reasons arise from an emotional level; we were married in The Church of the Ascension, both our children attended Hall Green School, paddled in the River Cole, and searched for Hobbit's in Sarehole Mill.

A community takes decades to develop and it feels that with the slash of a pen by someone in a remote office with no knowledge of Hall Green or its history is going to destroy that. We live in Southam Rd one of the roads that is suggested be moved into the Tyseley ward, and it is not an underestimation to say that we feel that our family has been excommunicated.

The councillors from Hall Green Barry Bowles, Sam Burden and Kerry Jenkins have submitted what appears to be a realistic solution and we would urge you to seriously consider these proposals.

We would also like to support the submissions by the people of Mosely and Kings Heath with whom we feel closely allied.
In the next point we would like to question the validity of the boundary review in the first place.

Kerslake highlights the fact that Birmingham City Council has some of the largest wards in the country and Councillors have a heavy workload. He suggests that to address the heavy workload the number of councillors should be reduced from 120 to 100, while at the same time having increased contact with the electorate. This would seem to be straight from the pages of Alice in Wonderland.
In terms of saving money he estimates 1.5 million pounds saving over 5 years, but we are sure it will cost over a million pounds upfront to instigate these changes. These amounts are obviously a drop in the ocean in relation to the whole budget, but 1 million pounds would enable our desperate children's services to employ 28 social workers, which would make a huge difference to the safety and support received by the vulnerable children in Birmingham.

He also suggests that managing 120 councillors is too difficult, well to be honest this is nonsense, it would be just as easy to manage 120 as 100. He also states that Birmingham has been compared to Manchester and Leeds; well The City of Manchester has a population of 514,417 and 95 councillors, a ratio of 1:5000. Leeds has a population of 751,500 and 93 councillors a ratio of 1:8000. While it is suggested that Birmingham with a population of 1.1 million can make do with 100 councillors a ratio of 1:11000.
The changes will also not effectively address workload issues as the needs of the people in for example Acocks Green or Washwood Heath are going to more complex and challenging than those in Harborne or Four Oaks.

We strongly object to the patronising tone that is used by Kerslake when he states that Birmingham Council should stop seeing itself as a 'victim', blaming poverty and deprivation for the difficulties. The fact is we do have high levels of deprivation and poverty and a significant number of communities where English is the second language, to suggest we are using this as an excuse really devalues the very real problems experienced by real people.

The council has to save money and some reasonable suggestions have been made but to expect a council to produce a coherent strategy at the same time as experiencing swingeing redundancies with more to come and to identify savings of 360 million by 2017 is a recipe for chaos, and this against a backdrop of a Children's service and Social service that is on it's knees. Changes can be made but they have to be rational, planned and achievable.

We are really concerned about the degree of coercion that is implicit in this review, and really wonder what sort of democratic society is evolving.

The Boundary review seems to us to not address any of the key difficulties experienced by the council and is going to cost money to implement, yet again taking money from frontline services.

This seems to be purely about austerity and nothing to do with a planned recovery.

I hope you will consider our comments and look forward to a response

Yours Faithfully

Jane Cresswell

Roger Cresswell
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Yours Sincerely

[Signatures]

Name:  **JOSEPH CRIDGE + FAYE PIPER**
North Birmingham Community Together

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

Save our local community now by petition letter overleaf and return
The Review Office (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that plans have been drawn up for Swanshurst Lane to become part of Sparkhill South Ward. I also understand that the Boundary Commission wishes to remove Springfield Ward altogether.

I have lived in [redacted] for almost 20 years, and it has always been in the postal district of Moseley. For much of that time, this side was in Moseley ward, and in about 2001, it was changed to Springfield ward. I understand that several community groups in Moseley have submitted plans which include Swanshurst Lane in a new Moseley ward. All these groups identify with Moseley and any issues concerned with Moseley. For instance, Moseley Bog is a short walking distance from this home, and I am a member of Moseley Park School. We are a community of Moseley and identify with it. Therefore, if it is definite that Springfield ward must disappear, and that, consequently, we cannot remain a part of it, it would make perfect sense for Swanshurst Lane to be Moseley for election purposes, in addition to it being our postal address.

