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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Pete Gale
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Frankley may be confusing, with the Frankley Parish in neighbouring Bromsgrove, Worcestershire. "New Frankley" might make more sense and would match the Birmingham parish rather than the Worcestershire parish. Although I'd prefer Longbridge West.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Emma Gallagher
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I would like to express my views about the redrawing of the boundaries specifically for the Moseley ward. Moseley is a vibrant community with a distinct identity which will be under threat if the proposed changes take place. On a simple level the proposed change is entirely nonsensical - for Moseley village to no longer constitute Moseley is absurd in itself. Moseley has a proven track record of community cohesion and community spirit. It is very unlikely that this would be retained if we were then renamed and having to deal with different councillors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Mark Page,

I am writing to object to the proposed new ward changes to the boundaries within Birmingham, mainly Hulmeley.

Although I live under Sparkhill South 310, I am under B13 post code.

The amended boundary runs right through the centre dividing it into two constituencies effectively. As a long-term resident I would propose a more natural geopolitical border.

From Alcester Road, up Queensbridge Road, right at Reddings Road, left at Alcester Road, then either left at Salisbury Road, turning right up Park Hill or right at Salisbury Road and following the Alcester Road up towards Balsall Heath.

My main objection is omitting the centre of Hulmeley by not following the main Alcester road and the obsolete boundary of the railway track.

This divides Hulmeley.

Yours sincerely,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: stewart gardner
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The names of the Yardley and Stechford draft proposed Wards are misleading and confuse to the area they cover. Stechford East is more Yardley west, Stechford West is more Yardley East. Yardley East should be South Yardley and Yardley West should be named Hay Mills

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
The proposed new Moseley ward does not actually include the village of Moseley, and it should do. The parish church, the main shopping area (including the Post Office and the farmers market) and Moseley Park & Pool form the centre of Moseley as actually used by local residents and experienced by visitors to major events such as the Mostly Jazz and Moseley Folk festivals. Lots of local organisations active in improving quality of life for the area are centred around this area too - The Moseley Forum, The Moseley Community Development Trust, The Moseley Society and Moseley in Bloom. It makes no sense for our democratic representation at city level to split the village centre off from the ward it gives its name to. As it stands, our councillors - of whatever political party, this has changed considerably during my time in Moseley - have worked very effectively with community organisations, with the area's clear sense of identity and strong local networks enabling strong grass-roots activism to work together with elected representatives. The proposed boundaries will weaken these currently strong democratic processes. Please keep the village of Moseley in the ward of Moseley.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Claire Garrity
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:
For goodness sake. Under this proposal you have Moseley Village, the clue is in the name, in the Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Ward?! Moseley Village, Moseley Park and Pool, the Moseley Farmer's Market, the Moseley Arts Market, the Moseley Festivals...you didn't think that all this suggested that there is a very strong community identity that you are proposing to hack out? Absolutely outrageous with no consideration given to the strong local identity that exists here and that people are proud of. RETHINK!!

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Timothy Gascoigne
E-mail: [black]
Postcode: [black]
Organisation Name: Tim Gascoigne

Comment text:

Yardley church is outside of the Yardley wards. This can not happen it is the reason we have are name. Perhaps Stechford East could be renamed Yardley North? Or otherwise named to maintain its status are part of Yardley.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

I wish to OPPOSE the changing of North Edgbaston to Summerfield, under the proposals. Firstly, the area has always been formally and informally known as Edgbaston. Very rarely it is referred to as North Edgbaston even. Secondly, people living and working in North Edgbaston face towards the main Edgbaston area, even though the area is divided by the Hagley Road. Thirdly, Summerfield does not exist as an area, it is a park. Calling the area Summerfield would cause confusion not only amongst individuals but with business and government organisations, possibly preventing investment in the area. Fourthly, there is Edgbaston Reservoir and Edgbaston Rowing Club (established in 1870) which would be in the new area of Summerfield, which would cause more confusion. These proposals fly in the face of the history, tradition and strong philosophy of community that exist in the area. The proposals should be scrapped.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: David Gaussen
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I live in [Redacted] and I welcome the proposal of the new Summerfield Ward and feel it would fit in well with my locality, the people I know and see around me. At present I am in Soho ward, but feel I have practically no connection with that area of Birmingham. I think the proposal for the new Ladywood ward makes sense too as this is a more central part of Birmingham. David Gaussen

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Katherine Gauton
E-mail: XXXXXXXXXX
Postcode: XXXXXX

Organisation Name: XXXXXX

Feature Annotations

Annotation 2: The blue line is a proposed increase in the Moseley borders

Comment text:

I am really disappointed to see the proposed boundaries for Moseley. It looks like a lack of thought and care has gone into creating these boundaries and the impact on the local communities has not been considered. To cut out Moseley village centre which includes the church, farmers market, central square, park, hospital and many other iconic pieces that represent the village is totally ridiculous. Moseley was the best urban place to live in the UK a couple of years ago and that was not through a few roads of houses but rather through the building of community around the central village square. As one of the most desirable places to live in Birmingham and the country for young professionals and families these boundary changes will effect Moseley in a negative way, and thus have negative knock on effects with the rest of Birmingham. I know that this decision to cut out Moseley village centre from the Moseley constituency will have a huge negative impact on the local community, businesses as well as the wider community and businesses. This has to be rethought not just from a narrow minded political perspective but from a holistic perspective that will benefit both the community and city.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Sandie Gay  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**  

**Comment text:**

I don't think the proposed joining of JQ to Winson Green makes sense. They are 2 very different areas with different needs. Birmingham will lose a valuable asset of tourism as the JQ will become invisible - many people come to Birmingham to visit the JQ specifically. It will also be detrimental to the value of the properties in the JQ which doesn't seem fair given residents' investment.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission, I would 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 my area. I 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. The draft proposals appear to obliterate the heart of Erdington, including removal of the historic Abbey and the district's railway station into neighbouring Stockland Green. Please consider the alternatives being proposed by NBCT.

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Elizabeth Gibbons
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: 
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Kingstanding
Annotation 2: Oscott

Comment text:

Drawing the Kingstanding and Oscott wards in this way gives a much better reflection of the communities. It adds those parts of the old Oscott ward which call themselves Kingstanding to the Kingstanding Ward, and leaves the Bandywood estate in Oscott. Bandywood has a much clearer link with Oscott, which it has always been a part of, unlike with Kingstanding.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Raymond Gibbins
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Kingstanding
Annotation 2: Oscott

Comment text:
The drawing of these two wards this way gives a better reflection of the two communities of Oscott and Kingstanding. Some parts of Oscott always call themselves Kingstanding and so it makes sense for them to be added to this ward. The Bandywood estate has always considered itself to be part of Oscott and not Kingstanding.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Matthew Gibson
Email: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Line for Edgbaston/Summerfield boarder

Comment text:
The line cutting Edgbaston from Summerfield seems to be very arbitrary. It splits roads and even neighbours into different wards. This will be very bad for the area. We have a neighbourhood watch area which has had to be very active in the past due to the prostitutes. The community has had to come together to keep the streets safe. This meant mobilising the local politicians and police force who helped out. It really helped having 2 set of politicians to get involved. Having more than that would make it much harder and would increase the risk of us not being able to do things as quickly or efficiently when they come back - which they do every now and again. Furthermore, we are neighbours and we experience the same issues. We will therefore need to speak to the same people about the issues. Splitting us up means it makes it more difficult to get things done, there will be less coordination, our area will suffer as a result and it will deteriorate.

For example, the church at the end of St Augustine's road is the central part of this small community and we all work together to help keep it safe and clean. This line breaks this up and again we would need to contact 2 different sets of politicians to get anything done/support. The line I have proposed runs along Portland road and then down Gillett Road. This is a natural division of our area. On one side people go towards Harborne and the other people go to Winson Green. It is a naturally occurring boundary, in part because it is a very busy road and so it breaks the community up. Furthermore, we have had a lot of breaks put in. For example, the end of Holly Road is blocked off. We had it blocked off to stop the prostitutes and curb crawlers in the 1990s. This has made a natural end to the constituency and people feel they belong to Edgbaston as a result. It makes one side calm and safe while the other less so. People see a difference between where I have drawn the line and the other side as within the line it is a contained community, identified by the breaks/blocks in the road/cal-de-sacs. If you come down and walk around you will see this line makes sense to keep the communities together while providing you with the new ward you need.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Adam Gilchrist
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Isn't it a little silly moving Moseley Village and Moseley Park out of Moseley? I can't see any reason for this apart from blatant gerrymandering.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

We have now been to two well-attended community meetings in Hall Green regarding the proposed changes to the Hall Green Ward boundaries. We are appalled at the suggestion that parts of Hall Green should become part of the Tyseley Ward and strongly object to the current proposals.

Just over a hundred years ago, Hall Green evolved from a rural community to become one of the greenest suburbs of Birmingham and it is possible to trace the life of the community of Hall Green back to these early days. For example, Hall Green has the oldest Residents’ Association in the country and, under these new proposals, many of these members would be living in Tyseley.

The community is represented and served by several other organizations including Brownies, Cubs etc, the Hall Green Local History and Gardening Societies and Hall Green United Reformed Church. Very recently a new community group was establish called ‘We are B28’ which organizes events including fetes, picnics, musical evenings etc, all of which are well attended by the residents of Hall Green. With the proposed changes, we feel our established community will be split.

Under the new Boundary Commission proposals, many of Hall Green’s public amenities, used by the residents, such as Hall Green Health Centre, Hall Green Station and Hall Green School would no longer be in Hall Green but in Tyseley.

Hall Green is well known as a residential suburb of Birmingham whereas Tyseley couldn’t be more different. It is the home of many industrial/factory units, the City Council Waste and Recycling Centre and Tyseley marshalling yards.

If it were necessary, we could support the Labour Party suggested boundary alternatives.

We strongly object to the current boundary proposals and urge the Boundary Commission to leave Hall Green and its community as it has been for over one hundred years.

Yours faithfully,

Alan and Christine Giles.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jean Gilkison
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I am writing to object to the proposals for re-drawing the ward boundaries of Moseley. It is nonsensical to fragment a vibrant and successful community into what will be five different wards. It is inevitable that tensions and conflicting interests will arise, as different parts of Moseley are tugged in different directions depending on the larger priorities of each ward. This seems to be to be especially acute in the proposed assignation of Moseley Village, St Mary’s Row, St Mary’s Church, Moseley Park and Pool and Moseley Hall to the new ‘Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill’ ward. These areas of Birmingham are at a different stage of evolution from the centre of Moseley, and the inclusion of Moseley will either divert attention and resources from the needs of Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill, or will result in Moseley Village constantly having to fight to have its priorities recognised. As a long-time resident of Moseley (30 years), I wish to see the whole A435 corridor developed and improved, so I am not arguing from a position of protectionism. However, I do know that conflicting interests can waste a great deal of time and energy with little productive outcome. I realise that it could be argued that these proposals do not do away with ‘Moseley’, and that people who identify with our community will still do so even if they are in a different ward. However, that seems a specious argument, as it is tantamount to saying that local politics are unimportant. I want to be represented by one or more councillors who have the interests of my whole community at heart and understand that their role is to balance the needs of that community. I very much hope that these proposals will be reconsidered. I am aware that various community groups in Moseley are submitting a grass-roots proposal for our community, and I support these wholeheartedly.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear sirs,

We support the proposed change in boundary that you are undertaking. It has been understood that some councillors are suggesting the merger of 2 wards to create a larger area. This seems ill in its creation since the purpose is to give better service by way of 1 ward per councillor not larger area with less.

We also require you to consider increased number of councillors as 1 is still not adequate for the area as defined above.

Thank you

Azhar Gillani LLB
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Moira Gilligan
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name:  

Comment text:

I strongly object to the proposed boundary changes to the Moseley Ward. I live at [redacted] so the proposed changes mean that while I would still live in Moseley my local churches, shopping centre, and the all Moseley busesed retail and social would be in Balsall Heath. The proposed boundary lines would also exclude the Moseley conservation areas - all of these need to remain within the Moseley ward. 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. These proposed changes would add extra workload to volunteers, community groups and councillors having to liaise across different wards

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Margaret-Mary Gleeson-O'Byrne

**E-mail:** [redacted]

**Postcode:** [redacted]

**Organisation Name:** Elector in the Hall Green Area

**Comment text:**

Dear Sir or Madam I write in connection with your current proposals regarding changes in the Hall Green Constituency (B28) in County West Midlands. I wish to object most strongly to the current proposal and to express my fervent wish that the current status quo be maintained. My reasons for this are numerous but in summary: 1. Hall Green is a long established (100+ years) cohesive, vibrant, local community with innumerable community organisations binding it together – a number of which I am a member. This community "spirit" would be seriously jeopardised by the current proposals. 2. It is both inconceivable and wholly unacceptable that Hall Green residents should be asked to accept a higher ratio of electors to elected representatives than in neighbouring constituencies (Solihull for example). A significant part of the Boundary Commission’s raison d’etre is assurance of adequate, appropriate and equitable provision for representation in the country’s political life. The current changes proposed clearly fly in the face of that and thus the currently proposed changes give rise to this very valid ground for objection. 3. I already find it very difficult to access GP & Health services in Hall Green because of the number of patients using Hall Green Health. There is a podiatrist centre here yet I already find myself obliged to travel across to Woodgate Valley when Hall Green is “full”. I have lived here since 1970 so I am a person of considerable experience in these matters. I do not wish to see a further facilitation of influx (Tyseley) on these services which will impede us further. 4. None of our local Political Parties and representatives are in favour of these proposals of the Boundary Commission. That level of Political agreement is in itself a first and merits your serious consideration during your deliberations. 5. I attended a 200+ meeting about the planned changes on 29 January and I can assure you that no one there spoke in favour of your changes. That 200+ electors were present at this one event alone is a factor which cannot be overlooked. 6. There are a significant number of schools in Hall Green serving the local community and it is a community (the elderly, young parents, students etc.) who have no appetite for the proposed changes. My husband lived his early years in Hall Green in Robin Hood lane - like so many “local” people he remained here, a part of the tapestry of lives making up Hall Green. 7. I do NOT want the current B28 post code to change, I do not want to loosen the ties with the history which binds Hall Green – from Robin Hood and Sarehole Mill to the spot where J R Tolkien conceived his famous “Hobbit” – a house which is now part of an elder care community in Hall Green. There are numerous other reasons why the current proposals are unsatisfactory but I do not intend to weary myself by elaborating them all, nor burden you with an excess of issues for consideration. Thank you for your attention in this matter M M Gleeson-O’Byrne (Mrs)

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Pascoe, Mark

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews  
Sent: 09 February 2016 09:30  
To: Pascoe, Mark  
Subject: FW: Hall Green B28 - Objection To Proposed Changes

From: M M OBYRNE  
Sent: 08 February 2016 17:28  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Hall Green B28 - Objection To Proposed Changes

Dear Sir or Madam

I write in connection with your current proposals regarding changes in the Hall Green Constituency (B28) in County West Midlands.

I wish to object most strongly to the current proposal and to express my fervent wish that the current status quo be maintained.

My reasons for this are numerous but in summary:

1. Hall Green is a long established (100 +years) cohesive, vibrant, local community with innumerable community organisations binding it together – a number of which I am a member. This community “spirit” would be seriously jeopardised by the current proposals.

2. It is both inconceivable and wholly unacceptable that Hall Green residents should be asked to accept a higher ratio of electors to elected representatives than in neighbouring constituencies (Solihull for example). A significant part of the Boundary Commission’s raison d’etre is assurance of adequate, appropriate and equitable provision for representation in the country’s political life. The current changes proposed clearly fly in the face of that and thus the currently proposed changes give rise to this very valid ground for objection.

3. I already find it very difficult to access GP & Health services in Hall Green because of the number of patients using Hall Green Health. There is a podiatrist centre here yet I already find myself obliged to travel across to Woodgate Valley when Hall Green is “full”. I have lived here since [redacted] so I am a person of considerable experience in these matters. I do not wish to see a further facilitation of influx (Tyseley) on these services which will impede us further.

4. None of our local Political Parties and representatives are in favour of these proposals of the Boundary Commission. That level of Political agreement is in itself a first and merits your serious consideration during your deliberations.

5. I attended a 200+ meeting about the planned changes on 29 January and I can assure you that no one there spoke in favour of your changes. That 200+ electors were present at this one event alone is a factor which cannot be overlooked.

6. There are a significant number of schools in Hall Green serving the local community and it is a community (the elderly, young parents, students etc.) who have no appetite for the proposed changes. My husband...
lived his early years in Hall Green in Robin Hood lane - like so many “local” people he remained here, a part of the tapestry of lives making up Hall Green.

7. I do NOT want the current B28 post code to change, I do not want to loosen the ties with the history which binds Hall Green – from Robin Hood and Sarehole Mill to the spot where J R Tolkien conceived his famous “Hobbit” – a house which is now part of an elder care community in Hall Green.

There are numerous other reasons why the current proposals are unsatisfactory but I do not intend to weary myself by elaborating them all, nor burden you with an excess of issues for consideration.

Thank you for your attention in this matter

M M Gleeson-O’Byrne (Mrs)
Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed boundary changes affecting local Government in the Birmingham Hall Green area.

It is proposed that the existing Hall Green ward is split into three, with part of it going into a new Tyseley ward. At present, the various political parties represented here have a good record in working together for the benefit of Hall Green and if there are three separate one-member wards there will probably be little or no co-ordination between them.

More importantly, the older part that was once the centre of Hall Green will be renamed entirely to the new Tyseley ward. This includes the Hall Green Parade of shops, the Hall Green Secondary School and United Community Church, Hall Green railway station and I believe the Hall Green Health Centre. Will all these places have to be renamed ‘Tyseley North’ and ‘Tyseley South’ railway stations for example since we already have Tyseley?

The areas of Tyseley and Hall Green are totally different in character. A large part of the community identity, which is very strong, will be lost. It is hoped that these plans will be reconsidered because they make very little sense.

Yours faithfully,
Hi I’m Margaret goby I live in kingstanding I’m happy with my area the way it is , if it’s possible to keep it this way , lived here for over thirty years and can’t stand why it as to keep changing m goby
Dear sir/madam

I am writing on behalf of the residents living in [Redacted] having discussed with them the renaming of the ward, we would like it to be named Soho Ward after its historical heritage. The industrialist Mathew Boulton who did so much for our city lived in Soho House, which we are so proud of and is one of our many tourist attractions. The name Winson Green after the name of the local Victoria prison is not something we are so proud of.

Yours sincerely A Godridge
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: ANDREW GOFF
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Change the boundaries if you want to but don't call it Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. Who can identify as being a resident of two places? Call it Moor Green, Salisbury or Highbury Park but not Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. That's just rubbish.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mark Goodchild
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

The proposed Northfield East ward in fact covers a sizeable part of the West Heath area which historically had its northern boundary just south of where Abbeydale Road and Staple Hall Road join West Heath Road. There has been a sensible proposal to rename the Northfield East ward West Heath North. I support the proposal. West Heath is a sizeable district with a distinctive local history and should be fully recognised. Northfield too is a distinctive area but the name has been somewhat indiscriminately applied to large swathes of the surrounding area which are some distance away from the centre of Northfield and have their own historic identities.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

I write to object to the Boundary Commission proposals that the number of councillors Sutton Coldfield should be reduced to only 10. It is unfair that the average number of electors per councillor in Sutton should be so much more than the average for the rest of Birmingham, with the result that the town would be under-represented on decisions taken by the Birmingham City Council.

I recognize that this is part of an overall reduction in councillor numbers from 120 to 101, but the opportunity should also be taken to re-align representation ratios for the various wards in accordance with up to date population figures. The current proposal actually further disadvantages Sutton on a elector to councillor ratio basis,

If the number of Sutton Councillors were set at 11, this would go some way towards redressing the imbalance whilst still contributing to the overall reduction.

Yours sincerely,

Henry R Goodfellow
For the attention of the Review Officer (Birmingham)

Dear Sir

LGBCE proposed boundary changes for Birmingham – My response

I have examined your proposals in respect of the existing Moseley and Kings Heath Ward and neighbouring wards.

1. My understanding is that you are required by Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 of Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, as follows:

(3) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), in making the recommendations the Local Government Boundary Commission for England must have regard to—

(a) the need to secure that the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of members of the county council to be elected is, as nearly as possible, the same in every electoral area of the council,

(b) the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities and in particular—

(i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable, and

(ii) the desirability of not breaking local ties when fixing boundaries,

(c) the need to secure effective and convenient local government, ...

1. I believe that you have not properly considered sub-sub-paragraph (b) above, as follows:

1. Your draft proposal places part of Moseley into a new Ward Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill (2 members), part into a new Ward Sparkhill South, and part into Stirchley, leaving a one-member Moseley Ward.
2. The proposed Moseley Ward does not include Moseley Village, Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley Parish Church, Moseley Hall Hospital, Moseley Golf Club or Moseley Bog.
3. Moseley has a strong identity and people living in a wide area want live, believe that they are part of a community and are active, in Moseley.
4. I have no connection or community with Balsall Heath, within which ward you have placed my residence.
5. The inhabitants of Sparkhill South Ward have no historic identity with Sparkhill.

2. I believe that you have not properly considered sub-sub-paragraph (c) above, as follows:
   1. Existing active community bodies, such as the Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, or the Parish Church, wishing to engage with public bodies, will, under your proposals need to contact 7 Councillors as most of Moseley lies outside the proposed Ward. The Kerslake proposals prompting your work are intended to improve local government effectiveness, and your proposal will clearly not achieve this.

3. I suggest that your proposals be amended as follows:
   1. Include the southern half of Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill, extended to Dad’s Lane
   2. Extending Moseley ward south to include Springfield Road and Church Lane, including Greenfield Road and Elmfield Crescent
   3. Making Moseley the 2 member Ward, and
   4. Renaming Sparkhill South as Moseley East, with appropriate northern boundary changes.
   5. Checking with the borderline inhabitants where they want to be considered part of.

4. My suggestion will enable you to meet your legal obligations and will broadly satisfy the inhabitants of what the community of Moseley.

5. The Sunday Times in an article on 6 March 2015 proclaimed Moseley as the best place to live in Britain. Your proposals risk destroying this community and what it represents.

Yours faithfully

Brian Goodkin
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: raymond goodwin
E-mail:          
Postcode:       

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: should be called new cross ward

Comment text:

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Philip goodyere
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

To change north Edgbaston to Somerfield is a really stupid move. Please keep north Edgbaston EDGBASTON as it has been for ever.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stephen Goward
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

1. 
2: Where Edgbaston and Moseley could join
5: This to remain Edgbaston including the cricket ground
6: This to remain Moseley including park, pool and village centre

Map Features:

Annotation 1: d
Annotation 2: Where Edgbaston and Moseley could join
Annotation 3: 
Annotation 4: 
Annotation 5: This to remain Edgbaston including the cricket ground
Annotation 6: This to remain Moseley including park, pool and village centre

Comment text:

In these proposals, Moseley Park and Pool, and Moseley village and green, will no longer be in Moseley. And Moseley Road will no longer lead to Moseley. The village is the heart of Moseley, and an area of considerable importance to Birmingham and its reputation. When the Sunday Times and others cited it as the best urban area to live in the UK in 2013 they were looking at factors that included the park and village with restaurants and services. To separate these from much of the housing to the east destroys Moseley. We realise this is only on paper but it will have implications for reputations, businesses and so on. It is more serious but akin to the fact that what the rest of the country knows as Edgbaston* (i.e. the cricket ground) will no longer be in Edgbaston. It would be more sensible to have Edgbaston and Moseley with a joint border (perhaps parallel to Queenbridge Road in South), perhaps Russell Road West East and parallel with Edgbaston road in the north. For Moseley there are streets in the current proposed South East that are not fundamental to its character and could be part of King's Heath, but the adjustments can be slight because the area with the common border has two parks and a cricket ground and therefore relatively few permanent inhabitants. These revisions are overdue and welcome in general, but they ought to respect historical famous parts of Birmingham.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Seb Gordon
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Seriously... What on earth were you smoking when these boundaries were thought up?! Parts of Yardley in Stechford west?! Yardley church in Stechford east?! Do us a favour and leave it as it is.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I attended the meeting 16th Jan 2016.

My remarks focused mainly on the Bandley Change Proposals. I am writing to ensure you take note of these objections.

Scheme level in most areas over 16 acres and 9 strongly object to the split of moorland into different areas. The Proposal Bandley Change would damage what Moordlef has built up over many years.

The Proposal flies in the face of your own Policy Guidelines, and your findings when you walked the area in 2004 and agreed then, that the moorland area is split by a stream with no Proposal areas.

Your Current Proposal would dismantle a very well established community and will wreck local Caroline and local decisions by local people.

Effectively, this would mean a real Bandley that does not encompass the two moorland Conservation Areas, and would pull apart an area, with over 150 years of historical cohesion and reference.

The Partnership between Moordlef Society and moorland Councillors would be broken, and the Volunteers Paving for the Conservation Area would have a ridiculous increase in their workload.

The work of many speaks in the Moordlef Big Plan, of moorland Residencel. Bandley and the Council. Replacing in a Supplemental Planning Document would be costly.
and all the effort and voluntary
and Council officers made to support
Economic Development in the Port
of the City, would be wasted, out
of time. When we have real opportunity
to accelerate this. Particularly
in time with the reopening of
Modelo £1 million Element of HS2
Connectivity Package.

1. The Centre of Modelo must be -
 Modelo Ward.
2. Modelo Parish Church must be -
 Modelo Ward.
3. St Columb's Church must be -
 Modelo Ward.
4. Modelo Park must be in Modelo Ward.
5. Modelo Exchange must be in Modelo Ward.

I urge you to scrap proposed changes
and to consider taking account of
1, 3, 4, 5 above
and in line with the wishes of the
Community and Businesses.
and I fear some disapproval in 2004,
and all the hard work and time given,
by the Community and Councillors,
and the Planned HS2 Project.

Sincerely,

20 Jan 2016

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** EDWARD GOUGH  
**E-mail:** [Redacted]  
**Postcode:** [Redacted]  
**Organisation Name:** Glebe Farm Residents Group

**Comment text:**

I am a resident of Glebe Farm and a member of the Glebe Farm Residents Group; 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. Thanks

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Have your say

Birmingham residents: have your say on new council ward boundaries

We are asking local people and organisations to comment on our draft recommendations for new ward boundaries across Birmingham.

We have an open mind about further suggestions from local peo...

more

Consultation Map

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database rights 2013.
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:-

Alteration for the sake of it.

Leave well alone, Erdington works well as it is. Utter nonsense. Wilton Lodge Road is not really close to Wyrley Birch, how can you have the road in two different wards?

RECEIVED
29 JAN 2015
North Birmingham Community Together

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

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

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

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

leave it as it is.

Yours Sincerely,

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
As a resident of [BLANK], my wife and I object most strongly to the misguided proposal to rewrite history so we will reside in Stechford not Yardley.

Do you care so little for our 1000 year heritage (or were you not taught history?) that it can be changed on a whim. I was outraged about earlier proposals to rename the Gun Quarter as it could offend people. My Grandfather and Great Grandfather had gun-shops in Bath Street - what an insult. If “people” are offended then go elsewhere. It’s PC for the sake of PC! What is the true cost of re-signing areas of Birmingham? Will it come from the public purse again; or if you think it’s such a brilliant idea, will you pay for all the changes personally?

Change the boundaries by all means - we don’t need the number of ineffectual councillors we have already at our expense - I can’t afford them.

Leave tradition alone!

Mike Goulding
Dear Sir/Madam, I wish to register my objection to the proposed boundary changes for Moseley. I am a resident in Moseley and I have seen the area change and improve over the past 20 years. This has been due to the residents and the Moseley Society working together and it demonstrates the strong feeling of a local Moseley community working for the community and in its best interests. There is a clear and definite identity of Moseley based on its residents and its locality around the village and the high street, encompassing the surrounding streets and park. It doesn't seem as if this has been taken into account when drawing up these proposals. I wish to register my opposition to these proposed boundary changes.
Dear Sirs,

I wrote to support the proposals submitted by the vast proportion of the Hall Green population (essentially B28 post code) to retain the status quo within Hall Green. I am aware that you will have received numerous requests to do so. It seems that city wide politicians have said that we will HAVE to have this imposed because this is what Lord Kerslake wanted & your own suggestions that you were minded to support the idea of single Wards is almost a 'done deal'.

I find that deeply disturbing. I will not reiterate all the points others have so ably set out but really say the following;

1. Hall Green is a community. It has shown this by its responses. Many hundreds have attended public meetings & voiced their concerns. Their voice should be respected. And didn't Kerslake say politicians should represent well-defined local areas. Hall Green is one such.

2. It is efficient to have a large Ward with 3 cllrs. It I has worked well for a good time. People understand the system & the way that it works. Any audit of satisfaction (if empirically carried out) would support this contention.

3. The issue over parity is surely over played. Many Wards need higher ratios. Not 'one-size fits all' suits Birmingham. And certainly not Hall Green.

So you will have seen a massive response to a local petition. Emails to cllrs & public opinion firmly set against the idea of change. Opprobrium will surely be justly cast upon your deliberations if people's views are not taken into consideration.

Listen to the people of Hall Green.

The vice chair of your commission said on television that names were important. Well let us say for a start that the name of Tyseley is not appropriate for Hall Green. It should remain Hall Green. If we MUST have change let us use some imagination. Let us consider re-titling Hall Green with some verve & individuality. How about (assuming you adopt say the Labour proposals of two member wards & a one member ward) that you DO NOT CALL them just Hall Green East & West but for say the suggested Tyseley Ward name to call it Hall Green - Sarehole - which is linked to Sarehole Mill (a working Mill) widely associated with...
Hall Green for a long time & linked to JRR Tolkien. Or say Hall Green - Tolkien. This is not unusual as Sutton Coldfield already is Sutton-Four Oaks / Vesey etc. naming it Hall Green - Sarehole would give it social cachet & name recognition. And if named Tolkien would identify it widely & help to preserve the link to Hall Green's most famous son. It would have international name-recognition.

Adopting this principle would mean the naming of say other Ward(s) Hall Green - Highfield after the ancient Highfield area.

Please think creatively & with some imagination. East & West as names for Hall Green have all the resonance of the old FRG & DDR. That is surely the wrong image to foster.

Please listen & then recommend what the people want. Surely they must be paramount. Hall Green is slow to anger but in this exercise they have found this voice & know what they want.

Steve Gove-Humphries

---

On Sunday, September 27, 2015, Steve Gove-Humphries <[redacted]> wrote:

Dear sirs,

I wish to submit a few points on the present Boundary Commission examination of the City of Birmingham.

Firstly I believe that the idea that the Commission is 'minded' to consider a reduction of councillors in this city from 120 to 100 before any input by the public & others to be very troubling.

You know that cities within England of a much lesser size have much higher ratios of clrrs to residents. Even though this is the case you plough on.

This is all part of the demonisation & politicisation of the city since the most unfortunate Lord Kerslake came to this city. A man who one could almost see a parallel with the Lord Ashcroft case. A man spurned in the past by his non-appointment as City Chief Executive bides his time to exert his revenge. Shocking but considered by many within this city to be the truth.

Anyway to Hall Green. I live & have lived here for over 20 years.

I think that the changes in Hall Green have been profound & significant. The demographic of Hall Green has changed beyond anything we could contemplate. It is now more diverse & has one of the highest set of young people in any Ward of the 40 in the city. It has low crime at the moment. It has good social cohesion. It has excellent schools & a growing but articulate & independent older section of residents ( of which I am one ) & who love the character of this Ward.

We find it difficult to understand why the boundaries need change. This Ward is in the postcode ( pretty much ) of B28 & save for a few houses people know & like that identity.

At the moment we have 3 clrrs who work hard for this area. We have had in the past most excellent elected representatives ( of all parties ) who have lived , worked & represented this Ward to the best of their ability. I believe that having 3 clrrs per Ward is excellent . It allows one to have a broad mix of
representatives & allows the position that if one ( for any reason ) did not feel one of those cllrs was being properly representing your views you could speak/contact the other.

It is not the same in constituency representation where their is ( generally ) paid professional input to advance ones concerns. In fact in the city most people think Local politics affecting the " close-up & personal " more important. This especially where we have fixed Parliaments.

The idea of single Wards is fraught with problems. The 3 cllrs all contribute their 'pool' of expertise to the Ward & I think we are lucky to have such a good cohort & to have had past cllrs of the calibre of the late Michael Wilkes former Lord Mayor.

So my first plea is do not remove the multi - Cllr representation for the Ward. It is of a benefit to all within the Ward.

My next recommendation is that Hall Green Ward stay exactly as it is. It is a densely populated Ward but has a real definition. It has a neighbourhood feel. It has a local neighbourhood Forum ( WeAreB28 ) that represents the best interests of ALL of Hall Green. A bit difficult if we are carved up into small specific streets.

I have been aware that local consultation has been minimal. It is only on the last few days that cllrs have been directly consulted. The ruling Labour Group did not widely published this change & should have.

Whilst it is always arrogant to suggest one speaks for a wider brief than just oneself I can say that in conversations with residents they say they are horrified at the idea of single member Wards & the splitting up of Hall Green.

The boundaries of Hall Green are easily navigated. We have the River Cole & the Dingles as a line & then a zig zag line going to the bounded edge of the city limits. It is within that zig zag we have B28 Land - Hall Green. Of course as Hall Green is relatively young in its expansion & in terms of its inclusion within the city people identify with Hall Green & it is something that has been relatively compact & neighbourly for many many decades.

I understand that one suggestion of the Labour Party is the natural boundary of the river Cole would not be followed. We would have a small section cut off - Cole Valley Road & the Dingles area. This is frankly stupid.

The Dingles, The River Cole & Sarehole Mill have always been identified with Hall Green along with the recreation ground abutting it. Keep all of that in Hall Green please.

Also I note the Triangle of Shaftmoor Lane / Cateswell Road & one-side of Stratford Road are being sacrificed. This is a significant area. It has a large Junior / Infants school where many come from Hall Green & a church called the Hall Green United Community Church ( old Methodist Church on Reddings Lane ). Within this triangle is a green area awaiting development & an abandoned garage that cllrs are endeavouring to turn into a better public amenity. That affects all of the people in Hall Green. Gain it should stay in Hall Green. They feel & are a part of Hall Green Ward.

The Labour Plan also would mean the loss of Robin Hood School on the Pitmaston estate. This is B28. It may not be as economically thriving but is part of Hall Green. This makes for the mixtures of Hall Green. Let us not ghettoise this city any more that it is.

The Labour plan would also lose St Michael's Church on the edge of the Ward but serving many on the Pitmaston estate & engaged with Hall Green & it's people. They should not be cut free to swing & be sacrificed.
So to summarise-

1. Retain the status quo.

2. Keep multi Cllr representation in a greater Hall Green

3. Do not implement single Wards. This is a recipe for disaster & trouble. Where is the empiricism that says it will deliver better representation to the residents of Hall Green?

4. Where is the evidence we need less cllrs? Or is this just some political shibboleth that has been said & without good evidence to back it up.

5. Hall Green is a neighbourhood. It knows who it is. It has representatives bodies & organisations that identify with it.

I believe that if we are to have greater engagement we should not ruin this Ward. It gets a good turn out in local elections (above the norm). Weakening that link will further atomise those disengaged individuals to our collective loss.

I understand people can look at submissions. However I trust that all personal individual information identifying who I am will be redacted.

Yours etc,

Steve Gove-Humphries
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stella Grainger
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: None

Comment text:

Feel that the boundary of Bannersgate/ Four Oaks Sutton Park should follow the line of the railway. Otherwise any issues regarding the Park are wholly the responsibility of Four Oaks. The reason most people moved into Sutton was the Park. After this has no effect on the 'head count' per Councillor as no-one lives in the park.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sebastian Gran
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I believe that the following changes should be made to the draft proposals for Ward Boundaries in the north of Birmingham. Castle Vale My proposed Castle Vale Ward consists of the Castle Vale housing estate and the Jaguar Industrial estate opposite, the address for the factory/site is Castle Vale. This was the site of the factory where Spitfires and Lancaster aircraft were produced during the Second World War. These were tested on the Aerodrome which is now the site of the Castle Vale Housing Estate. Erdington My proposed Erdington Ward preserves the core of historic Erdington, including all of the areas covered by the proposed Erdington Residents Parking Scheme and Conservation Zone. This ward would keep community significant buildings within the Erdington Community, unlike the commissions published plan. The ward would keep Erdington Abbey, Erdington Train Station, Erdington Royal Mail depot, the old Erdington Cottages, Osborne School (former School for the Erdington Urban District Council) and the Yenton area of Erdington around Orphanage Road together in the ward. The boundaries are the border of Sutton Coldfield to the North, Court Lane to the West and to the South the traditional border with Gravelly Hill/Birches Green of Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road is used. To the East border is the border of Pye Hayes, enabling Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive to remain in Erdington. Gravelly Hill A historic community that is built up around the railway line, Gravelly Hill is bordered to the South by the Gravelly Hill interchange. From East to West across the North of the Ward. The A4040 Wood End Road/ Marsh Hill borders the ward. The only exception to this is the addition of Witton Cemetery in the West of the ward. Kingsstanding The Kingsstanding Ward brings together the community of Kingsstanding within one two member ward. The ward is bordered on the East by College Road from North to South. To the West the border is the dual carriageway Kingsstanding Road, until it breaks into a boulevard through southern Kingsstanding by the Kingsstanding pub, the Golden Hind retuning the Kingsstanding Royal Mail Sorting Office to Kingsstanding Ward. Oscott The Oscott community which comes together around the Cardinal Wiseman School is bordered to the North by the City border and Sutton Coldfield. To the West, continues the City border until it meets Southern Kingsstanding in the South. The ward then is bordered by Kingsstanding Road to the East. Perry Common Perry Common is a compact community built up around the Ring shopping area, Witton Lodge Road and the neighbouring Community Hall, home to the local Perry Common Housing Group – Witton Lodge Community Housing Association. The ward is bordered to the North by Sutton Coldfield, to the East by Court Lane, to the South by the large Witton Boating Lakes and Bleak Hill recreation ground, which is not passably by vehicle. To the West the border is the College Road. Pye Hayes Pye Hayes Community is focused on the shared shopping centre, the Norton, on the Tyburn Road/Kingsbury Road junction. Shared with Birches Green, our ward brings together the two communities into a Pye Hayes Ward which residents can connect to through its shared groups. The ward is bordered to the North by Sutton Coldfield, to the East the Jaguar Factory and to the South by the A4040 large dual carriageway, Bromford Lane. The Western border is Kingsbury Road and then the historic border with the parish of Erdington. Stockland Green The Stockland Green Community is built up around the Witton Boating Lakes. The Community is close knit and is bordered to the south by the A4040, Marsh Hill border with Gravelly Hill, to the North by the Lakes and recreation ground, to the East the border is Summer Road and to the West the North Birmingham Academy Playing Fields.
Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ian Grant
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Tax-payer & voter

Comment text:

The proposed Tyseley Ward should be renamed Hall Green North-west, or the proposed HG North named HG East. Hall Green is geographically, historically & administratively a unit, separate from Sparkhill & Tyseley, but more close to Springfield/Billesley. If HG is too small for 3 councillors, then a 3 way split (1 councillor each) greater HG could include geographically West towards Yardley Wood Road. The north end of "Tyseley" ie post-code B11 north of Shaftmoor Lane,can be joined to "Sparkhill",to which it is more culturally suited.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Please can we treat this as a submission.

Marcus

Dear Sir,
I am concerned about the democratic deficit, in the proposed changes to the Birmingham wards.

The lack of publication, shortness of time & advanced proposals from anonymous bureaucrats ignorant of local issues based faraway, presumably Whitehall alarms me.
I attended a meeting recently, here in Birmingham, & was impressed by the large turn-out; but also by the complete lack of power the local 3 city councillors were able to demonstrate.
I came away feeling I lived in a totalitarian state.

Sincerely

I. Grant
The boundary review was supposed to make smaller wards that reflect single communities within Birmingham. But in my part of the city, the proposals contain a number of wards that merge two quite different communities together. These two councillor wards could be easily split into single member wards that each contain a single community. Weoley and Selly Oak are two quite different areas. Weoley Castle was the prototype council estate on which 1950s council houses across the country were based. Selly Oak is an area of traditional bay windowed semis neighbouring Selly Oak Park. The two areas face in different directions with their own shopping centres. Each have their own residents associations and there is little in common between the two. Lodge Hill Cemetery forms the natural division between these two districts. Bournville and Cotteridge are two separate towns, each with a separate feel and history. Beaumont Road is the natural edge of Bournville, with the area to the south of this being Cotteridge. Selly Park and Bournbrook are also very different areas. Bournbrook is an area of Victorian terraces with a large student population and an active residents association for its permanent residents. Selly Park is more commuter suburb with larger family houses. The two areas are clearly split along Raddlebarn Road and Bournbrook Road. These three proposed wards are easily divided into two separate wards. In each of these there is a strong case to separate the different communities. Elsewhere locally, the new Quinton ward covers the Ridgeacre estate and a few roads to the east. is very much a single place. Similarly, the new Harborne ward covers an area that all "feels like" Harborne.
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs,

Ref Proposed Moseley Boundary Changes

I cannot imagine a more ill-conceived suggestion for boundary changes in Moseley than those which you are proposing.

At the stroke of a pen you are endeavouring to divide the ancient “village” of Moseley into several component parts with fractions going to Moseley, Balsall Heath, Kings Heath, Stirchley, Sparkhill, South and Cannon Hill. By doing so you will separate the parish church from the other church in the benefice (St Anne’s), the vicarage and the school. The parishioners will also be separated into several different areas. The parish will have to consult six different councillors to discuss matters relevant to church and community. We count ourselves fortunate in Moseley in having a thriving Christian community with a strong sense of identity situated in the heart of Moseley Village which under the changes will become Balsall Heath. The Church of England is not the only church to find itself with a predicament as many other faiths are represented in Moseley from Buddhists to Muslims and all are co-existing in harmony as the result of the hard work of people from all parts of our suburb.

Within Moseley there are several voluntary active, thriving community groups. I name a few of these below.
Moseley in Bloom has won many national gold awards for the beautiful maintenance of the Village centre. Moseley Society and Moseley Forum provide a platform for local people to give their views on a myriad of issues affecting us all, representing the residents to the relevant city authorities. Several people on the committee might be about to find themselves residing in another area. We have a regeneration group strongly committed to ensuring we remain a thriving centre for the future. Moseley Market will no longer be in Moseley. I could go on.

A Lottery grant has been awarded to improve the Moseley parish churchyard and make it viable for Community use after a long battle to overcome vandalism and mis-use by drunks and drug-addicts. If you have your way the church will be situated in Balsall Heath whilst those of us living in Moseley will no longer feel it belongs to us.

Not for nothing is Moseley said to be one of the best areas in the country to live. I insert a passage relating to this from the newspaper:-
Moseley village named best place to live in UK after beating Mayfair and Muswell Hill

Birmingham's famous Moseley village has been crowned the best place in the UK for city living.

The trendy district, famous for its pubs, independent shops and cultural scene, came out tops above London suburbs such as Muswell Hill, Mayfair and Blackheath in a list compiled by The Sunday Times.

The 600-year-old suburb topped the list of Britain's top 50 urban districts and comes just days after a report ranked Birmingham alongside Rome in a global index rating the quality of life for city dwellers.

Moseley was praised by judges for its "village community." The panel based its results on a number of factors including schools, crime rates, house prices and transport links, as well as "the expertise and knowledge of Sunday Times writers."

We are proud of our suburb but the pride has not come without considerable work on the part of the many residents who engage on a voluntary basis to achieve the accolade. If you were to ask any of us if we would prefer to live elsewhere in the city (i.e. one of the other areas you are proposing we become part of) I am sure your would get your answer, a resounding No. You would have been able to see this at a recent meeting to discuss the Boundary Commission proposals where, in a large local hall, there was standing room only and for once even all those with opposed strong political persuasions were unanimous in agreeing that these proposals are (I repeat) ill-conceived. They are wrong.

Why destroy by fragmentation, a community which is a model for others to strive to emulate?

Yours faithfully,
To The Review Officer —

Do not cast us out. Very popular — highly desirable place to live — Mosley Village.

The place known as "Mosley Village" has been on the map for centuries —

LEAVE WELL ALONE.

PLEASE,

Signing off — very angry and upset.

(Mrs.)
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Polly Green  
**E-mail:** [redacted]  
**Postcode:** [redacted]  
**Organisation Name:** [redacted]  

**Comment text:**

I am a Boldmere resident and I am concerned that the proposed boundary change now excludes Boldmere Gate end of the park. Sutton Park is such an important part of Boldmere, in so many ways, and I really hope that it can be included back within Boldmeres boundary.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
From: PATRICA GREEN
Sent: 08 February 2016 13:00
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: proposed ward changes.

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

Name...............Richard Green

Address.......
Dear Sirs

i wish to object to the splitting of Moseley and also to suggest that with the future need for more economical running of national and local government it would be better to combine Kings heath, Moseley, Cannon Hill, Balsall Heath and Moseley Rd to the Ring Road (or at least to Haden Way junction) across to the Railway which forms a natural Division. We at the Old Print Works have done a lot to bring the diverse sections of the Communities together as Mr Cameron earlier and his Communities Minister and staff found when they visited last year.

There seemed agreement from the Balsall Heath Forum to this proposal to unite the areas, when the Public Meeting was held, voiced by their Leader in response to my point to the whole meeting. What is to stop such sharing/pooling of Councillors, as recommended below from the Moseley society?  i endorse their reasons.

To summarise, please add at least part of the Moseley Rd Triangle but ring-fencing existing funds in such a way as to allow the buildings to receive their improvement funds

Yours Faithfully

Ian R Greenwood
Founder and structural engineer

"Your proposals will divide what the community thinks of as Moseley between five Wards, which will be represented by six councillors. Only one of these, the councillor for Moseley Ward, will have most of their attention on what we think of as part of Moseley, although even that person will have part of Balsall Heath, including Balsall Heath Park and the top end of
Ladypool Road, to care for

. All the other councillors will have their main

focus on other areas –

Balsall Heath, Stirchley, Kings Heath, Sparkhill South.

In our experience larger wards work better, are much more
efficient to administer, provide citizens with a choice of Councillors to
approach. We think it important that there is a choice of gender available.
From: Niki Gregory  
Sent: 19 January 2016 17:07  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Cc:  
Subject: Boundary Changes Hall Green (Moseley)

The Review Officer

I am writing in strong protest regarding the boundary Commission proposals. My position is one of both a practical and emotional stance, which I am sure the majority of residents will share.

Having taken the time and energy to write this, I do hope that it will be read and given the consideration it deserves.

On a personal front, I have lived in Hall Green for 27 years. Prior to that my Grandmother lived in Ferndale Road when it was first built and my Mother and Uncle were brought up here their whole childhood. At the age of 7, my Mother and I returned from living in America to live in Hall Green and I went to Hall Green junior school. So our history is steeped in this area and it has been Hall Green for what must be well over a century.

The thought of my address changing to Tyseley is, quite frankly distressing. The implications on my insurances and above all, the value of our properties is bound to be adversely affected and no-one can guarantee that they won't be. It is a gamble that is not fair for those in their white collar pen pushing jobs to take as the implications on 1000's of people, not just in Hall Green would be huge.

Then there is Moseley. I was a Drugs Worker at Mary Street Community Drugs Team some years ago. I know well what the reputation of Balsall Heath has been and still is by comparison to Moseley. And though it may have changed some, it will still linger in most peoples' minds. Again, the prospect of someone's address moving from Moseley to Balsall Heath must have implications on insurance and house price factors and be a horrendous thought to those living in Moseley.

I was also a musician in the 90's, a big part of the Moseley scene and played at Moseley festival. I've played my part in both the Hall Green and Moseley communities. Moseley has it's own Bohemian identity with the festivals, the markets, the unique cafe's. Hall Green with it's Tolkien festivals, Sarehole Mill markets etc... What are you going to call Moseley Bog? Balsall Heath Bog!!!!?

It is like suggesting that you merge London's Camden into Holloway. Just ridiculous, distressing to peoples' peace of mind, the community, finances and the area's history and reputation.

Why reinvent the wheel? Okay, so the number of councillors needs to be reduced. But the way this is being done just demonstrates that those people re-drawing the boundaries have no real knowledge, insight, cultural or historical sensitivity about the areas or towards the folks living on the ground. Same old story.

I have rarely felt so impassioned about anything locally before, apart from trees being taken down for no reason and speed bumps not being put on roads which are lethal.

Please DO NOT CHANGE THE BORDERS OF HALL GREEN TO TYSELEY OR MOSELEY TO BALSALL HEALTH!!!!!

And please feel free to contact me.

Regards
Niki Gregory  (and on behalf of all my neighbours who don't have internet!!!)
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 faithfully,

4/2/16

Bernard Griffin
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Johanna Griffin
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

To re-draw boundaries so that an ancient landmark, Yardley Church, would be outside Yardley, is plainly a stupid idea. Yardley evolved around this church. How can you 'move' it to Stechford?! Defies common sense.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ceri Griffiths
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

It seems that established communities with an affiliation to the name of their 'village' are being split up and the identity of those areas will be lost. Many of the places that currently have a recognised heart will be fragmented. For example, Moseley, where I live, will be split between five wards; the active societies which have grown up over many years and which generate a lot of care for and organisation of the area will be splintered. It would be better to keep thriving centres intact.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Kara Griffiths
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

As a resident of Moseley village itself, the proposals defy common sense. Moseley is a major draw for Birmingham - there have been numerous accolades and national press mentions of it as a draw for people from elsewhere in the country. This, together with the high number of professional people who move here, perhaps after a spell at University and living elsewhere in the city, means that Moseley is an importer of skilled and professional talent. To remove Moseley village - the part of Moseley which has the most attractions for this group - from Moseley ward, means that people will be confused about what area constitutes what, but, more crucially, that the hub of the area will be governed by a different representative to the rest of Moseley. The remainder of Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill is very different from Moseley Village and it will be impossible for Councillors to adequately represent the needs of both areas without compromising what one needs. Moseley is a historic village, and needs to be recognised as part of the area of which it is, without doubt, a crucial part. The nature of the village centre, with a prevalence of independent shops and outlets needs to be maintained among a sea of suburbs which all resemble each other. This can only be done by elected representatives representing the entirety of Moseley, with an overview of the needs of the complete area.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hi,

Re: Sutton Coldfield

I have just heard that the plan is to reduce the number of Councillors down from 11 to 10 in what is already a busy and growing constituency, I strongly believe that this is unfair and the wrong decision and that the area will suffer as a consequence.

Please can you respond with your reasoning to this proposal?

Regards,

Nigel Griffiths

Sent from my iPad
From: Terry Grimley
Sent: 29 January 2016 13:55
To: reviews <reviews@lgbc.org.uk>
Subject: Proposed reorganisation of ward boundaries in Moseley, Birmingham

January 29 2016

Re: Proposed reorganisation of ward boundaries in Moseley, Birmingham

As a resident of Moseley for the last 30 years, I am writing to protest in the strongest possible terms against the proposed changes to its ward boundaries.

I am not putting forward alternative changes because I know carefully considered proposals were submitted at an earlier stage by community groups which the Boundary Commission has inexplicably chosen to ignore. I call upon the commission to revisit these proposals from people who know the area well and have its interests at heart, and to act upon them.

I note that on your website you list three main considerations in conducting an electoral review, of which the second and third are “to reflect community identity” and “provide for effective and convenient local government”.

It appears that this particular review has ignored the second criterion entirely and failed to meet the third, since there is abundant anecdotal evidence, based on past experience of working with less than ideal ward boundaries, to suggest that these changes will make local government clumsier and more complicated. Only the first consideration, equalising the number of voters per ward, appears to have been addressed.

Moseley as a village is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Although long engulfed by the city suburbs, its centre is still universally known as Moseley Village and is still recognisable as one. This is the living heart of one of the most characterful urban communities in the UK: it is unthinkable that it should be excluded from the Moseley Ward.

I would ask the Boundary Commission to return to the drawing board and ensure that the community identity of this special place is preserved for future generations.

Attached below is a copy of a letter I have already sent to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

 yours sincerely,

Terry Grimley
The Right Hon Greg Clark  
Secretary of State,  
Department for Communities & Local Government  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

January 18 2018

Dear Mr Clark,

Re: Proposed reorganisation of ward boundaries in Moseley, Birmingham

I am a freelance journalist who was arts editor of the Birmingham Post from 1979 to 2009 and also the author of the official history of Birmingham’s internationally acclaimed concert hall, Symphony Hall, published in 2014. I have been a resident of Moseley since 1983.

I am writing to you to register my astonishment at, and opposition to, proposals from the Boundary Commission for reorganisation of ward boundaries in Birmingham. In the first place, I am opposed to the reorganisation as a whole, which I believe is an irrelevance to resolving the undoubted problems of governance in the city.

But in particular I am opposed to the proposals as they affect the boundaries of Moseley. Completely disregarding the carefully considered proposals put forward by local residents groups, these are so bizarre and perverse that they might have been drawn up by Lewis Carroll.

For example, if they are implemented:

1. Moseley Park will be in “Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill”.

2. Balsall Heath Park will be in Moseley.
3. The centre of Moseley, universally known as “Moseley Village” - because it still looks like a village, with its green and its late 15th century church - will no longer be in Moseley.

4. For decades there has been talk of reopening Moseley railway station, which opened in 1840 and closed in 1941. This finally seems likely to happen in the next few years as part of a package of Government-funded transport improvements linked to HS2. But by the time the station reopens, it will no longer be in Moseley!

When we moved here 40 years ago it was an area with many symptoms of decay. Many people of our generation restored neglected Victorian and Edwardian houses as family homes, and over the years we have seen the area flourish to the extent that the Sunday Telegraph named it the best place to live in urban Britain.

It has a diverse and independently-minded population which is united by a sense of pride in the area, with numerous civic engagement groups. The village centre, with its award-winning farmers’ market and Moseley in Bloom events and its increasingly nationally-recognised music festivals, is the essential heart of this community.

Moseley is a leafy inner-city suburb with one more Michelin-starred restaurant than Manchester, but it would be wrong to assume that it is a nest of middle-class NIMBYs, resistant to all change. On the contrary, it has a very mixed, dynamic and pro-active population which has seen much change and welcomes the right kind.

In a recent and generally upbeat case study of Birmingham, part of an international report on densification in growing cities, the Urban Land Institute puts the success of Moseley into a strategic, citywide context:

“Birmingham urgently needs broader focus on place-making. Its ability to attract younger professionals relies on a more vibrant street life and flourishing independent retail sector. Birmingham also needs pockets of real identity and sense of place. Some locations do possess this appeal - especially Bournville, Digbeth, Edgbaston, Four Oaks, Harborne, the Jewellery Quarter, Moseley and Sutton Coldfield. But many others do not. This is one reason why the city struggles at graduate retention, compared to some other UK cities.”

The same study talks about developing “Birmingham’s ‘city of villages’ character, which would be more capable of sustaining a mix of uses and age groups at medium and high density”.

This is a good description of the development of Moseley over the last 30 years, most of which has been led by local businesses and community organisations. In future they could find themselves having to deal with no fewer than six councillors, so ineptly have the proposed new boundaries been drawn.
It is incomprehensible to local residents that the Boundary Commission would want to ride roughshod over what has been achieved by randomly splitting the area up - particularly when one of its guiding principles is meant to be encouraging a sense of identity. Clearly this has been entirely disregarded in this case in favour of balancing electoral numbers.

I must also point out that the re-drawn boundaries will cause great difficulty for our neighbours in Balsall Heath, who have only recently produced a comprehensive area plan after several years of hard work. Balsall Heath is another area noted for its community engagement and was, I believe, an influence on David Cameron’s thinking about active communities when your party was in opposition.

I understand that as Secretary of State you have the power to put a stop to this nonsense, and I hope that you will be persuaded that this is the right course of action on this occasion.

Yours sincerely,

Terry Grimley
Dear Sir/Madam,

My wife and I have lived on [address] in Hall Green for 29 years (very happy years) and raised our family. We are members of a close community and are very passionate about Hall Green and its history. Hall Green has become one of the most desirable places to live in Birmingham, offering affordable status in what are still pleasant surroundings. The qualities of residential life and conservation issues have played a very important part in the reason why we have lived in Hall Green for so many years. Hall Green urbanisation has always been rather special, consisting of a high proportion of private housing which allowed for many green spaces left enclosed behind roads as they were constructed. The Residents Association of 1925, the first in the country, has continued to vigorously address many issues of conservation in Hall Green and the surrounding areas. One of the most attractive areas in the whole city is on the edge of Hall Green: The River Cole valley. Of course Hall Green is also linked to a number of famous names, Tony Hancock, born on my road. The world famous author J.R.R. Tolkien, author of the Hobbit and Lord of the Rings trilogy, lived near Sarehole Mill and Nigel Mansell, one of Britain's greatest racing drivers, spent most of his childhood and early adult years in Hall Green.

Tyseley, although not the thriving industrial area it once was, is still considered to be an industrial area within Birmingham, famous for companies linked to the bicycle and motorcycle manufacturing trades. Tyseley contains many Victorian buildings which housed many manual workers reflecting the heritage of the area. There is also the large incineration plant which burns rubbish and is a major recycling location. Much of Tyseley remains industrial today and includes companies such as Klaxon, SCC and Wester Pegasus Ltd. One of the local attractions is the Tyseley Locomotive Works, it has also become one of the most popular furniture retail destinations with over a dozen furniture retail outlets trading, such as the well known Cousins.

My wife and I's understanding regarding the proposed boundary changes is that areas need to reflect the closeness of their communities. It's clear that Tyseley is linked more to being an industrial area. Hall Green, with its small village (The Parade) tree lined roads, conservation areas, and variety of different residential homes is the much greener suburb. Hall Green should not, in anyway, be linked to the more industrial suburb of Tyseley in our opinion. We have been informed that if these boundary changes are implemented that Hall Green will never become known as Tyseley and the B28 postcode will never be removed. I'm afraid common sense will tell you that with boundary changes, in time, everything will change, including postcodes and ones address.
My wife and I wish to table our objections, as detailed above, for the proposed boundary changes to Hall Green. We feel that Hall Green should remain the same or at the worst scenario become Hall Green North and Hall Green South. Should the proposed changes be approved, my wife and I have decided to relocate completely out of the City of Birmingham. We are of the opinion the proposed changes will devalue our property and destroy the Hall Green community.

Regards

Mr & Mrs R. M. Groves
Dear Sir/Madam

This e-mail is to register both our deep resentment to changes in our boundary of our Yardley, Birmingham ward.
We have both lived in this historic area for over 40 years and the area is known as a conservation area with St.Ediburghas Church at the centre surrounded by Yardley Old Park.
We ARE NOT IN STECHFORD EAST.
We support the campaign to save our YARDLEY name.

Fred & Jean Groves
Pascoe, Mark

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 02 February 2016 11:56
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Proposed Boundary Changes B28 to become part of Tyseley

-----Original Message-----
From: unknown
Sent: 31 January 2016 20:18
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: FW: Proposed Boundary Changes B28 to become part of Tyseley

Dear Sir/Madam,

My wife and I have lived on unknown in Hall Green for 29 years (very happy years) and raised our family. We are members of a close community and are very passionate about Hall Green and its history. Hall Green has become one of the most desirable places to live in Birmingham, offering affordable status in what are still pleasant surroundings. The qualities of residential life and conservation issues have played a very important part in the reason why we have lived in Hall Green for so many years. Hall Green urbanisation has always been rather special, consisting of a high proportion of private housing which allowed for many green spaces left enclosed behind roads as they were constructed. The Residents Association of 1925, the first in the country, has continued to vigorously address many issues of conservation in Hall Green and the surrounding areas. One of the most attractive areas in the whole city is on the edge of Hall Green: The River Cole valley. Of course Hall Green is also linked to a number of famous names, Tony Hancock, born on my road. The world famous author J.R.R. Tolkien, author of the Hobbit and Lord of the Rings trilogy, lived near Sarehole Mill and Nigel Mansell, one of Britain’s greatest racing drivers, spent most of his childhood and early adult years in Hall Green.

Tyseley, although not the thriving industrial area it once was, is still considered to be an industrial area within Birmingham, famous for companies linked to the bicycle and motorcycle manufacturing trades. Tyseley contains many Victorian buildings which housed many manual workers reflecting the heritage of the area. There is also the large incineration plant which burns rubbish and is a major recycling location. Much of Tyseley remains industrial today and includes companies such as Klaxon, SCC and Wester Pegasus Ltd. One of the local attractions is the Tyseley Locomotive Works, it has also become one of the most popular furniture retail destinations with over a dozen furniture retail outlets trading, such as the well known Cousins.

My wife and I’s understanding regarding the proposed boundary changes is that areas need to reflect the closeness of their communities.
It’s clear that Tyseley is linked more to being an industrial area. Hall Green, with its small village (The Parade) tree lined roads, conservation areas, and variety of different residential homes is the much greener suburb. Hall Green should not, in anyway, be linked to the more industrial suburb of Tyseley in our opinion. We have been informed that if these boundary changes are implemented that Hall Green will never become known as Tyseley and the B28 postcode will never be removed. I’m afraid common sense will tell you that with boundary changes, in time, everything will change, including postcodes and ones address.

My wife and I wish to table our objections, as detailed above, for the proposed boundary changes to Hall Green. We feel that Hall Green should remain the same or at the worst scenario become Hall Green North and Hall Green South. Should the proposed changes be approved, my wife and I have decided to relocate completely out of the City of Birmingham. We are of the opinion the proposed changes will devalue our property and destroy the Hall Green community.
Regards

Mr & Mrs R. M. Groves
-----Original Message-----
From: Katharine Gnych
Sent: 20 January 2016 12:19
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Scrapping of Yardley, Birmingham

To whom it may concern,

I have recently been informed, via a leaflet from my local councillor, that the Boundary Commission are proposing to change the ward boundaries in Birmingham. This would include the scrapping of Yardley as a ward, and instead creating the very unimaginative area of Stechford East.

Initially this looked like some kind of joke. Why would anybody be spending time and money on changing ward boundaries when there are far more important things to sort out? How on earth is this going to make a scrap of difference to the day-to-day running of my area? As far as I can see, it will not.

More to the point, I live in the historic old village of Yardley. I am right in the heart of the oldest conservation area in Birmingham. My house looks out onto Yardley Old Church, a church which is almost 1000 years old, and has the second biggest carillion in Birmingham. The area of Yardley predates the Domesday book, and was a large and influential area in the Middle Ages. All of a sudden, because the Labour council are unable to run the city effectively and efficiently, you want to change where I live. How ridiculous!

You might as, what's in a name? As Juliet says in Shakespeare's play, 'A rose by any other word would smell as sweet?' However, she was talking of Romeo. We are talking about people, properties and identities. By changing the name of where I live to Stechford East, you will essentially be affecting the potential price of my property. Stechford's prices are lower than those of Yardley. A name change WILL affect what my home is worth, and I don't suppose for one minute that you will be compensating me for that. Furthermore, you make where I live into a white elephant. Yardley Old Church, located in Stechford East is idiosyncratic at the very least. Yardley conservation area in Stechford is again ridiculous.

I know that Yardley is not the only area affected by the changes. Indeed Hall Green has got similar issues, and the idea that Edgbaston cricket ground will no longer be in Edgbaston is also ludicrous. These changes will just go to prove that once again Birmingham is disorganised and inept.

I finish with Proctor's plea in The Crucible: leave me my name!!

Thank you for considering my views. I sincerely hope that the boundary commission seriously consider the views of the residents of Birmingham before making any decisions.

Regards,

Katharine Gnych
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 of the important facilities i.e.
Erdington Royal Mail sorting office + Erdington Police station will be taken out of Erdington Ward. Also wards broken up is confusing for all residents and visitors to the area.

Yours Sincerely

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

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

The local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced 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 consider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our plans also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have unequal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

Birmingham Mail has printed a number of articles on the disgraceful proposed breaking up of North Birmingham Communities.

Some of the things the commission are proposing are, Erdington Library and Police Stations and Erdington Abbey are proposed to be out of Erdington. Graveley has been wiped off the map. Wordsley is being ripped away from it's Oscott community links.

The clearly defined Kingstanding Community is proposed to be broken while the proposed Perry Barr and area doesn't even include all of Lodge Road, but it includes part of Wyreley Road.

We urge you to please take action now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!

Birmingham Mail, Dec 2015
Dear Commission members

I have read with dismay and astonishment the proposed changes to Erdington Boundarys.

The traditional and ancient heart of the district is being divided up. To have Erdington Railway station, the Parish Church, the Roman Catholic Abbey, Osborne Rd. School, which dates from the 1800's, Erdington Police Station, The P. O. Sorting Office and the historic Cottages all removed from Erdington seems irrational and unnecessary.

I grew up in Erdington and now live in . I attended Osborne Rd. school and earned an Engineering Qualification at what was then called Erdington Technical College. I swam at the baths, as have my wife and children, and used the library. To think these local landmarks will be in separate wards is hard to believe.

Erdington was a prestigious and wealthy area as can be seen when you look at some of the houses from the turn of the last century. The land where Lyndhurst estate now sits was occupied by just 3 grand houses. Erdington deteriorated so far from what it was in the pre and immediate post war eras but is now fighting back to improve and rebuild a sense of community, it would be such a shame if this was to be destroyed, as would happen if these boundary changes take place. Erdington traditionally runs from the Yenton crossroads to Gravelly Hill and from Pype Hayes to Court Lane and this seems to be right.

Yours Faithfully       Larry and Joy Gumbley
Dear sir or madam

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

Yours faithfully

Leslie and Penny Gutteridge
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

I am writing to say I support the proposal submitted by the Balsall Heath Forum (BHF) to join Balsall Heath (BH) with Highgate rather than split BH in two. I have actually worked with the BHF on a number of occasions. Once in relation with the BH neighbourhood plan in which a considerable amount of voluntary work helped to create a stronger BH identity and once in terms of an initiative to create an informal Business Improvement District. In both cases it was much easier to work with ward councillors that were associated with a distinct BH identity rather than councillors who were more aligned with distinctly sparkbrook interests, especially as Sparkbrook has its own neighbourhood forum. Historically all the key areas you wish to remove from a BH ward into a Sparkbrook ward contain the key institutions that along with the BH Forum have resurrected BH from a drug and prostitute infested gangland area into a respectable hard working area that cooperates on multiple levels to give BH a strong civic identity. Your proposals seem to be aimed at sabotaging these time consuming efforts to promote a strong civic democracy within BH for reasons yet to be established but destructive nevertheless. Any common sense perspective that actually respects civic democracy rather than distespecting it must in the instance allow the people of Birmingham to define their own political boundaries which of course will align with their identity of place as their main sense of belonging. When is local government ever going to appreciate that things work better when authentically created from below rather than spuriously and artificially imposed from above.
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