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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jonathan Jaffa
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Kings Heath Business Improvement District

Comment text:

Being unable to "Draw a shape on the map" I shall describe my idea. The triangle of land at the Northern end of Brandwood, protruding into Kings Heath & Moseley, with Howard Road (A4040) as its base, should be included in the latter. The reasoning is that it cuts into the natural shape of Kings Heath centre and forms a false boundary. I sit on both the Kings Heath Residents Forum and the Kings Heath Business Improvement District and this anomalous division causes many problems to both organizations. The first issue is that we have to deal with two sets of Councillors and Council officers simply by crossing the main street (A435) which runs through the area, while the businesses on both sides of the road are included in the Business Improvement District. The KH & M representatives see Kings Heath as an important part of their District while the Brandwood representatives view the small area of Kings Heath as an unimportant adjunct to their larger responsibility to the residents of Brandwood District. Secondly there is a sense of allegiance in this triangle to the local centre, Kings Heath, rather than to the distant Brandwood core. Thirdly, Kings Heath is a strong business area with its own distinctive issues while Brandwood is predominately residential in character with different problems. Inclusion of this little bit of Kings Heath in the Kings Heath & Moseley District would decrease the amount of time spent liaising between Districts when the matters are usually of little interest to the Brandwood personnel, this area representing such a small section of their responsibilities.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Cheryl Kinsella
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

As there would seem to be 3 councillors for most of the areas around where I live and having spoken to others, changing the boundaries seems to be causing some anxt especially among elderly citizens. Would it not be better to reduce the number of councillors for each ward rather than increase the boundary sizes or move some areas into new boundaries which is likely to cause confusion and concern. Surely a reduction of 20 councillors can be achieved by reducing 3 to 2 where appropriate. Most services are being reduced or removed to save money and district control for larger budgets removed so the reduction of councillors per ward seems like a better fit.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Michael Lawley  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]  
**Organisation Name:** Acocks Green Focus Group

**Comment text:**

I live in Acocks Green and I think that we need a 2 councillor ward and think that as much of B27 as possible should be kept together as we are a community that now works well together.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Pascoe, Mark

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 24 July 2015 11:53
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: BIRMINGHAM

Ken Lawrence

Sent: 24 July 2015 11:10
To: reviews
Cc: 
Subject: BIRMINGHAM

I understand that the Local Government Boundary Commission is of the view that the number of councillors on Birmingham City Council is too many at 120 and is minded to go with the recommendations in the Kerslake Review which suggested 100 councillors.

I am not sure of the logic here. Birmingham has fewer councillors per head of population than many areas. Indeed a Birmingham councillor has to represent about 8,900 people, whilst in Leeds the figure is 7,500, Sheffield 6,500, Bristol 6,100, Nottingham 5,600, Manchester 5,200, Liverpool 5,200 and Newcastle 3,500. Birmingham City Council does not even have as many Councillors as Cornwall Council where the level of representation is one councillor per 4,300 people. Leicester a city as ethnically diverse as Birmingham has one councillor per 6,100 population.

The statistics alone suggest the proposal is out of line with the rest of the country and is basically unfair to the people of Birmingham. If the argument is that there are too many councillors in Birmingham for effective government then the issue of Cornwall must be looked at – and they unlike Birmingham have numerous parish councillors. However the argument is more fundamentally flawed as statute determines how many councillors can be part of the executive.

The proposal to go to one member wards will exacerbate the problem of accessing a councillor. I currently work for Citizens Advice Bureaux in Birmingham and Staffordshire, and have worked in local government and/or the third sector (in Manchester, Merseyside and the West Midlands) for 39 years (27 years in Birmingham) much of it involved contact with elected members and local communities. Whilst there are many very good councillors it is not unknown for councillors to be elected who are either far from impartial or very inactive in pursuing their constituents problems. With multi member wards local people have at least the chance of approaching another councillor who may be more receptive to their cause or more effective in its pursuit. One member wards would without a doubt disadvantage some people and advantage none. It also may increase the balance of power between the elected member and the local area which may significant in some communities.

All out elections would be a good idea as it allows the incoming administration time to put in place and evaluate new proposals.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me

Best regards
Ken Lawrence
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Paul Long
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

4: This is the area of Sutton Park that residents would identify as being part of Four Oaks.
5: This is the part of Sutton Park that residents would NOT identify as being part of Four Oaks but being more part of the Vessey Ward or shared with Vessey and Trinity.
6: This is the Wylde Green area which includes Wylde Green Primary School and the Wylde Green shopping centre that has far more in common with Vessey ward than with the areas East of the New Hall Valley.
7: This is the area that could be a Boldmere ward represented by one councillor. It would be a Green area need to include the 'nobby' bits at the South West too.
8: If we have a larger ward with 3 councillors, then this is my recommendation for the Vessey Ward to include Boldmere, Wylde Green, Maney and Bishop Vessey Grammar School and including the Town Centre, Leisure Centre and Youth Centre.
9: This is the part of Trinity that I would suggest becomes part of New Hall, although I can see the numbers may not add up and so more may need to be taken from the North of this area to be put into Four Oaks, or a ward with fewer councillors.
10: This is the part of Trinity that I would suggest becomes part of New Hall, although I can see the numbers may not add up and so more may need to be taken from the North of this area to be put into Four Oaks, or a ward with fewer councillors.
11: This is the the part of Trinity that could go into Four Oaks and shares more identity and maybe just 2 councillors for Four Oaks, with 3 for Vessey and 3 for New Hall so down from 12 to 8.