P.T.O
I support the Moseley Community Groups' plans.
I thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours faithfully,
Re Boundary Changes Hall Green Birmingham.

As a life long resident of Hall Green Birmingham I am concerned that the proposal as it stands will damage the community feeling that we have in Hall Green. Key landmarks such as Hall Green Railway Station, Hall Green Parade and Sarehole Mill need to remain within wards called "Hall Green". Even Hall Green Health Centre could find itself in Tyseley.

I have been impressed with Option 3 attached... this would create a two member Hall Green West ward and a one member Hall Green East ward. Plus retain key landmarks such as Hall Green Railway Station, Hall Green Parade, Hall Green Health Centre, Hall Green Community Church and Sarehole Mill within the new Hall Green wards and retain the overall boundaries that make up Hall Green.

Hope this helps

Ian Crockford
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Robert Crosskey  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Organisation Name: N/a

**Comment text:**

I haven’t drawn on the map, but am horrified by the draft proposals put forward, which will completely change the nature of the area - leaving no councillor with the interests of Moseley village at heart. In fact, the plan is so strange that the proposed ward of ‘Moseley’ does not even include the village centre within it!! I fully support the boundary for Moseley that has been proposed to you by the Moseley Community Groups - led by Moseley Forum. This is not a faceless suburb, but an area which has an identifiable community, and it is important that it is not marginalised and ignored - which would be the likely consequence of the current Boundary Commission proposal. Many people here feel very strongly about this - please do not ignore us. Thank you.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Peter Cross
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Sutton Coldfield Resident

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: We live at [redacted] Wyde Green. Why can't you put the border of Wyde Green at the bottom of our gardens to avoid confusion.

Annotation 2:

Annotation 3:

Annotation 4:

Annotation 5:

Comment text:
As our address is [redacted] Wyde Green Sutton Coldfield, we should belong to the Wyde Green Ward. The boundary of Wyde Green should therefore be at the bottom of our garden (as it is for example for Berwood Farm road opposite us). There are implications for school and health service locations and house value. If our daughter had not passed for Sutton Coldfield Girls School and gone on to Goldred, her educational prospects would have been quite different. The people of our street all feel the same. Please revise this border so that it makes sense while you are doing changes. We don't live in Pype Hayes! Thankyou.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Will Cross
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: New boundary to include the 6 BV7 houses and two bungalows

Comment text:

As a resident at [redacted] in Northfield, currently the proposed boundary omits us from the Bournville and Cotteridge ward. I have spoken to a few of our neighbours and like me they would like to be included in the Bournville and Cotteridge ward. Regards Will Cross

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/madam,

I am a resident at [redacted] in Northfield, currently your proposed boundary omits us from the Bournville and Cotteridge ward. I have spoken to a few of our neighbours and like me they would like to be included in the Bournville and Cotteridge ward.

There are only 8 BVT houses on our road and we are a little confused why we haven’t been included.

I have a few questions regarding the change of boundary.

- Why have the 8 BVT houses on [redacted] been omitted from the Bournville ward?
- Will areas in the Bournville and Cotteridge now be called Bournville rather than Northfield? If not what is the advantage if any of us being in this ward rather than Northfield west?
- If we were included in the Bournville ward would that have an impact on our house prizes?
- Would our Council Tax change?

Please find attached the screen grab of the area and also a quick mock-up of what I propose.

Many thanks

Will Cross
3D Visualiser

[Image of attached screen grab and mock-up]
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

In addition we object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because:- I am an Erdington resident and wish to remain in same borough. Erdington has a community feel, a history to it and I feel to change the boundaries could have a negative impact my children were born in Erdington, the Abbey was their School we visit the Abbey Church in the Heart of Erdington known as the village. To Modernise/change areas is not always for the better to stay traditional and improve same boroughs can have a positive outcome. People are close to Erdington, I love my area I love Erdington I am not happy to live in borough of Stockland Green. We need to Adopt an Erdington Ward with boundaries of changes to Stockland Green maybe put to a vote for local people to consider these changes. I want Erdington to remain the same. I feel this borough adds character to Birmingham with its own small piece of historical Value.

Yours Sincerely

Name:-
Address:
Postcode:
Email:-
Phone number:
Dear Sirs,

Like very many other residents of Erdington, I would strongly ask you to amend the plans to break up the Erdington Ward in the way envisaged. How can it make sense if old historic cottages in the centre, plus the RC Abbey, Erdington railway station, the police station, to name a few places, are removed from Erdington? I hope you will consider what many people feel. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Nigel Crowther.
Dear sirs,

Please see the following email I was sent, it is unclear if they also sent this to you, but is clear that they meant to.

Please add it to the consultation responses.

Cheers
Robert

Cllr Robert Alden
Erdington Ward

Please take pride in Erdington - Don't drop litter

Begin forwarded message:

From: Patrick Crozier
Date: 8 February 2016 09:01:45 GMT
To: Robert Alden
Subject: Keep Erdington Abbey in Erdington

We ask the commission to change their plans to take the abbey, the police station, the railway station, the old Erdington cottages, the top end of Erdington High St and other historical parts of Erdington.

Erdington is mentioned in the Doomsday book and has a great history.

Please leave Erdington alone so that it's history is preserved.

Regards,

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

27th January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

Boundary Commission's Draft Recommendations: Acocks Green

I regularly attend my local Acocks Green Forum meetings which serves to help keep the local residents of Acocks Green up to date with, amongst others thing, issues that concern this area.

Through attending this meeting on the 26th January 2016, I learnt (for the first time!) about the new draft boundary recommendation for Birmingham, and the effect this change will have for me because I do not live on the right side of the demarcation line. That is to say, that despite my postal address being in Acocks Green, for voting I will be part of the proposed new Yardley West ward.

I take an active interest in my local area and community which is Acocks Green, I get involved with activities that happen in Acocks Green, not Yardley. I shop and attend local meetings in Acocks Green not Yardley, use local amenities such as Restaurants, Churches, Doctors, the Library, and Pubs in Acocks Green not Yardley, therefore to me I live in, and Identify with Acocks Green and not Yardley. I therefore feel that I should be able to vote for elected representatives for this area (Acocks Green) and not for representatives of a area that I have no connection with.

During this meeting two of our local councillors Cllrs Roger Hamer (Liberal) and Cllrs Stewart Stacey (Labour) both put forward in my opinion, two workable alternatives that would insure that Acocks Green ward and community would remain as a whole, should either be chosen over the current proposal. I understand that these alternative plans have been submitted to the boundary commission for consideration.

I do hope that I have been able to express to you at least a little of the care and sense of identity that I feel for Acocks Green, as it is the place where I live and wish to continue to be part of its community.

I look forward to hearing that our elected Councillors have been able to achieve the desired amendment for Acocks Green ward.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Antonia Cuddihy
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Diana Cullum-hall
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I do not agree with creating a new name of Sutton Parkside. Please keep either of the old names of Sutton Vesey or Banners Gate. I would prefer to keep the current Sutton Vesey boundary including Banners Gate, New Oscott and Boldmere. (I understand using the railway line as a boundary - so that the Eastern part of current Sutton Vesey - Wylde Green - to be included in Sutton Trinity.) The Sutton Vesey boundary to also include the areas of Sutton Park already included. Sutton Vesey residents would then be able to contact councillors in the area of the park if there are problems. (not in Four Oaks). It would make sense to also include Westwood Coppice and Longmoor Pool in this Sutton Vesey area. The population size of this council ward would warrant having two councillors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

1. The cottages in Station Rd and Erdington Abbey are the oldest & historic part of Erdington. Erdington Railway Station, the Royal Mail Sorting Office, Eradaga Police Station are also the heart of Erdington.
2. The proposed boundary changes would rip the heart out of Erdington.
3. These changes would cost a lot of money which could be used in health care or other necessary causes.