Map Features:

Annotation 4: This is the area of Sutton Park that residents would identify as being part of Four Oaks.
Annotation 5: This is the part of Sutton Park that residents would NOT identify as being part of Four Oaks but being more part of the Vessey Ward or shared with Vessey and Trinity.
Annotation 6: This is the Wylde Green area which includes Wylde Green Primary School and the Wylde Green shopping centre that has far more in common with Vessey ward than with the areas East of the New Hall Valley.
Annotation 7: This is the area that could be a Boldmere ward represented by one councillor. It would need to include the 'nobby' bits at the South West too.
Annotation 8: If we have a larger ward with 3 councillors, then this is my recommendation for the Vessey Ward to include Boldmere, Wylde Green, Maney and Bishop Vessey Grammar School and including the Town Centre, Leisure Centre and Youth Centre.
Annotation 9: This is the part of Trinity that I would suggest becomes part of New Hall, although I can see the numbers may not add up and so more may need to be taken from the North of this area to be put into Four Oaks, or a ward with fewer councillors.
Annotation 10: This is the part of Trinity that could go into Four Oaks and shares more identity and maybe just 2 councillors for Four Oaks, with 3 for Vessey and 3 for New Hall so down from 12 to 8.

Comment text:

Dear Sir I wish to submit comments for the consultation on Birmingham's ward boundaries with respect to the constituency of Sutton Coldfield. Sutton Coldfield is a constituency of Birmingham since 1974, but formerly of Warwickshire. It is a Royal Town and so has its own identity. 75% of residents have also voted for Sutton Coldfield to have its own Town Council which will be approved by Birmingham Council in September 2015. Sutton Coldfield also has as its centre piece Sutton Park which gives the people of Sutton Coldfield a common interest as well as identity. In order to maintain the identity and interests of the people of Sutton Coldfield, it is essential that any changes to ward boundaries do NOT affect the Sutton Coldfield constituency boundary. Furthermore, in order to maintain consistency and effective working relationships with the new Town Council and the Town's MP, it is essential that any new wards fall within Sutton Coldfield and do not cross the current constituency boundary. If the constituency boundary is crossed then it will cause conflicts of interest when liaising between City and Town Council and Westminster MP. The current Sutton Coldfield District boundary should remain in line with the constituency and Town Council boundary. With respect to the current ward boundaries, I understand that the proposal could include keeping the existing boundaries and decreasing the number of councillors. I would fully support this as our current councillors do not do much to represent the people of Sutton Coldfield but instead represent their own political interests and ambitions. One of the issues with having 3 ward councillors is that when votes are required in the Vessey Ward, the two conservative councillors simply...
overrule the one labour councillor rather than working together. Having an even number of councillors (two) would mean that more co-operation would be required in these areas. Another option would be to reduce the ward boundary sizes slightly and have only one councillor representing each ward. I feel this would be healthy to encourage councillors to work harder for residents. Currently Sutton Coldfield has 12 councillors. If this was reduced to 9 or 10 then the areas they represent could be smaller communities where even more interests are shared in common and perhaps these areas could represent Church of England Parish boundaries. There are distinct areas that could easily be formed. A railway line and several main roads run through Sutton Coldfield. For example, in the Vesey ward, there is a triangular shape surrounded by Jockey Road, Boldmere Road and the railway line that covers the area of Boldmere. Boldmere is a vibrant community with many local events happening each year including a Music Festival and Christmas Lights switching on. There is a common identity of people with the area, particularly the shopping centre on Boldmere Road. Another option is to reduce the number of wards. Sutton Coldfield used to be represented by 3 wards and now has 4 wards. The Sutton Trinity Ward was a new ward that was added by the last boundary review. This ward covers the Town Centre and parts of Four Oaks. It is a divisive ward as it does not properly represent the area. It would make more sense to increase the Four Oaks ward in the North East to take in some of Trinity Ward and to extend New Hall Ward northwards to take in part of Trinity Ward. Currently New Hall Ward represents 4 very different areas. Wylde Green, Walmley, Minworth and semi-rural areas. It would make more sense if Wylde Green was moved into the Vesey Ward as it has a lot more in common with the Boldmere which is also in the Vesey Ward. It is not until crossing the main Birmingham Road onto Penns Lane that people would really class themselves as being “New Hall” which is more associated with Walmley. Further to this, areas of the current Trinity Ward have much more association with Boldmere in Vesey than they do with the current Trinity Ward. These include Clifton Road Youth Centre, Wyndley Leisure Centre (home to Boldmere Swimming Club) and Maney. It would make sense to draw a new boundary along the Birmingham Road from Chester Road (Vesey / Erdington) to Tamworth Road (Trinity / Four Oaks), encompassing the Town Centre by including the whole of Brassington Avenue. Sutton Park is currently in 3 wards. It would make more sense to be within 2 wards. North of the goods railway line is considered Four Oaks, but the rest of the park is not associated with Four Oaks, yet it is currently within that ward. This would disconnect people who live in Boldmere, New Oscott and Banners Gate. I would recommend that the north of the park above the railway line is Four Oaks and south of the railway line is Sutton Vesey. Having this pattern will make communication and liaison with the Parks Department and Park Rangers far more effective and convenient. I hope this information helps. As a resident of Sutton Coldfield for 41 years and somebody who is active in the local Neighbourhood Forum and takes a lot of interest in the Town, I would be very happy to meet with the people responsible for drawing up new boundaries and advise on the different types of areas and how interests and identities differ within them. I believe you need people with local knowledge to help make these decisions rather than relying on statistics. Yours faithfully Paul Long
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Carol Lumley
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I live in a suburb of Birmingham called Kings Heath. There is a ward boundary and parliamentary constituency boundary right through the middle of the centre of this suburb. Part if the centre of the suburb is in Brandwood ward (which is in Selly Oak constituency) and the other part is in Moseley & Kings Heath ward (which is in Hall Green constituency). In the last boundary changes consultation local councillors apparently recommended that it remain as it is (something to do with the numbers of people living in the wards). However, having it like this makes all sorts of difficulties. For instance, one of the wards may be organising something which will affect the day to day activities of all the people of the suburb (e.g. changes to the roads or high street) but the other part if the centre of the suburb will know nothing about it and ends up having no say in it. I think the whole of the suburb of Kings Heath should be in one ward and also within just one parliamentary constituency. Possibly the suburb of Moseley should not be in the same ward as Kings Heath but some parts of it are quite close to Kings Heath Being in different wards even affect policing as the police are now organised to match ward and parliamentary constituency boundaries. This means that each part of the suburb even has different police teams, which requires that people in one part of the suburb have to go to one police station if they need to, and the people from the other part of the suburb have to go to a different police station. I feel that the whole of Kings Heath should be in one ward/constituency. But you may need to take local advice as to where the boundaries of Kings Heath are.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

I write regarding your consultation on boundary review. The above address is in the "Yew Tree and Great Barr" ward of Sandwell MBC. The 'local' point of government is in Oldbury, West Midlands. It has previously been in Walsall, Aldridge, Staffs etc etc (a reason for it often not being included in local initiatives as officers often use old maps?)

I am just about to take a 5 minute walk to my local center at the Scott Arms. The journey will take me through 4 different wards and 2 local authorities. The Scott Arms has 4 local social clubs, 3 churches, one library (Sandwell) several banks, a post office and a shopping center. It is also the busiest junction for traffic in Europe. Local people are supposed to use a "tip" in Oldbury but in fact use are in Birmingham. The Scott Arms needs to be one. Is this possible?

Yours sincerely,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mohammad Mahboob
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Please place Alexandra Road, Edgbaston B5 back in to the Edgbaston Ward. In a previous review, we were unfairly and without consultation placed in to the Sparkbrook Ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Gurdev Singh Manku  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
Organisation Name: Birmingham City Council

**Comment text:**

Electoral Review of Birmingham 1. We would strongly propose that there should be one Councillor per ward and this will be sufficient, as one MP is able to manage a whole constituency and we feel that one Councillor will be able to manage a Ward and this will also save the taxpayer a lot of money. 2. Each constituency should consist of only 2 or 3 wards, where necessary the wards should be made larger. 3. If any particular councillor or Mayor is not doing their role effectively then there should be an option for constituents to request that Councillor or Mayor to be recalled. 4. There should be an elected Mayor for the City of Birmingham, not as current where they are appointed. 5. This proposal will save the City of Birmingham a lot of tax payers money and will ensure that the Councillors have sufficient work.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

Dear Sirs, The previous proposed boundary changes indicated the ward of New Hall (sutton Coldfield) being merged with the ward of Erdington. In view of the new Town Council proposal to Sutton Coldfield District I would suggest that any ward configurations should be within the District to enable the vote to be a valid one

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Luke Moloney
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Increase four oaks to tamworth road. To include moor hall.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Helen Neuenhaus
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I believe the Oscott boundary should remain unchanged but I have never understood the need for 3 councillors. I believe 2 councillors would work equally well. I have to say in all the years that I have lived in Oscott - 27 years to be exact - I have only ever contacted one councillor, who to be fair has always been very hard working. I would be happy to see the number of councillors reduced to two.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Matthew Nixon
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

5: The top end of banners walk
6: Water course or cycle path
9: Boundary of Sutton Vesey

Map Features:

Annotation 5: The top end of banners walk
Annotation 6: water course or cycle path
Annotation 8:
Annotation 9: Boundary of Sutton Vesey

Comment text:

I learnt of the proposal on boundary changes, I would like to express my reasons for outlining the proposal to include part of Kingstanding ward to be part of Sutton Vesey. I am looking from a different perspective that Sutton Vesey is obviously an affluent area and their needs and concerns would be different than those on the Kingstanding ward. I am concerned that outlining the Kingstanding ward on its own would present real challenges in terms of deprivation and high levels of lower socio economies that would take up a lot of resources. It is my view that ‘saving’ off part of Kingstanding ward and make it part of Sutton Vesey would lessen the impact on socio economics and the resources would be in theory would be available to make a difference otherwise it is strange to make a clear divide of council estates and leafy suburbs. I rather see that defining boundaries are not influenced by socio economics and have obvious outlining of parks, main road and railway lines. Also I think it presents a good clear boundaries using the cycle path or water course to define the potential of being in Sutton Vesey. It seems strange to allow few streets off Chester Road to be marked a boundary whereas the cycle path and section of college road would make a clear boundary along with allowing the deprived part of Kingstanding to be part of a affluent area. It would bring a good mix of housing, seeds and different set of challenges.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Please read VERY CAREFULLY

25th August, 2015

To whom it may concern,

Re: Proposed New Changes to COUNCIL WARDS for Birmingham
with Special Reference to SUTTON COLDFIELD VESEY WARD

I am writing as a resident at the above address in the Birmingham Council VESEY WARD for the past 47 years. I have had the occasion on three previous proposals for electoral boundary changes for General Elections to write to the Boundary Commission to point out the geographical and social implications of such changes to this ward, the last one being on 10th. October, 2011. Along with my fellow residents in this Council Ward I therefore wish to remind decision-makers in this connection of certain facts on the ground, especially with regard to our Banners Gate section of the Vesey Ward as it now stands, that are not apparent to non-resident outsiders considering lines on the maps they peruse.

Any temptation to judge from afar that a line drawn along the Chester Road, which cuts through the Western extremity of Sutton Coldfield, means that residents can easily be switched to new Council Wards outside the Royal Borough of Sutton Coldfield, runs counter to residents present affiliations, cultural as well as political. It should, therefore, be understood by officials that the Banners Gate area of Sutton Coldfield, stretching some one and a half miles along the Chester Road and the current adjacent Kingstanding constituency boundary from Beggars Bush to the Questell Road and approximately half a mile deep, is an enclave of SUTTON COLDFIELD, sandwiched between the Chester Road and the current KINGSTANDING constituency boundary. Since the LATE 1940s, i.e. nearly 70 YEARS ago, the houses were built wholly for PRIVATE OWNERSHIP occupation, especially for accommodating young families, and hence were allocated to SUTTON COLDFIELD (as testified by the address above) and the VESEY WARD of the EXTANT electoral boundaries for Local Government elections in this case, which since then has long remained the well understood electoral situation and arrangements.

It is, therefore, IMPERATIVE that the few thousand voters in the Banners Gate area of the current VESEY WARD retain and maintain their historical and traditional longstanding affiliations with and identity with Sutton Coldfield for its electoral and other social and cultural purpose, not least in view of the very recent according of the POLITICAL STATUS of a new devolved SUTTON COLDFIELD TOWN COUNCIL.

Yours Faithfully,
27 August 2015

Dear Mr Paton

REVIEW OF WARDS IN THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Thank you for your letter dated 25 August 2015. This letter refers to the review being undertaken a different organization – the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

I have forwarded your letter to them at the following address:-

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

Yours sincerely

G R Tessier
Commission Secretariat
Hello, I would like to protest against any boundary change that would split-up the town of Sutton Coldfield making it have more than one MP. Sutton Coldfield should not be split because it is one single cultural entity with its own identity ... this has been proven to a large extent because the town recently voted, by a large majority, to have its own division of Birmingham City Council: something along the lines if its own town council (but with lesser powers). The town has a definite single centre that all the people of Sutton Coldfield consider their own town centre, and the welfare and upkeep of Sutton Park is very much a concern to all people of the town... just 2 examples where if the town were split electorally, some citizens may not be able to have a voice via their MP on a certain issue because the area in question may no longer be under the jurisdiction of their own MP. Also it is possible, if the town were split electorally, that there will be a situation where both MPs think that it is the other's responsibility to deal with a certain issue of the town and hence the issue does not get dealt with at all... or there could be lack of communication between the two MPs on an important town-wide issue. And it could be that neither MP really has his or her heart in representing Sutton Coldfield because it is only part of the votes they need. -- In short there is potential for "buck-passing" and poor performance. J Prestidge (resident of Sutton Coldfield since 1966)
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Nanem Qureshi
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Sparkbrook Ward

Comment text:
I wish to present this submission as a resident within the neighbourhood defined as Sparkbrook Neighbourhood Forum. The area has some resonance with the district of Sparkbrook and would consider the ward to be named as ‘SPARKBROOK’. I believe that this neighbourhood would significantly benefit being identified as a ward to increase public agencies to focus area development improving health, education, employment and housing opportunities for the 8000 adult residents of the area. It will also provide a unique boundary for local resident groups, community groups, third sector providers and charities to work together addressing key inequalities in the area. There are also number of local assets that can be harnessed together including parks, community spaces, centres to connect together improving all aspects of life in the area. There is a strong cultural and business identity of the area and by having it defined as a ward will make the area having greater sustainability for the future generations in this new Sparkbrook Ward.

Uploaded Documents:
Download

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/6054
28/09/2015
Resident Submission

Introduction

I am an active resident within the current Sparkbrook Ward and wish to present a case for a revised ward boundary to be co-terminus with a recognised neighbourhood area called the ‘Sparkbrook Neighbourhood Forum’

The proposed ward structure takes into account the current polling district contained within the Sparkbrook Ward.

Currently the Sparkbrook ward has 19,534 electorates and has three elected members, equating to 6,511 per councillor.

The criteria for the new proposed geographical make up is creating 1,2 or 3 member wards consisting an average of 8000 electorates per councillor.

There is merit to create a single member ward for this particular neighbourhood as it will provide national focus to address local socio-economic issues affecting the area.

There are further benefits of defining the neighbourhood as a ward, as it will enhance future opportunities by creating and developing area focused interventions. It will create a strong platform to build the existing strengths of harnessing natural communities, neighbourhood and natural landscapes to defined a geographical space as a brand and identity.

Preferred Choice

The diagram below defines the new ward as Sparkbrook locally identified as the Sparkbrook Forum Area
The area profile

The neighbourhood has a natural arterial boundary contained within the main roads of the A45, B4145, A4167 and A4540.

The Sparkbrook Neighbourhood Forum area was constituted in 1991 in response to the local Government Act of creating a Neighbourhood Forum to act as a representative body for local residents as a structure to influence decision making structures. The area was originally developed taking into account natural housing estates within the Barber Trust Area and aligned with the history of the Lloyds Family.

The locality has a diverse spectrum of communities, cultures and faith living together with a strong structure of local assets and infrastructure to have stability and sustainability bonded by a neighbourhood defined as Sparkbrook Neighbourhood Forum.

The area has a rich source of community engagement and participation that recognise the natural area, this includes the south Central CCG, Birmingham City Council and Department of Communities and Local Government.

Birmingham City Council has also recognised the area as a Neighbourhood Management Area PN8 (attached evidence 01). A substantial part of the area has also has recently contributed as part of the Localism and Big Society investment in 2015 by being recognised by DCLG as a ‘Place’ area. (attached evidence 02)

The total population of the area is approximately 16,500 with an adult population electorate of approximately 8000.

Central to the area is a park and has a unique feature of a community urban village with a showcase health and Community Centre, a youth centre, a church, a temple, a mosque, resident groups, charities, Housing Associations, three GP Practices and a neighbourhood Office.

There are two landmark commercial corridors – Sparkbrook North on the A34 having a unique cultural identity serving the local community and Sparkbrook South on the A34 with a potential £10M commercial development – creating local opportunities for the area.
The identified polling Area

The area has 4 polling stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polling Station</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DDF*</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>2156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDH</td>
<td>2111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDI**</td>
<td>2357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DDF requires to be modified to remove electorates living outside the defined area;
**DDI created by the split of DDH into 2 new polling areas as defined below;

The Proposed Sparkbrook Ward

---

Area cut from DDF
Recommendation

To define this area as a ward to be called ‘the Sparkbrook Ward’

It will provide the following benefits for the area contained;

- To create an identity so that the neighbourhood may have national recognition as a ward, to focus public and statutory agencies and local authority to designate action plans and resources for the area.

- A tool to measure change in austerity by setting indices of deprivation that can be measured over time and evaluated public agency investment is making positive change within the new proposed ward.

- Establish a place that people can be empowered to make positive change for the area by developing platforms on themes affecting the community.

- Clear recognised boundary to define the socio-economic barriers that will allow resources to be targeted and not deflected to other affluent areas using key dataset of this disadvantage location.

- Ring fence resources by public and statutory agencies measuring real neighbourhood impact on equality and improvement of life of local residents

- Strengthen local community based assets in the area developing collaborations and partnership within the defined area.

- Align Faith, Culture and Community to act as one in a small defined area that the services delivered can be measured and evaluated of making direct impact on the area – measured by Super output area statistics – improving lives and opportunities

- That the proposed outline neighbourhood area be considered by the boundary commission as a natural community boundary to be given ward status.

- This would provide a unique identity for the area and focus activity and intervention to develop business cases for stakeholder to improve the life of citizen and improve the image of the area.

I hope the Boundary commission can review the information presented that it makes good sense, to realign the ward boundary for Sparkbrook Neighbourhood Forum to empower residents and stakeholders to test out how real neighbourhood management can lead to real instrumental change in communities.

Supporting documents:

- Management Area 1
- Our Place Sparkbrook 1
We are Sheila Reading & Alan Pickering, living in the New Oscott area of Sutton Coldfield. Post code. We do not want to lose our existing Sutton Coldfield address. We want to remain part of Sutton Coldfield. We want to retain the existing boundary between Sutton Coldfield and Birmingham. We believe any move to link us to Birmingham and detach us from Sutton Coldfield would devalue our property by £20,000. Sheila Reading and Alan Pickering.
I think this is for Birmingham

-----Original Message-----
From: Dick Rodgers
Sent: 22 July 2015 13:50
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Wards boundaries review.

I’m in I’d like separate wards for the part of BVT on our side of A38. and separate wards for weoley castle and the estate reaching from Merritt’s Brook to Frankley Beeches Rd. These are distinct neighbourhoods. Within these zones people can identify with each other and know their electorate and vice versa. Dr Richard Rodgers
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Kanika Safiya
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I would like to say before I recommend my suggestions I grew up in Perry Barr but mostly raised in Handsworth. Handsworth is the place where my dad's family were based and still based. My ties to this place are forever no matter where I go. I always strive for it to be better and want Birmingham to know we gave you a lot. So, I would rather the boundaries around where I live be renamed Handsworth and Handsworth Wood. While Lozells is significant and not just a past historical landmark it would be better to incorporate into the bigger area of Handsworth. I have issues with where Handsworth Wood and 'Aston' meets at certain points. When you head to Birchfield Rd along Wellington Rd it continues as B20. As you pass into Aston Lane the B20 postcode continues which I think doesn't make much sense since most of that side goes into B6 a completely different district. Roads like Bragg Rd, Thornbury Rd should be part of the Ladywood District. I believe wards should be separated by major roads and transport links. The ward of Soho is a unusual one for me. While I feel I understand it's significant to certain buildings, it becomes confusing once you are near the Hockley Flyover. Most residents regard Soho House as Handsworth since it's close to Soho Rd yet the postcode says it's Hockley. I think Soho should not exist as the ward as it is too small. It should form part of Ladywood. In regards to councillors, Handsworth Wood should only have two. Between the two councillors they should decide on areas to cover between themselves. For example, Friary Road to Cherry Orchard Rd could be one while Handsworth Wood Road to Wellington Rd/Churchill Rd and Westminster Rd. Handsworth needs two also to break up the two sides of Soho Road. Grove Lane/Soho Road would be the cut off point for Handsworth councilors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Paul Slater
Email: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 3: Kings Heath is an area reflected in postal addresses covering about half of the current Moseley/Kings Heath ward + large chunks of Billesley and Brandwood wards. It would be good to see the boundary revised to create a (2 member?) Kings Heath ward

Comment text:

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/5725 21/07/2015
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stephen Smallwood
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

It would be ideal and logical to have the same boundary for the combined wards, the parliamentary constituency, and the Sutton Coldfield town council. This would help communication between the 3 entities and promote community involvement.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Richard Sparkes  
**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** [REDACTED]

**Comment text:**

I am writing as a resident and former candidate in Acocks Green Ward. There is a very strong sense of community feeling across Acocks Green and it saddens me that the ward could be split into two. I realise that the ward needs to be reduced in size. Therefore I would suggest that the homes in Tyseley (B11) be taken out of the ward and that the rest of the ward become a two member ward. The Tyseley part of the ward does not really identify with Acocks Green and there is little evidence of these residents taking part in the community events in Acocks Green. The rest of the ward could then continue as a cohesive unit. Acocks Green was previously split into two with the ward border going down the centre of the main shopping street (Warwick Road). Since the two halves of Acocks Green have been reunited it has increased the sense of community and cohesion. It would be a shame if this were to be reversed.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** Philip Spink
- **E-mail:** [REDACTED]
- **Postcode:** [REDACTED]
- **Organisation Name:** N/A

**Comment text:**

I am in full agreement with the proposals to reduce the number of councillors. I think we should re-establish the link we had with Selly Oak Constituency and consider making the constituency larger to include Northfield.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Sir

I am writing to you on behalf of some of my neighbours as well as myself.

We all live in the area above Beeches Road (to the north) which includes Scarsdale Road, Brushfield Road Somercotes Road and so on.

Without exception we feel we live in a community and that community extends to the other side of the Aldridge Road and takes in most of what is currently the Oscott Ward. We think of ourselves as living in Oscott.

For example we use the shops on the Aldridge Road near Dyas Road, the Hawthorn Shopping Centre and a number of local children use the Great Barr, Glenmead and Mary Vale schools as well as the Perry Beeches Schools. Many elderly residents from around this area are members are in groups based in other parts of the current Oscott Ward area.

We all feel more part of that area than we would the other side of the M6 motor way which we feel is another area. If there is such a thing as a natural boundary the motor way is one.

If changes must be made in the case of the Oscott ward having looked at the map, it seems clear to us the only part which could be considered to be a separate community if there is such a thing would be the Council estate at the north edge of the ward which appears similar in nature to the houses in the Kingstanding Ward.? This we believe would leave the rest of the Oscott Ward with around a 17 thousand electorate suitable for 2 Councillors.

Naturally we would prefer to keep 3 Councillors representing us if at all possible but given the changes required we would hope that 2 would be kept together, working together, to fight on our behalf.

Yours sincerely, [Redacted]

Gall Street
Dear Members of the Boundary Commission.
I am finding it difficult to understand why the government wishes to 'redraw' Sutton Coldfield's boundaries and merge them into the rest of Birmingham. I am assuming that it is;
1. A cost cutting exercise;
2. A rather cynical attempt to manipulate the vote in these redesigned wards.

I don't understand why, in the very year when Sutton has voted overwhelmingly to restore, if possible, its 'own' council, independent of Birmingham, that anyone would then go on to 'blur' these boundaries.

I live in Sutton Coldfield. I do not vote Conservative.
I am resigned to the fact that in every General Election my vote counts for nothing. Only in council elections, within the existing ward boundaries, does my vote give me a voice. These proposed new wards could well disenfranchise me yet again.

Yours Faithfully'
Janet Swallow.
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Donna Taylor  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I live on Barnes Hill, which means I fall inside the Bartley Green ward, although my Parliamentary constituency is Edgbaston. My local shops and doctors surgery are a ten minute walk from my front door, but these are in Weoley Castle, which is Northfield ward. The boundaries are confusing and neither the ward or the Parliamentary division is representative of where I live. I get frustrated that the immediate neighbourhood is left largely uncared for by the local council office; the area is scruffy and unkempt and both the local council office and our designated councillors are unresponsive to expressions of concern. It is as if we are in no man’s land and completely forgotten about. I would like to see a boundary change that has Barnes Hill reclassified as either Harborne or Weoley Castle. I think this is the only way that this small pocket of the ward will receive any sort of regeneration, or even just basic cleansing and maintenance. In addition, I would add that we have three ward councillors here, and as none of them do anything productive for our part of the ward, I cannot see a necessity for so many ‘representatives’.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sue Tipping
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: None

Comment text:

I support the Conservative policy of having two members for Walmley and Minworth wards.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Feature Annotations

Annotation 5: ACOCKS GREEN WARD currently 3 Councillors with 19748 electors, with an estimated increase to 21625 in 2021.

Comment text:

Dear Local Government Boundary Commission in reducing councillors to 100 across the City, and the city has an electorate of 735190 and if retaining 40 wards that is an estimated 73519 electors per councillor, which is within the recommendation for electoral equality of 8000 voters per councillor. Therefore, in attempting to retain some integrity to any reassigned ward, which reflects the interests and identity of its community and effective governance even with the proposed reduction of elected members, the common and accepted identity of its community and area should be paramount in any administrative deliberations. The ward known as Acocks Green should radiate from its commonly accepted centre and reflect the the feelings of its community. If it should be necessary to realign the ward to adopt the needs of any administrative structure and governance then any change should reflect local expectations towards its boundaries, which currently follow obvious visual features. There is currently, across the ward many people and community groups who have put an enormous amount of time and effort in working for the benefit of Acocks Green and the community, who have developed a special understanding and association to the place where they live which should be recognised by those who serve these communities. All will depend on, are we to going to reduce the number of wards or increase them. If we are looking to reduce the ward to say 2 members, then based on the 2014 figures of 19748 and 8000 voters per councillor, we need to reduce the electorate by approximately 3748. If we base this on the 800 post codes, then say losing polling districts CAA and CAC, would achieve this. Alternatively, retaining 3 members would require an increase to 24600 electors, which could be attained by extending the ward south west to the boundary of the Stratford road, incorporating part of polling district CJ and districts CJG, CJF and CJK. On a point of interest, we have been subject to various boundary changes due to demographic influences, in 1934, we lost the western area to Sparkbrook and the Southern area to the newly created Hall Green. Recent changes were in 2003/4 which resulted in major changes with the abolition of Fossholme ward and the creation of the South Yardley Ward. The Acocks Green Ward moved South to take in the electors from the old Fox Hollies Ward, south of the Warwick Road and the Grand Union Canal, which allowed Acocks Green to have a natural centre. However, this is resolved, we do not want to return to a situation when we have an illconceived boundary that runs right through the natural centre of the village, like some proverbial Berlin Wall, with all the associated administrative and representative issues reappearing. On a further point of comparisons, Glasgow has an electorate of 479200 with 21 wards, and plans for an increase to 23 wards made up of 16 wards with 4 councillors, 7 with 3 councillors a total of 83 councillors, an increase from 79 councillors. Manchester has 32 wards each with 3 councillors and the number of electors from 12590 to 23500. In 1934, Birmingham had a population of 840464 with 31 wards, compared with 1073045 in 2011, with 40 wards. This was even before the Greater Birmingham Act of 1911 and before women had the franchise. Does the electoral equality apply across each of the UK administrations? Thanks for your consideration of these matters David Treadwell Acocks Green Ward Birmingham

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Joe Walsh
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I believe that the city centre within the Middleway (A4540) should be a ward within Birmingham City Council. It is a distinct area and the council already uses it as the basis for its Big City Plan.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Mr M Walsh. Aug 2015 Dear sirs
Re: Birmingham City Council (BCC) ward review. Have your say. My Response to Birmingham
City Council ward review. To reduce number of councillors is...... As you may be aware from Sir
Albert Bore, (leader of BCC) Sutton Coldfield constituency has been successful in becoming a
Town Council. Within its current constituency boundary. With this in mind, any reorganisation of
the wards would have to be within the current Sutton Coldfield constituency boundary. During
the parliamentary review of 2012, New Hall ward which is an integral part of the Sutton
Coldfield constituency gave the commission an overwhelming response of strong community
feeling of being part of Sutton Coldfield and not wishing to be moved into Erdington
constituency. The commission recognised this. And by way of a statement. Thanked the
residents of New Hall ward for showing such a community bond. And praised the true hard
work that had been done to state our case. We were delighted that the commission found in
our favour, and thanked them for the hard work you did in 2012. Even though this was never
implemented. After the vote was lost in parliament. I now ask you again. During your review of
Birmingham city council wards, to reduce the number of councillors. Please keep the whole of
New Hall ward in The constituency of Sutton Coldfield. And remove any further uncertainty our
residents have faced these past few years of being split from the community. I'm sure you will
have correspondents from the interim shadow Town Council members and other residents who
will guide you on how to keep the communities together, with in the Town we take pride and
ownership in. Thank you for your time and reading my response. Mr M Walsh.
Dear Commissioner, last night I attended the Banners Gate Neighbourhood Forum meeting to discuss and vote on the forthcoming boundary changes and the nature of the best pattern for the wards. Whilst a vote was taken it was only on the agreement of maintaining the current boundary with Sutton Coldfield and Birmingham. There was not a vote or even discussion on the best pattern of wards for Birmingham.

I bring this to the commissioner’s attention as I am sure the forum will send a submission saying that of the 100 or so that were present that they all supported and voted for the new pattern of wards. Yet this is not the case as we were voting only in support that there should be no changes to the Sutton boundary.

I query also the assertion that this was a Sutton wide ‘neighbourhood forum plan’ as I believe it has been discussed with only a select few neighbourhood forums in Sutton Coldfield and agreed by even fewer.

I noted also that the Conservative councillors for the area were present and made a point of order that their proposal was only one submission and that other proposals should also be discussed. This comment was dismissed and the Councillor told that they should have their own public meeting.

The Banners Gate Forum had asked to be allowed an extra day to respond given the date of their meeting. What was the point of this extension if they are already agreed to the proposal by some secret cabal beforehand and residents only voting on the agreement of keeping Sutton Boundaries and not on the detail of the best pattern of new wards?

There was no discussion or opportunity to present alternative views or hearing evidence. I am greatly concerned that the proposal by this forum does not reflect the interests and identities of local communities. In fact one gentleman came and asked me if this was a Labour meeting and not an open forum.

If a submission is presented from the forum stating it has 100% support from it's members, this is not accurate. There was no discussion as to how they arrived at the conclusions as to the best pattern of the new wards for Birmingham and we voted on Sutton boundary, not new wards.

In fact if we had voted on the ward pattern, having lived in Sutton for 49 years, I make little sense of the groupings that have been proposed. They in fact show little understanding of the communities and very little understanding of the distinct communities in Sutton. The proposal tries to join very disparate communities together or disenfranchise communities from each other.

I am also unclear as to some of the areas they refer to "Wamley Hall and Parkland's".

The ward changes are contentious enough without miss leading information being presented to the commissioner.
Yours sincerely

Suzanne Webb
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Claire Whitbread
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I'm happy with my ward and my councillors, I fear this a conservator political ploy in order to improve their numbers. I feel well served by my ward, although being in the city centre there is a lack of understanding that consideration needs to be given to residents when huge building projects are undertaken that drastically impact on our day to day lives.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Simon White
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I support reducing number of councillors to 100 • Town Council boundaries for Sutton Coldfield should coincide as much as possible with Constituency ones. changing wards so they overlap would cause a conflict of interest •Sutton Coldfield is a Royal Town which has its own identity and therefore if ward boundaries should not be moved beyond the borders of Sutton Coldfield •The people of Sutton Coldfield share a common identity and interests and therefore the outer boundaries of Sutton Coldfield District should not change

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
22 September 2015

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

Dear Sir,

Please find enclosed my comments and proposals for a new pattern of Oscott Ward in Birmingham.

Yours Sincerely,

Robert Wild
Proposal for new pattern of Oscott Ward, (Birmingham)  

Comments by: Robert Wild

I was born and grew up near the [redacted] and have lived in the Oscott area for most of my life (69 years). I take an active part in a number of local organisations and committees. These include the Oscott Ward Advisory Board, Oscott Residents Association, Friends of Queslett Nature Reserve and formerly the Oscott Housing Liaison Board. In addition, I am on the committee of the nearby Trehurst Community Centre and Youth Club.

I have lived for 37 years at my current address on the [redacted].

I am particularly interested in the Oscott area and in perhaps helping shape its future. Therefore, I would like to express my views to the Local Government Boundary Commission regarding the future pattern of the Oscott ward.

Currently, Oscott Ward comprises approximately 19,000 residents. It is served by three councillors who, operating as a partnership, do an excellent job and have done for a number of years. Quite frankly, I see little point in changing a situation that is working well. However, if change is deemed necessary or advisable I have some proposals to make.

I refer to the plan attached - Approximate extent of Oscott Ward in Birmingham.

Regarding boundaries.

The current boundaries are very clear, obvious and identifiable.

On the north side of the ward, the boundary is Queslett Road, a fast dual carriageway separating Birmingham from Walsall and Sandwell. To the South West the boundary is defined by the M6 motorway, separating Oscott and Perry Barr Wards, both of which form part of the Perry Barr Constituency. The eastern boundary is defined by Hawthorn Road and Kingstanding Road, a dual carriageway separating Oscott from Kingstanding ward. To the south there is College Road to the south of which lies open spaces in the form of Witton cemetery, playing fields and industrial estates but very few residents. On the north of the ward is the Bandywood estate.

Possible changes

If any changes are to be made, perhaps the Bandywood estate could be incorporated with neighbouring Kingstanding ward or form part of a new ward should Kingstanding be divided or reorganised. The natural boundary here would be Kings Road, marked on the plan, a dual carriageway linking Queslett Road with Kingstanding Road at Kingstanding circle.
I estimate that Oscott Ward after losing the Bandywood estate would net down to about 16,000 residents and could conceivably be served by two councillors. Currently, 19,000 residents served by three councillor equates to about 6,300 residents per councillor. This would rise to about 8,000 should Bandywood move. Clearly, this would increase the workload and demands on those councillors and reduce the service to residents in Oscott. Residents would be very much opposed to further splitting of the defined area.

Housing types

Oscott Ward, with the exception of Bandywood, is predominantly owner occupier and private rented with a small amount of council housing. Even of this original council housing, as is the case in my estate, has been bought by tenants and forms mainly private ownership. In addition, two new major developments (Persimmon and Taylor Wimpey) have taken place in Booths Lane and Sandy Lane that will link the Bowman Caddick estates and integrate with the rest of Oscott.

Bandywood is different in character to the rest of Oscott. It was built at about the same time in the 1930's and to the same design as the municipal Kingstanding estates. Although some housing has passed into private ownership much remains in the hands of the local authority. The argument here is that the housing is of the same type and the residents have the same needs and problems as in neighbouring Kingstanding.

This pattern of private owner occupier properties bordering municipal estates is replicated across the Oscott border on Kingstanding Road, Hawthorn Road and College Road.

Community identity

Bandywood sees itself as an identifiable community. It has a good bus service, its own shops and ease of access to Kingstanding circle and shops on Queslett Road. It has good school provision including Sundridge Road and Kingsland Road schools. Centrally positioned and dominating the estate is St. Marks Church. Leisure facilities include King George V playing fields off Cooksey Lane.

The rest of Oscott, also community orientated, has itself excellent bus services linking it to the central areas of Birmingham, adjacent wards and outlying areas in Walsall, Sandwell and Aldridge. This area is well served with excellent schools including include Cardinal Wiseman, Great Barr School and Perry Beeches schools (post 11) and Glenmead and Greenholm (Pre 11). Churches serving the area include St. Matthews on Birdbrook Road/Aldridge Road, Maryvale on Old Oscott Hill, Elim Church on Warren Farm.

There are numerous community groups many including Oscott in there names including Oscott Residents Group, Oscott Elderly Residents Group, Friends of Queslett Nature Reserve (including Booths Farm Nature Reserve). Community centres include Oscott Community Centre and the 610 Centre on Kingstanding Road. There is also the Oscott Working mens Club on Aldridge Road.

Shopping facilities are good with a large Asda supermarket on Queslett Road, a thriving traditional shopping centre along most of the length of Hawthorn Road and another on Kingstanding circle. Many smaller shopping areas are found within the ward.

Medical facilities are good with a number of doctors' and dentist surgeries. a major new medical centre recently opened in Shady Lane.
Leisure facilities, although with limited resources, comprise a number of sports playing fields including Aldridge Road recreation ground, Burford Road and Glenmead playing fields. In addition, the community looks forward to the reopening of the Sports and Leisure Centre on Aldridge Road.

Adjacent to Booths Lane and Queslett Road is the Queslett Nature Reserve used by many in the community. The Friends group has about 90% of its membership in the Oscott Area.

 Provision for the elderly and social support groups is generally good, although under resourced, in both Bandywood and in the rest of Oscott. Much of this is done through the community centres, churches and community groups.

Robert Wild  
22/09/2015