I beg you please don’t waste money keep the boundary of Erdington as it is.

Yours Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

[Postcode]

[Email]

[Phone number]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sandra Cunningham
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Moseley Residents Ass

Comment text:
To the Village of Moseley does not make sense. We have built up Moseley over the past twenty years I have lived here. Moseley has now become one the most sought after places to live in Birmingham. Reason is because of us the residents. We care about our village. We now have faceless London civil servants who have no idea and cares nothing for our cities outside of London trying to destroy our village.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Cynthia Cupido  
E-mail: **********  
Postcode:  
Organisation Name:  

**Comment text:**

I live in the Moseley Ward and strongly object to the proposed boundary changes because they will carve up a vibrant and cohesive ward where residents have a strong identity and pride as Moseleyites into something completely unrecognisable, with arbitrary boundaries and a place we do not recognise. Doing this will simply not achieve the Commission's aim of providing effective local government. I have lived in Moseley for 23 years and have enjoyed all of the great features that has made this ward such a distinctive and exciting place to live in. Moseley has an established and diverse community with strong community organisations and civic action, and has the asset of bounding two conservation areas, the Moseley Bog and site of special scientific interest and a well utilised and active community leisure facility, and the wonderful Moseley Village with its popular farmer's markets and retail by day and by night the great bars and restaurants that locals and visitors flock to for entertainment and dining. The Moseley Park in the heart of the Village, has been host to two renowned music festivals every year for more then 10 years and attracts people from across the country. The clean well looked after streets, with floral arrays are amongst the other features of Moseley that residents identify with and are proud tell-tale signs of a strong civic action and good we'll run local politics. Sadly the Commission's Proposed boundaries takes no account of these many attributes that gives Moseley a big heart with a strong and engaged community, and a place of pride for its residents. By redrawing the boundaries in the arbitrary way proposed the Commions own stated reasons 2 & 3 will not be realised. I attended a public gathering where 500 people voted against these proposed changes in favour of retaining the current boundary line and bringing back into the ward the the Moseley Bog and Sarehill Mill. Moseley's key strategic documents and plans for the area, namely the Moseley SPD and 'Making Moseley', the regeneration strategy borne out of strong and active community engagement is represents of all the stakeholder interest in this ward. my main objections to the proposed boundary changes are : * Moseley is a historical village and the proposed redrawing of boundaries will pull apart an area with over 150 years of identity and civic legacy. * redrawing of the ward boundaries will have a huge impact on this ward with a strong and long established identity and it would be simply wrong to take the village, St Mary's Church, and the Mosley Park and pool out of Moseley, whilst Balsall Heath Park would fall within the boundary of Moseley. * Property values are threatened too by the redrawn boundaries, as are local economic growth as proposed boundaries will fundamentally change the ratings of what has recently been voted as the best place to live in and the best pubs in The UK. *redrawing of wards and reduction of political representation will also impact on the level of investment and local government resources for the area...to its detriment * I am concerned that the boundary review for wider Birmingham will result in reduced number of elected members and this is overall a negative message and I fail to understand how this will achieve the aim of electoral equality for the Wards across the city. Please rethink and consult with residents in the city before you redraw the boundaries for this city.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Tom Curtis
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Please keep Broad lanes, Bayston Road, Jasmin Croft etc in the grand wood ward. It makes no sense to split the boundary where is suggested, I do not want to be part of the Monyhull ward, very different catchment of housing/political views.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded