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I am a resident of Glebe Farm and a member of the Glebe Farm Residents Group. 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 & Yardely 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
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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...

Consultation Map
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Faheem Taj
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I have seen the proposals for the Tyseley Ward and I am very happy with design of this new ward. This make life easier to try and contact one councillor for local issues and not get passed between three.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ravi Talati
E-mail:
Postcode:
Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: boundary of moseley should extend to here
Comment text:
Moseley should not be split through the middle. the boundary should extend at least to russell road and salisbury road
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Shilla Talati  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I do not think the boundaries should change as at current Moseley village actually falls under Moseley. You can't have a boundary and not involve the actual village in it. I think the boundary should cover Russell road on the left and all of mostly village on the right under Moseley and not basal heath. It should remain as it is currently.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: hamid tarren
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:
I am happy with tyseley. I live on 
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: daniel Tassa
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I wish to stay in Bartley green ward please.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Susan Tassa
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am not happy about you pushing me into wooley castle ward I was originally Harborne now Bartley Green then to be wooley castle which will lower the price of my property. Susan Tassa.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: susan tassa
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am very upset at being put into Weoley Castle Ward and if there were to be changes then why could you not put me in the Harborne ward especially as when I bought the property it was classed as Harborne Rise, Harborne and land registered as Harborne and I am also in the Parish of St Peter's Harborne. I would much prefer Harborne Ward, but am totally opposed to going into Weoley Castle Ward.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Andrew Tatman
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am writing to say that I wish to object to the proposed changes to the Edgbaston ward. My reasons for saying so are as follows: 1. I have lived in North Edgbaston for 18 years, and we have a close community in Clarendon, Vernon and Montague roads. However, I have close associations with Edgbaston south of the the Hagley Road. My children were born there, they went to nursery there, they were educated there, we have many friends there, we eat out there, we shop there and we use the gym amenities there. To put it simply, we are much more associated with Edgbaston than with Soho or Bearwood. Therefore I do not believe that the proposed electoral ward of Summerfield would reflect our local community. 2. The Edgbaston Cricket ground is an international sporting arena with the name of Edgbaston being recognised around the world. Perhaps a better name for the new ward might be North Edgbaston rather than Summerfield, as this would allow the ward rearrangement whilst retaining the Edgbaston name. This would also minimise the name changes required, and its associated cost, to places such as the Edgbaston Reservoir. 3. I do not understand why the hotels along the north of the Hagley road are being kept within the Edgbaston ward, whilst the residential properties are being moved to Summerfield. This suggests that the boundary commission does appreciate that being within the Edgbaston ward, i.e. having an Edgbaston address, does have financial benefit, and that being moved to the new ward of Summerfield may result in loss of business and financial loss. This view has been supported by two independent, Edgbaston based, estate agents who have said that to be moved from the Edgbaston ward will make residential houses more difficult to sell, and will undoubtedly result in a reduction in the value of the properties, as they know that many clients are asking for an Edgbaston address. I do not agree with the boundary commission's assertion that house prices will not be affected and there does appear to be some double standards being applied here.
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** CAROLYN TATMAN

**E-mail:** [Redacted]

**Postcode:** [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:** [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the ward boundaries. I object for the following reasons. 1. Our family have lived in Edgbaston for 19 years and are very proud of where we live. We are part of a close knit supportive community who identify strongly with the name Edgbaston utilising facilities and businesses throughout the Edgbaston area. These include Our children attend Edgbaston High School for Girls We are members of the Edgbaston Priory Club We are members of the Edgbaston Cricket Ground We attend appointments at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Our friends are in Edgbaston, we eat out in Edgbaston and we shop in Edgbaston. 2. I feel strongly that although the Boundary Commission have stated that there is no evidence to state that house prices would be effected by the changes in ward boundaries that is unlikely to be the case. I find it hard to understand why the hotels and businesses along the north side of the Hagley Rd have been left out of the proposed Summerfield Ward which suggests there would be a reduction in their value by the change. Why is this any different for residential properties? When we bought our house we looked for a house in Edgbaston, attracted to the area because of the International recognition of the area due to the Edgbaston Cricket Ground. I feel strongly that we would be significantly disadvantaged by having our ward changed to Summerfield. 3. You ask whether the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities. I do not believe the proposed Summerfield Ward would reflect the local community at all. It would be made up of a number of disparate communities with nothing at all in common, thrown together for the sake of saving money ignoring years of history, local identity and community spirit. 4. In terms of the name. If the change does have to take place I would be in favour of our area being called North Edgbaston rather than Summerfield as then the Edgbaston Reservoir could continue as it is and we would continue to identify with the rest of Edgbaston. Currently I have no connection with an area called Summerfield.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** David Taylor

**E-mail:**

**Postcode:**

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

The present Moseley & Kings Heath ward is logical as it represents community boundaries. The new proposals are non-sensical and illogical as they divide communities. The present arrangement and boundary has worked very well over the past years. The proposals mean a community having to deal with 2 lots of councillors, whose interests may be largely out of the actual community, and they may be more interested in an adjacent one. Their interests will at the least be divided - a wholly unsatisfactory situation. The new boundaries mean the names do not represent the places. The new wards may have only one councillor; this is dangerous as the new councillor might not be interested or able to deal with a problem on their own. A ward should have a minimum of 2 councillors, and be centred on the community they represent. These ill thought out proposals appear to afflict the whole city, and should be reconsidered by people who actually know the city - if indeed they are needed at all. The idea that just to cut the number of councillors by a few percent requires a wholesale redrafting of the ward boundaries is unbelievable. The whole proposal should be scrapped and if change is needed, the review should start with the way the council is run to ensure this is suitable for the city.

**Uploaded Documents:**
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Moseley (Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Ward) It appears the boundaries have been drawn up with no knowledge of the inherent needs of the area. I have lived here for over 50 years and Moseley has become a password for community. The cohesive identity, without doubt, has built this up as there is always a group or society to further this. To have just one councillor would be a very erratic way forward for the area and totally dependant on their attitudes. We have had excellent work done by the balance and joint regulating ideas of these councillors. For decades Moseley has been a breeding ground for music and literature and the media can connect to this alongside the renowned music festivals in the Moseley Park. Moseley in Bloom would be destroyed by removing key areas and also strip the village of the cleaning programmes, all hanging baskets and road displays; these are underwritten by the MIB charity instead of the rightful duties of the council to clean and maintain the village. The City of Birmingham uses Moseley as a flagship for their Britain in Bloom awards to demonstrate the partnership in floral displays and as a "cleaner, greener" route for the international judges to take through the city. My own Residents association has preserved valuable buildings, Arts and Crafts etc. road signage, street furniture and paving with the help of our joint interested councillors and backing of the Moseley Organisations. The strength and ability of our present ward is due to multiple skills of our residents. The envisaged effective and convenient government will slide backwards due to "divide and rule" and loss of the Moseley Brand of co-operating community. I trust you will take heed of all the comments and actually ASK for advice in the particular area.
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

- Many tens of hundreds of people will be completely confused by the new boundary changes, people's community neighbours will not feel part of a strong, vibrant, cohesive, neighbourhood if proposals for a breakup of existing wards, this community has been thriving for over a hundred years, & I have lived in this area for almost twenty five years in the same house.
- Many of our landmarks, such as, the local church, police station, railway etc, will be moved to different wards, that's how you will destroy communities, people will have no identity in which to associate with any more.

Yours,

Name
Address
Postcode
Email
Phone
From: Ted Taylor
Sent: 07 February 2016 15:35
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: claire.spencer@birmingham.gov.uk
Subject: Moseley ward

TWIMA, Councillor Claire Spencer

We wish to make the following representation with regards to the proposed boundaries on Moseley ward south Birmingham.

Submission to LGBC from:

Dr Edwin W. and Mrs Ann-Marie V. Taylor,

The present proposal for the boundaries of Moseley ward is far too restricted. It reduces the area to an off-centre collection of suburban streets. This ignores the historical and current social reputation of this well-known area, featured in an article in the national press just last year. A ward called “Moseley” should certainly contain the centre of Moseley village, consisting of the shopping and social facilities clustered along the Alcester Road and St Mary’s Row, plus the Parish church. This area is a vital part of the social scene in south Birmingham, known as Moseley and not Balsall Heath. It stages the annual Moseley Festival plus regular farmers markets. Ideally the ward should also include Moseley Private
Park, used by local residents and the venue for nationally recognised events such as the Moseley Folk Festival.

The proposal from the LGBC threatens to corrode the sense of community in this vital and energetic area of the city. This is reflected at present in numerous community groups, all operating under the banner heading of “Moseley”.

The decision regarding the boundaries of Moseley ward should be urgently reconsidered by the LGBC.

7th Feb 2016
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

Going back to 1920, after the First World War, Erdington began to expand with Perry Common being built, and later New Oscott being built, before the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, which was progress for Erdington, and the City of Birmingham.

After the Second World War, we had German prisoners of war building the roads of the motorway, and building of prefabs, which was guaranteed to last 10 years. It will be ludicrous, and bring confusion, for the Boundary Commission to go back in time.

Birmingham City Council motto, Bring Forward.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone number: [Redacted]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name:  Ian Teffer
E-mail:  
Postcode:  
Organisation Name:  N?A

Comment text:

I really object to the proposal to curve up Moseley and placed it into various other Wards. Moseley has always had a unique identity and is a thriving Ward centred around the shops and facilities at the centre of the village. To sub-divide the Ward would, in my opinion, be criminal.
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I strongly object to boundary changes as proposed, you can't take Erdington abbey, railway station fire station etc out of Erdington without a good reason.

Terri
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:-

It is political tinkering with established areas and yet another waste of public money which would be better used on making the city clean and safe for the people i.e. more police, fire and health service. Good grammar schools for the children etc. (and please repair the roads)

Yours Sincerely

Name: B.R. Turbot

Address: [Redacted]

Postcode: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

Phone number: [Redacted]
North Birmingham Community Together

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

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more than 31,000 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!
To whom it may concern,

I am concerned that this proposal redraws Moseley without incorporating the heart of Moseley village into the proposed Moseley ward. This seems like utter madness. St Mary's Moseley dates back to 1405, the site of Moseley Hall (now part of the hospital) dates back to the 1700s and the village centre led to much of the development of the area from Victorian times onwards. It also neglects more recent success for Moseley for example being named as the most desired urban location to live in in a Sunday Times survey in 2015. How on earth can you redraw the boundary for Moseley without incorporating the village centre? Many thanks,

Claire Terry
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** Claire Terry
- **E-mail:** (redacted)
- **Postcode:** (redacted)
- **Organisation Name:** (redacted)

**Comment text:**

To whom it may concern I strongly object to the proposed boundary changes in Birmingham and attach a letter outlining for reasons for objection.

**Uploaded Documents:**

[Download]
Dear Sir/Madam,

Proposed Boundary Changes Moseley Ward, Birmingham

I have lived in Moseley for well over a decade and I wish to make strong objections to the split of Moseley into different Wards.

In my opinion the proposed boundary would greatly harm the strong community that has built up in Moseley over many decades. The proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines.

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

The loss/losses that would affect me particularly are:

- A Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance;
- The work of many years on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in a Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the effort by volunteers and council officers, made to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening of Moseley mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package;
- The centre of Moseley must be in Moseley Ward. For this not to be the case is sheer stupidity;
- St Mary's Moseley, St Anne's Moseley and St Agnes Moseley, all Parish churches and all important in the community simply must be in Moseley Ward;
- Moseley Park must be in Moseley Ward;
- The Moseley Exchange must be in Moseley Ward.

Further I note that Moseley is not the only part of Birmingham where the proposals appear to be completely preposterous. I would strongly urge you to reconsider your proposals for the entire city. I also note that Birmingham is the only place where it is proposed that the number of Councillors is reduced – how can this be right in the UK’s second largest city?

Again I strongly urge you to reconsider your proposals because they make no sense to the local people of Moseley.

Yours faithfully,

Claire Terry
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Tetlow
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Moseley Inter Faith Forum (convenor)

Comment text:

On January 16th I attended a dynamic meeting in Moseley of 400 or so people all mightily concerned about your proposals to alter the boundaries of Moseley Ward I live at [REDACTED] on the west side of the railway which you propose will cease to be Moseley under you new plans. My work is with the different faith communities in Highgate under the name ‘the Highgate Inter Faith group’; it is also in Balsall Heath to a lesser extent and in Moseley with the ‘Moseley Inter Faith Forum. The geographical centre of the inter faith involvement of the people of the area is quite clearly Moseley village at the Moseley cross roads. This sense of the name and the identity that goes with the name is very significant to me personally; it is also to our members through this sharing of community between those of faith and also between those of faith and non-faith members and concerns. The religious and secular worlds have a very natural and hard-earned title together as ‘people of Moseley’ I have been involved in ‘community identities’ since living and working in South London as a community worker from 1967-76, teaching community work at Lancaster university for the next 5 years and then studying, living and working in Birmingham inner city/city central for nearly 35 years. All this first hand experience has given me insight into and strong support for the importance of community identity and its beneficial and essential consequences for individuals and every age group. Moseley is by repute one of the most unified and yet diverse communities in the whole country, a situation that many councils and community workers and indeed governments yearn for. (Mr Cameron’s beloved ‘social/ community cohesion’.) That is particularly so when the relatively recent multi-faith element has made Moseley even more diverse than previously and the need for models of urban unity is recognised as so significant locally, nationally and even internationally. To damage that achievement and reputation intentionally or otherwise would, to my mind, be a destructive act of great folly for everyone. Richard Tetlow Revd M.A., CQSW

Thank you for this opportunity.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sarah Teversham
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I have been a resident of Moseley for many years and the proposed boundaries changes are absolutely crazy. The Moseley shops, park and parish church not in the boundary of Moseley and Balsall Heath park to be so. How bizarre is that, and the vicar of the parish church will be in Moseley, but his church not. Moseley residents are unanimously against these ridiculous proposals. Sarah Teversham
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None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

I am writing with regards to your proposed changes for the ward of Hall Green.

We strongly object to the proposed plans to redraw the boundaries of Hall Green which mean splitting it up to become not one close community, but split to be called something else.

Hall Green is a tidy, friendly community and the Hall Green residents don’t want to be split to be encompassed in a community that we do not feel part of. Moreover reclassifying the area of Hall Green would more than likely mean a drop in the value of our houses, houses which we scrimp and scrape to buy and keep in good repair. When I bought my house, I bought it at Hall Green prices, the same house in Tyseley would have cost considerably less, but I didn’t want to live in Tyseley. With your proposals the value of my house will now be reduced, do you plan to give me back the difference in value which could be in the region of £25,000-£30,000!!! . I don’t suppose anyone would dream to split Solihull or Shirley and call them Acocks Green or Sheldon would they.

Your reasoning behind the proposal is to reduce the number of councillors needed, why not give your councillors an extra ward. Your reason doesn’t make sense as you still have the same number of constituents and the same amount of land to council.

I suggest you go back to your drawing boards and think up some better way of spending our hard earned money, starting with scratching this ridiculous idea.


**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Derek Thomas

**E-mail:**

**Postcode:**

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

Local government has one function: to serve the wishes and needs of the people of that area. Moseley Village has existed for hundreds of years. For over a hundred and fifty years it has been one of a handful of Birmingham’s ‘urban villages’ which has allowed the local community to identify with the area they live in and build up a true community spirit. Because of this a real multi-cultural and socially mixed area has thrived and from it, active local community groups have grown - winning Britain in Bloom, developing Moseley Farmers’ Market, supporting the nationally known Moseley Jazz Festival and Moseley Folk Festivals are just some of the real spin offs. Moseley Village is the centre of the Moseley community - its very heart. Roads lead to it and, more importantly, the people living in them look to it and feel a real sense of belonging. By definition, Moseley Baths, Moseley Park and Moseley Golf Club belong in Moseley. The existing boundaries were well drawn up. They closely reflect the actuality of the local community. Your proposals will destroy this sense of cohesion at a stroke. How can three councillors in three different wards looking after the needs of three new and disparate communities maintain Moseley let alone develop it? Local government is not just about equalising the number of votes in areas of a City. It is not about a bureaucrat drawing lines on a map. It is about serving the needs of a community. Moseley is not a ‘rotton borough’ or a ‘precious middle class’ area. It is an historically important area and, currently, a thriving community. Derek Thomas, Moseley resident for 30 years and retired Headteacher.

**Uploaded Documents:**
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Francis Thomas
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Simplified Altered Boundary Line

Comment text:
The proposed change to move St Augustine’s Church and it’s surrounding area out of the Edgbaston district greatly concerns me. It would make sense to slightly alter the boundary line (as drawn above) as this would ensure: 1. Continued existence of the St Augustine’s conservation area within one district (the current proposal splits it between two (see attached plan of this)); 2. Continued presence of St Augustine’s church within the district from which the majority of its churchgoers reside; 3. Simplified/more effective management of the boundary as there are clear main roads between the different districts considering a number of the properties on the north side of the Hagley road are already proposed to be included 4. Continued association with the Edgbaston identity to which the included properties and the rotton park area have historically have a strong association with.

Uploaded Documents:
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jennifer Margaret Thomas
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Moseley as it stands, with Moseley Village at its hub, is a thriving, exciting, vibrant community-led, multicultural area, with a great sense of history. It deserves to stay within its present boundaries and not be divided up as planned. Your boundary line, which goes through the centre of Moseley Village, effectively cuts this community in half. I want, wholeheartedly, to remain within the present boundary of Moseley; I have a strong feeling of belonging here. I do not wish to be turfed out to somewhere else. I chose to live in Moseley for its sense of real identity and its community spirit. There is something so special about living here (in my opinion) that cannot be found anywhere else within the boundaries of Birmingham.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Juliet Thomas
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: n/a

Comment text:

8 February 2016 Re: Objection to The Boundary Commission’s recommendations for new ward boundaries for Moseley

Having lived most of my life in Birmingham I am very disappointed to hear of The Boundary Commission’s recommendations for new ward boundaries that will completely spoil Moseley as we know it. I can see no good reason why any changes should be made to the current boundaries. Moseley for my entire lifetime - over 40 years, has always had a very unique identity in Birmingham. It is a thriving creative centre for established and emerging artisans, it has a wonderful variety of thriving small cultural and artisan businesses and mostly importantly it is a place that brings people and communities from all walks of life together to socialize and share interests at its many social establishments. I’m sure everyone that lives in Moseley are proud of the fact families and people from all walks of life and of all nationalities live side by side happily. There is no other place in the whole of Birmingham which can say they are a real epi-centre for creativity. Moseley is undeniably special, the entire ambience and atmosphere reflects the harmony which truly exists here; the people, historic buildings and places such as Moseley Park and St Mary’s Church are considered very special. If the boundary commission divide Moseley, it would undoubtedly ruin the heart and character of Moseley Village as we know it - Moseley will be gone forever. I do not feel this would be a good for Birmingham as so many, many people, mostly probably thousands and thousands find it a wonderful place to both live and visit. As a Moseley resident, I see no reason to change the boundaries of Moseley, it would damage Moseley Village as a place of outstanding character. I would like boundary to remain as they are. I hope the Boundary Commission will consider my views. J. Thomas
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: keith THOMAS

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

**Comment text:**

HAVING SEEN THE NAME CHANGES TO YARDLEY WARD TO STECHFORD EAST. I MUST POINT OUT THAT THE OLD VILLAGE OF YARDLEY IS IN THE CENTER OF THE WARD, AND HAS ST.EDBURGHA'S CHURCH THERE ALSO KNOWN AS YARDLEY OLD CHURCH. THIS AREA BY THE CHURCH IS A CONSERVATION AREA, THE OLD VILLAGE OF YARDLEY DATING BACK 1000 YEARS. BY CHANGING THE WARD NAME WE WOULD BE LOSING THE NAME YARDLEY. PLEASE CONSIDER CHANGING THE WARD NAME TO YARDLEY WARD AS MOST OF THE WARD FALLS IN THE YARDLEY NOT STECHFORD. IT WOULD BE A GREAT LOSE TO THE AREA TO IF YOU CHANGE OUR NAME. TRUST YOU WILL REVIEW YOUR PLAN. YOUR Mr K THOMAS.

**Uploaded Documents:**
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Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to express my concern about proposals to redraw the ward boundaries here, esp. the suggestion that Hall Green be known as Tyseley!

If the Kenilworth report’s intention is to reduce the number of councillors, then this is the most complicated & inefficient way of achieving it. Surely the aims could be better met with less red tape & certainly causing less anger by simply COMBINING EXISTING WARDS! and lose one of the councillors?

What is being suggested is not only destroying years of history, but causing much anger in residents who view our Ward as much more than just a line on a map.

Regd.

Thomas
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Susan Thomas
E-mail:
Postcode:

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

This concerns the proposals for Handworth Wood and Holyhead wards. First, the proposed boundaries for Handsworth Wood include a distinct and separate area in the south west which consists of the Leveretts, Austin and Raleigh estates. These are mixed estates in all senses built between the 1930s and 1990s. These are all in the B21 Handsworth postal area and have never been considered part of Handsworth Wood - we have not been successfully integrated into the concerns of the current Handsworth Wood ward, for example we are not part of Handsworth Wood residents association or its associated activities. We would be even more 'cut off' under the proposed arrangements. We would be much more properly aligned to the proposed Holyhead ward or better still a two councillor Handsworth/Holyhead ward which would correspond to 'Handsworth'. In an area such as ours with very diverse ethnicity and political traditions it would be preferable to have another two councillor ward and the Handsworth/Holyhead area lends itself to this.

Uploaded Documents:
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Alan Thompson
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1:

Comment text:

I recommend that the Quinton boundary be changed to the above with the Welsh house Farm estate be moved back into Harborne ward as the previous boundaries instructed before being changed.

Uploaded Documents:
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jeremy Thompson
E-mail: [reddacted]
Postcode: [reddacted]
Organisation Name: [reddacted]

Comment text:

I am currently part of the Weoley ward and would still be under these changes yet my postal address is in Selly Oak. Personally I don't mind which ward I'm in BUT I think there should still be a Selly Oak ward. Selly Oak has an identity and its existence should be recognised - there used to be a Parliamentary constituency called Birmingham- Selly Oak, now there isn't going to be even a ward named Selly Oak. The current parliamentary ward splits up Selly Oak into different constituencies, but the ward system could at least still recognise that Selly Oak exists. The suggested Weoley ward with 2 Councillors could be split to make a Weoley Ward and a Selly Oak ward with one councillor each. I have suggested a boundary on the map for a Selly Oak Ward.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

I am deeply concerned with regard to the proposed redrawing of Birmingham Ward Boundaries under the auspices of Local Government Boundary Commission for England. I have studied the proposals & the core aims (as stated in the Kerslake report) & the considerations/guidelines the commission must apply when making proposals. Being that changes should - reflect community interest lead to convenient & effective local government, that is a representative model of governance equality of representation should be at the core of any decisions Perhaps with regard to the proposal to to reduce the number of councillors by 19 and yet at the same time create 77 wards in place of the current 40, and that councillors would be incumbent for periods of 4 years. I would first worry that should a councillor prove be less than effective at representing their constituents a wards prosperity could be severely disadvantaged by this. I would also be concerned that if aim stated in the Kerslake report is to set up Birmingham wards in such a way that it would help the council to develop a vision for the future. It would seem that community groups city wide, such as those I am aware of in Moseley & Kings Heath. Extremely intelligent committed volunteers many with years of local knowledge & experience in business. People who have worked together with councillors to develop improvements for the areas in which they live because they care passionately about creating a sustainable vibrant hopeful future. If they say they will find it difficult or even impossible to carry on with the many wonderful socially, economically and culturally important developments that have been created & which are currently proposed. It is clear the abilities & achievements of these citizens will not be given " Equality of Representation".The Boundaries Commission has not applied the considerations that it's own guidelines demand. With regard to reflecting community interest & identity" How Moseley village can in future be in Balsall Heath is beyond me, the same I believe is the case for Erdington centre to no longer be in Erdington. Selly Oak is set to cease existence as an area of Birmingham, as is Longbridge. also the historic Jewellery Quarter (massive importance economically & culturally to Birmingham) If you ask anyone hear in Birmingham if they agree with these changes surely they would say no! Again, the Boundaries Commission has not applied the considerations that it's own guidelines demand. I would request that these changes be put on hold and be subjected to full parliamentary scrutiny as I feel these changes could be used nationwide in other cities & this concerns me deeply, Yours Sincerely, Mr John Thompson
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Maree Thompson
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

The recent report from the Boundary Commission states that three objectives underpin the process: • Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents • Reflect community identity • Provide for effective and convenient local government

We maintain that little, if any, consideration has been given to the last two points. In the Birmingham Draft Recommendations report the Boundary Commission sets out the responses received from community groups across the City setting out plans for proposed wards. A comparison of community responses and proposed wards indicates that local knowledge has been largely disregarded in modelling future wards. We feel that the Boundary Commission should produce a transparent outline of how it will engage with local communities rather than relying on a remote desktop analysis. Equally it should consider the implications of running significant public consultations over the Christmas period. Whilst we appreciate that wards balanced by population size are important, as is the total number of Councillors, we do not think these should be the primary considerations. Community identity is a crucial element of creating municipal governance in which people will actively participate. The Kerslake report highlighted many reasons why there is a perceived disconnect between municipal authority and the communities it purports to represent. The growth of an active and engaged civic society in Birmingham is a testament to how communities have sought to address the gaps where the Council has not been capable of supporting residents. We feel that it would be a great shame, and a lost opportunity, if the lasting legacy of the Kerslake report was to undermine those very communities that have previously found little support from the local authority. In principal I have no objections to reducing the number of ineffectual councillors, but do not think it necessary to re-draw wards to achieve these savings.
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The area defined on the map (attached link) represents the Bournville Village Trust Estate (BVT): https://www.bvt.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/66593_BVT_Maps_HR2.pdf The Bournville Estate is sited four miles south-west of Birmingham and covers approximately 1000 acres, 10% of which is parkland and open space. There are almost 8000 houses of mixed tenure on the Estate which is home to about 25000 people. An estimated 80% of residents are owner occupiers and each property attracts an annual management charge payable to the Trust. The charge contributes towards the cost of maintenance and development on the Estate.

The History and Ethos of Bournville – courtesy of https://www.bvt.org.uk/ George Cadbury had a deep seated social concern for the way people were forced to live in the overcrowded back streets of Birmingham. Conditions were so poor that at the end of the 19th Century life expectancy was about 40 years. George and his brother Richard had made a success of their father's chocolate business, moving from Birmingham City Centre to its present site at Bournville in 1879. The Bournville Village Trust (BVT) was created in 1900. The Trust Deed was a foresighted document, setting out the objectives of the Founder, but allowing today's Trustees effective control of the Village. George Cadbury’s vision was of a mixed community and Bournville was conceived for people from a wide range of backgrounds. Many have credited the model village with laying the foundations for the development of garden cities and introducing the benefits of open space into modern town planning. Bournville has a long history that is steeped in a reputation for high quality housing and estate management services and the Trust’s vision is to create and sustain flourishing communities where people choose to live. Building new homes and adopting a pioneering approach to the environment remain important priorities for BVT. Unlike many social landlords, that have adopted outsourcing to deliver property maintenance, BVT still invests in training and people. Today the Trust employs 12 apprentices within its property care business, with plans to continue to develop new talent in years to come. Developing young people is part of the ethos and helps to support the local economy. It’s about offering local jobs to local people which in turn helps to build and sustain communities.

The draft LGBCE proposal suggests the creation of a new ward called Allens Cross. This will incorporate the west-side of Shenley Lane / Meadow Brook Road & Spiceland Road community (all of which are part of BVT and located at its Western extremity). The community is currently part of Weoley ward and has been for at least 30 years. Residents look to BVT and the east as their natural community. The Trust is involved with community events, estate management, Neighbourhood Watch, community services and resident associations. The Trust produces regular newsletters including an Annual Review Statement and resident feedback questionnaires. There is a Shenley BVT Residents Association which is open to anyone living on the estate. The Association provides advice on a range of issues and is always looking for ideas and projects to promote and improve the local community. Our children have a choice of schools on the Bournville estate. Our nearest Church is on the Bournville estate, at Shenley Green, as are our local shops. Our Doctors’ surgery is also on Shenley Green. Many residents have lived on the estate all their working lives (and traditionally at least one member of the household was likely to have worked for Cadbury’s). The only reason for the proposed Allens Cross ward would appear to be a convenient attempt to rebalance average ward size and a neat red line drawn (on the map) down the centre of Shenley Lane. It would not appear to consider a key LGBCE requirement namely “the pattern of
wards should reflect the interests and identities of local communities*. My proposal is to utilise the long established and clearly defined BVT boundary (per the attached link) and call this the Bournville ward. In addition Ley Hill Park, as defined by Merritts Brook Lane and The Holloway, will be included in the ward. The park is key to the western end of the community, has a thriving friends group (all living on the BVT estate) and a community hall offering a wide range of activities to residents.

**Uploaded Documents:**
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Thompson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Yardley Conservation Society

Comment text:

Yardley was in existence long before Birmingham was thought of. Yardley celebrated its millennium in 1972 and was mentioned in the Domesday book. The boundary of Yardley originally reached Yardley Wood and included Hall Green and Acocks Green. The Manor of Yardley together with St Edburgha’s Church was given by King Henry VIII to Catherine of Aragon as part of his divorce settlement. Yardley is an historic community and cannot be disappeared in Stechford which I’d a completely different district. I imagine these insane boundary suggestions have been planned by somebody in London who knows nothing of the history and culture of the Birmingham districts.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Thompson
E-mail: [红acted]
Postcode: [红acted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Dear Boundary Commission. I have been to a meeting where these proposals were discussed. We were told that all the MP's from Birmingham asked the Secretary of State to halt these proposals and they were ignored. It seems that the views of people who live here have no say in how you are chopping up the city. Stechford East includes the ancient parish of Yardley which is over 1000 years old. If you are not prepared to change these boundaries then change the name of Stechford East to Yardley. Most of that area is Yardley anyway and Stechford West is mainly Stechford so call it that. The other point brought up at the meeting was the fact that most wards in Birmingham will have only one councillor. How does that work? What happens when the councillor is on holiday or off sick? The present system works well when we have three councillors so we always have access to one. Also as happens sometimes a councillor is not up to the job then the ward will have to wait the remainder of four years before they can get representation again. Have you thought of that? I know other areas of the city are very upset at losing the name they have had since inception. I look forward to your response to all these concerns. Yours faithfully. Peter Thompson, Yardley.
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The Boundary Commission.

Dear Sirs,

How much "green" is there in Wall Green?

Well, at the bottom of the road where I live, there is the Ford Green Ef (where I used to fear for my character as a kid).

The playing fields (where all sorts of kids are killed)

Then the kids Hill, home of the R. Tolkien (a working, baking unit)

Then the John Horrie and Jones walkway (a walk along the River Cole)

All part of the Shenley Country Park.

We have the Hall and we have the Green,

No name change, please!

S. A. Thompson

Vic. Apr 1986

RECEIVED
04 FEB 2018
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Steve Thompson
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

The recommendations to move the village of Moseley outside the Moseley boundaries is so stupid that it seems like an April Fool's joke. I am a resident of Moseley and I am fed up with a host of policy decisions that are against the will of the vast majority of residents. Please listen to us.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Part 1 of the area to move from Winston Green to Ladywood
Annotation 2: Part 2 of the area to move from Winston Green to Ladywood

Comment text:

I understand from these proposals that [redacted] will form part of the Winston Green Ward. The proposed boundaries appear contrary to LGBCE advice to use natural boundaries and to keep communities together. We have no connection with Winston Green. We are part of the Jewellery Quarter. Outside our property is a new canal bridge representing two rings, signifying the connection to the Jewellery Quarter. We are in sight of the original Assay Office. We are in the parish of St. Paul's - the Jewellery Quarter church. I’ve marked an area which you should consider moving from Winston Green back to Ladywood Ward/Constituency. Sorry, had to mark it in two areas but it should be just one area.
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Dear Sirs:

I (along with a great many other people) am horrified at your proposals to redraw the boundaries of Erdington Ward. These I consider to be ill‐thought‐out, as they would tear the heart out of a long‐established community and result in it being left without a centre.

No Erdington Abbey School, no Erdington railway‐station (which enjoys a train every 10 minutes both ways), no Erdington Police Station, no Erdington B23‐B24 postal delivery office, no Osborne School or Erdington Cottages – All arbitrarily torn away and dumped in Stockland Green.

And for what purpose? What is the point of this proposed redrawing of our boundaries? It is almost as though you were proposing a Westminster Ward without Big Ben, Westminster Abbey, Westminster Cathedral, the Houses of Parliament, and Westminster Bridge!

My message to you (along with many other people’s) is, Leave Erdington Ward alone and keep it together within its historic boundaries: Court Lane to the west, Sutton Coldfield to the north, Pype Hayes to the
west, and Kingsbury Road / Wood End Road / Short Heath Road to the south.

Yours sincerely,

C.C.Thornburn (Dr),

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

Dear Sir or Madam

I would like to disagree with the proposed boundary changes concerning Moseley.

I find it hard to think that Moseley Parish Church will no longer be in Moseley!! Churches Together in Moseley. No longer relevant?

Moseley Farmer’s Market will no longer be Moseley Farmer’s Market?

Moseley Park and Pool no longer in Moseley? How will this affect marketing of this area for festivals etc.
I would like to ask how it is anticipated that these will be known in the future?

Moseley Forum is a well established local group with the interests of Moseley deep at its heart. This will surely destroy the years of hard work taken to establish it. Moseley Forum campaigns on behalf of local issues, listens to the residents and achieves satisfactory results.
How does all of this affect one of the government’s key aims which as I understand it is;
“ To promote efficient local government?”

The changes put forward can only destroy decades of work by the people of Moseley and cause confusion and unhappiness for many current Moseley residents.
I would strongly urge you to use any influence that you might have to seriously re-consider what seem to a long standing Moseley resident as rather outrageous and ill thought out plans for our future.
Dear Sir / Madam

with reference to the boundary change that may be happening in my area.

I feel very strongly that this is most unfair to all the Yardley residents that "Stockford East" is the area name that you are planning to give us. Do you know how lovely the Yardley church is, and also the lovely park in Queens Rd? The conservation area is very special too, please reconsider.

I bought my home 18 months ago, and have spent a lot of money to get it
Nice as I have always liked this lovely area, the church, and the lovely park does not deserve the Stechford label. Neither do the beautiful houses in church Rd and Queens Rd.

I would appreciate if you would kindly reconsider Yardley East would be much more acceptable.

Yours Sincerely,

Eileen Thornton
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

- All my stationery, standing orders, bank account, driving license, passport etc etc etc have an Erdington address. Having lived in Erdington for over sixty years, I do not wish at my age (over seventy) to start changing all the many addresses I would have to go.

I would think if money is available to make changes for changes sake it would be better spent on the NHS, Roads, Police and a good pension etc etc etc.

Yours sincerely,

Name: [Blacked out]
Address: [Blacked out]
Postcode: [Blacked out]
Email: [Blacked out]
Phone: [Blacked out]
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Ray Tier  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]  
Organisation Name: Moseley Society

**Comment text:**

I am appalled at the Boundary Commissions proposals in respect of Moseley, which appear to have been drawn up in a totally crude and mechanical way by amalgamating polling districts, without taking any account whatever of the need to retain the integrity and cohesiveness of Moseley as one of the most thriving and active local communities in Birmingham. It is insulting that Moseley Village, the shopping centre, Moseley Hall, Moseley Park & Pool, the parish church and the village green where the award-winning Farmers' Market is held have all been excluded from the new Moseley Ward and placed in the Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Ward with which Moseley has little common interest. Moseley has a long history of active community involvement, through a number of voluntary local organisations including Moseley Forum and the Moseley Society, which have worked productively with the city council on planning issues and community affairs. This was evidenced when the Council collaborated with Moseley community groups on the production of the Moseley Strategic Plan, a blueprint for the future development of Moseley that recognised the need to retain and enhance the character of the area and the unique interests of its residents. This type of involvement will be come impossible to maintain if Moseley as we know it is split not just between two wards but also three other wards around its periphery. The Kerslake Review was supposed to reflect community identity and improve the effectiveness of local government by working with communities. In the case of Moseley it has achieved the opposite - destroyed a thriving and active community and made it far more difficult for Moseley organisations to work effectively with the city council in future. I urge the Boundary Commission to think again and revise its proposals. At the very least Moseley needs to be a two-member ward comprising the proposed one-member Moseley ward and the southern half of the proposed Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward, thereby re-uniting Moseley with its historic village centre.

**Uploaded Documents:**
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Rachel Tier  
**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** Member of the Moseley Society

**Comment text:**

Moseley Proposed Boundary Changes I do not agree with the proposed boundary changes for Moseley as they fail to recognise the community identity of the area in that they split Moseley along the main road so that the main village shopping centre, Moseley Park and Pool and Moseley Hospital are in Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. If there is to be a ward called Moseley, it is unthinkable that it should not contain the centre of Moseley. It would significantly undermine the consistent approach that residents, businesses and the Council have taken to economic development in this part of the city, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this with the proposed re-opening of the railway station. If these changes go through community groups of Moseley such as the Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Regen Group etc will have to deal with 5 different wards and 6 councillors only one of whom will have Moseley as their main focus. These groups and others organise themselves round the shared locality of Moseley to nurture and develop the place they live in and love. Nor can I see how this proposal will meet the aim of providing for effective and convenient local government. Dividing up our community between different wards will make it harder for the planning department, the people bringing in the new cycle lanes, the 20mph zones etc to consult us and for local police to continue neighbourhood policing.
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[Download]
Moseley Proposed Boundary Changes

I do not agree with the proposed boundary changes for Moseley as they fail to recognise the community identity of the area in that they split Moseley along the main road so that the main village shopping centre, Moseley Park and Pool and Moseley Hospital are in Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. If there is to be a ward called Moseley, it is unthinkable that it should not contain the centre of Moseley. It would significantly undermine the consistent approach that residents, businesses and the Council have taken to economic development in this part of the city, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this with the proposed re-opening of the railway station.

If these changes go through community groups of Moseley such as the Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Regen Group etc will have to deal with 5 different wards and 6 councillors only one of whom will have Moseley as their main focus. These groups and others organise themselves round the shared locality of Moseley to nurture and develop the place they live in and love.

Nor can I see how this proposal will meet the aim of providing for effective and convenient local government. Dividing up our community between different wards will make it harder for the planning department, the people bringing in the new cycle lanes, the 20mph zones etc to consult us and for local police to continue neighbourhood policing.
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to say how strongly opposed I am to the proposed boundary changes for Moseley.

First of all, it involves the 'centre' of an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance.

It seems ridiculous that according to the newly proposed boundary changes, Moseley Hall Hospital, Moseley shops, restaurants, churches (especially St Mary, where people have worshiped since 1400s), Moseley School and the conservation area will no longer be part of Moseley. In fact the present centre of Moseley
will no longer be part of Moseley!

Secondly, Moseley as it is, is a desirable location to have a business thanks to the Moseley Exchange co-working space giving support and flexibility for those setting up new businesses. Moseley attracts nationally recognised festivals and there are venues such as "The Palace of Wales, Tipu Sultan and Carters Restaurant which have national recognition.

As far as businesses are concerned the new boundary proposals would destroy the economic development of this part of the city that residents, businesses and the council have taken time to develop and nurture. These proposals are also happening at a time when there is a real opportunity to promote economic development with
Special reference to the HS2 connectivity package.

Finally, the community of Moseley is active and vibrant with many faiths and cultures coming together to nurture and develop the place they live in and love. Community groups include the Moseley Forum, Moseley Community Development Trust, Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Festival, Moseley Arts Market, Moseley Farmers Market. There is even a Moseley 813 Magazine available.

It does not make sense to break up such a cohesive and well-established community as Moseley. There seems to be so much to lose and so little to gain.

Yours faithfully
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Derek Timmins

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

3: Kings Norton

1: Horizontal line, retains more Kings Norton properties within Kings Norton.

2: Hawkesley

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

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Horizontal line, retains more Kings Norton properties within Kings Norton.

Annotation 2: Hawkesley

Annotation 3: Kings Norton

Comment text:

It seems absurd to have Hill Bank Road, Old Oak Road etc, which are only 200 yards from Kings Norton Green placed into Hawkesley ward, whilst properties over 2 miles away are placed within the ward. It seems far more logical to adopt a horizontal line approach, keeping properties in Kings Norton within the ward, whilst properties nearer to Hawkesley are retained in Hawkesley ward. On the surface, it appears the split of the ward is also based upon demographics which will simply lead to the wards of Kings Norton Conservative and Hawkesley Labour, there will simply be no point voting. I think the effect of the proposed changes is to simply provide a share of seats between Labour and Conservative when no-one bothers to vote, because minorities of Conservative voters have ben cast into strong socialist areas and the strong socialist area has been removed from what was, an overall Conservative ward at the last election.
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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:-

\[ WILL \ YOU \ NEVER \ LEARN \ TO \ LEAVE \ WELL \ ALONE. \]

\[ THE \ WHOLE \ IDEA \ OF \ THE \ BOUNDARY \ CHANGE \ ARE \ FARcial. \]

\[ VERY \ MONTY \ PYTHONISH. \]

Yours Since

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone Number:-
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Samantha Tinsley-Hunt
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Resident

Comment text:

I would like to submit my objection to the new proposed boundary changes for Yardley, in particular the proposal from The Meadway, by Stechford Police Station down to Harvey Road as Stechford East. People living within this area do not identify themselves as from Stechford, but Yardley. Also, Yardley Old Church, park and conservation area need to be retained with the boundary of Yardley, it doesn't make sense! I am sure those proposed under Stechford West do not agree. The Stechford boundary can be contained in one area, the northern part of the proposed West and East.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Christine Tipping
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Re: The Commission's Draft Proposals for linking Selly Park and Bournbrook in a two councillor ward. I disagree with this idea and would be in favour of a separate one-councillor ward for Selly Park (and a similar arrangement for Bournbrook). Bournbrook and Selly Park are quite different from each other in terms of housing, community groups, residents' associations, areas of conservation and commuting routes. The two areas have different needs. Under the draft proposals, I believe that Selly Park residents run the risk of losing Selly Park's identity. The problems that arise from Bournbrook's mainly transient student population and multiple occupancy housing are likely to take time and resources away from Selly Park. Selly Park residents' groups work hard to maintain the character of their locality. A Selly Park Ward with a designated Selly Park Councillor is the preferred option here.
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Zoe Titchener  
**E-mail:** [redacted]  
**Postcode:** [redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I am a resident of [redacted] in Hall Green. Our road and several main features of Hall Green are within the new proposed Tyseley ward. I feel this proposal fails to take account of the physical areas or communities that make up Hall Green. It does not seem to consider how communities use the local amenities or would identify with their local area. I understand that Hall Green itself is quite spread-out but there ought to be a way to include landmark Hall Green areas within a Hall Green ward. The are two proposed wards with the Hall Green name, North and South. Neither of these wards includes Hall Green library, station, school or the well-defined shopping area known as Hall Green parade. And yet the proposed ward of Tyseley doesn't include the Tyseley railway station or areas that I would recognise as Tyseley. I do not understand why this name would be suggested for an area that DOES include all the above Hall Green areas and landmarks plus Sarehole Mill and other historical buildings such as local churches. I don't feel that the name Tyseley has any connection with the area that it is proposed to encompass. If the ward were named something like Hall Green Cole Valley, or there were three wards called Hall Green North, Central and South there may have been less resistance to the plans. As the plans stand I do not think the Tyseley ward is one that its residents would recognise. It's not helpful in building community relations or encouraging residents to participate in local democracy, to alienate a ward by naming it with no regard to local geography. Many Hall Green residents use the amenities and assets being encompassed in the Tyseley ward. The three wards altogether are very much the Hall Green community so giving one ward such a different name does little to encourage co-operation between the areas to work for the greater good. I sincerely hope the wards can be redistributed to better reflect the Hall Green area in a way that our community would recognise.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Hi,

I am a Jewellery Quarter resident and am writing regarding the proposals that the Boundary Commission have made for Ladywood.

I support the proposals of the Boundary Commission as far as they concern Ladywood.

Some points to note that are relevant to this:

The proposed new ‘Winson Green’ Ward has definite linkages - the industrial heritage around engineering, metal- Watt, Boulton etc. Also the Metro line is a connector of the communities within the new Ward. Bus routes also provide links.

The St. Marks and the Edward St. and Parade areas should stay in the new Ladywood- the A457 and Great Charles St. Queensway boundary is a good one.

St. Marks is a council-built estate and belongs with the other Central Ladywood estates in the new Ladywood Ward.

The Edward St. area is in the Convention Quarter - within the City Centre Neighbourhood Forum area. The JQ has its own Neighbourhood Forum.

All of the current Ladywood Ward, apart from the JQ, is within the recently-formed Ladywood Community Development Trust. The JQ has its own JQ Development Trust.

Thank you.

Best, Jonathan Todd
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Nicola Toms

E-mail: [redacted]

Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

**Comment text:**

I currently live in Acocks Green but under the draft proposal I would be moving to Yardley East. This makes no sense. The residents of Francis Road, Florence Road, Cottesbrook Road and parents and children of both Cottesbrooke Infant and Junior Schools, Elmdon Road etc identify with Acocks Green much more than Yardley. We are part of Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum. I live 6 minutes walk from Acocks Green Train Station and I want to live in Acocks Green! You have placed Acocks Green Rail Station on the edge of the new ward (and although I am not arguing that it should be the centre of AG ward, the shopping village should be, but the station should at least sit well within the ward.) Wards with skinny parts, such as the proposed Yardley East, will just produce sets of roads with no identification to any name/area. I think you have also missed an opportunity to bring back the name Hay Mills which local people recognise as a certain defined area.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

I would like to point out that my family and I are strongly objecting to your proposal to put Hall Green into the Tyseley Ward. My house has been in Hall Green since it was built, almost 100 years ago. You will be taking away our local identity and ruining part of Hall Green history.

Why not move Tyseley up, into Hall Green ward, or better still move Hall Green into the Solihull Council, where they seem to manage their finances much better.

R. Tonge. (Hall Green Resident for 37 years)
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Daniel Tunks
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Yardley Village
Annotation 2: Should be Yardley too

Comment text:

Yardley Village would no longer be in Yardley according to these proposals. The area I have highlighted should also be include in Yardley East because the historic village of Yardley is right in the middle of it.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam I am writing to register my objection to the proposed boundary change affecting Hallgreen. I object on the following grounds: 1. Hallgreen has an incredibly strong sense of identity. Residents consider themselves to be part of Hall green, and not part of a family. 2. Historically Hall Green (Hawe Green) dates from the 16th century and, although the bulk of residences were built during the inter-war years, many were built around 1910 - 1920s. Recently Hall Green has undergone great demographic changes. For many years, community organisations have been working to forge good community links between the different faiths in the community and the different generations. The number of young people in the ward has grown considerably in the last ten years. Hall Green has only one council asset - Hall Green Library - but it is rich in religious community buildings and also has Highfield Hall. You will destroy what we have built for years. so please leave it alone Yours faithfully,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Val Townend
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I have lived in Hall Green for over 30 years. My children attended local playgroups and Hall Green Primary, Junior and Secondary Schools. For many years I was the editor of a local newsletter for parents of young children in Hall Green. I am a member of Hall Green Gardening Society. We have regularly attended community run activities which have been held at Sarehole Mill such as the Middle Earth Festival (so called because of the Tolkien connection) and on the green outside the Hall Green Campus of South and City College. All this shows a cohesive and vibrant local community. Under the proposed changes, many of the Hall Green community activities would come under the ward of Tyseley. One of the considerations when conducting an electoral review is that the ward should reflect the community identity. It seems frankly absurd that Sarehole Mill, Hall Green School, Hall Green station, Hall Green Parade, Hall Green Medical Centre and Hall Green United Community church (the former Methodist church) which have all been part of Hall Green for many, in some cases, hundreds of years could, under the proposed changes, become part of Tyseley. There have been two very well attended meetings regarding these proposed changes and an overwhelming majority of residents of Hall Green find them unacceptable. Another consideration is to provide for effective and convenient local government. Our three councillors work hard as a team to serve the people of Hall Green. When one is sick or on holiday, the other two take over the workload. This has worked well for many years. Therefore I would prefer to keep the status quo. However, if the Boundary Commission insists on changes, then the proposal by local councillors would be far better in terms of local community representation and I have attached a copy of the map showing this. Finally, I would stress that it is vitally important that whatever ward boundaries are eventually decided on, this core area of Hall Green should remain named Hall Green. Val Townend Hall Green

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Robert and Carol Townsend
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

We currently live in the ward of Moseley, an area of the city we moved to Five years ago. Your current proposals will place us in a new ward, Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. The main reason we moved into the area was to enjoy the culture of the area. We are currently represented by three councillors. Your current proposals divide the area we know as Moseley into numerous different wards, this will make the representation of the various groups involved in creating the moseley culture extremely difficult. These groups include Moseley Society, Moseley Community Development Trust, Moseley Festivals, Moseley Farmers market, Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley and Kings Heath U3A, Moseley Forum plus many other organisations. I do not have the ability to work out proposed new areas, but think that proposals forwarded by Moseley Society best represent the area we know as Moseley. Alternatively, would it not be better to leave well alone and not proceed with the new proposals.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
To; The Local Government Boundary Commission for England.
The Review Officer (Birmingham)

Dear LGBCE Review Office,

Thank you for the notice and details of your recommendations for the proposed new local electoral arrangements for Birmingham City council, together with the opportunity for the citizen to make comments.

It is appreciated that you have been tasked to make recommendations to parliament, following the earlier Kerslake report and its subsequent recommendations and I acknowledge the scale of the challenge that this represents.

The report covers many issues, but it is the considered need to reduce the number of councillors and the corresponding realignment of existing boundaries that will have the biggest impact on the local settled communities.

For many of these new proposals do not relate to the long-standing local community identities and the expectations of the relationships of who we are and where we live. Indeed, there is unfortunately a perceived hollowness at the heart of many of these newly constructed local government wards, which will only result in a great loss in the level of identity and association.

This will not be helped by the drastic reduction in resources to local government and civic structures that will not be available to support and promote community cohesion.

It is often difficult to over-emphasise the importance of a local identity and tradition, for these proposals, as they stand, will only add to a communities sense of dislocation and worry for the future in these difficult times. This will only lead to a further disengagement from community involvement and the lack of a feeling of localism and the loss of security which an active and inclusive community can offer in a locally defined area.

Indeed, Birmingham, like many other large conurbations, is made up of historical and distinct neighbourhoods, that are expressive of earlier village settlements. Perhaps only those with a good knowledge and interest in where they live would be able to understand and appreciate this. I would suggest that it is local communities who are best placed to advise and help identify these areas of commonality and association.

Although you look to have achieved your criterion of electoral equality, we do not appear to have reached
anywhere near reflecting the identity and interests of local communities or the balance between communities and the council in discharging their responsibilities.

Following up on your request for possible alternative suggestions, there is really only three options 1/ not to implement the changes at all, but it is very unlikely that parliament would agree to this. 2/ The existing ward of Acocks Green to have a 3 member ward, but again this is not likely as the whole premise of this exercise (wrongly I believe) is to move away from 3 member wards or look for some names that reflect community views and accepted areas. ie Yardley East should retain the name South Yardley and Yardley West as Acocks Green North and Hay Mills, but with North Acocks Green realigned with Acocks Green Central, the new Yardley West would more accurately be Hay Mills and Tyseley.

However, in an option 3/ there is a possible solution, which could work on the numbers and ease the great level of local community disquiet. It would make far more sense to make the whole of Acocks Green parallel to bordering the City boundary with Solihull, as now. Its western boundary the Fox Hollies and Stockfield Roads, the Northern boundary to revert back to its traditional boundary with the Grand Union Canal, as now and the Southern boundary to be School Road/Lakey Lane, as now. This would allow a natural relocation of the B11 Yarnfield Estate as the existing CAA electoral district with Tyseley. Also the B28 post code part of CAE electoral district, may look to be Hall Green as their natural alignment. This should allow us to have no knock-on changes elsewhere, and the new Acocks Green ward would become much more in line with its natural community boundary. It could also be close to a desired size for a 2 member ward. The remaining part of the proposed Yardley West would be more appropriately named Hay Mills.

As Yardley West stands with your proposals, it appears to be a 'left over' ward, with no centre and little to show harmony or entirety of place.

Finally, under your heading Community identity, sub heading Community Groups, we do have a long established community group in the form of Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum (www.acocks-green-neighbourhood-forum.org) which, under your proposals, would now be subject to having to engage and report to three wards, namely Acocks Green (2members), Yardley East (1member) and the additional ward of Yardley West (1member) see attached map. We have over many years built up a very healthy and engaged community spirit across the existing ward of Acocks Green and developed a high level of pride in the area of Acocks Green. Therefore, it is our wish to be able to continue with our community of people who have a common identity and values, and to share these commonalities and at the same time enjoy our differences in perspectives of gender, race, class and faith.

On a general point for correction, within a submission of the West Midlands Liberal Democrats Regional Party, under notes on new wards Page 15 ref 6.3 states that "The Stockfield Community Association was involved in the creation of Westley Millennium Green" This is incorrect, as The Stockfield Community Association was not involved within Acocks Green in creating the Westley Vale Millennium Green. This was the result of an initiative of Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum, at the run up to the Year 2000, and to celebrate the New Millennium. This is now administered by a board of Trustees. Perhaps this could be amended, where necessary.

Apologies for the somewhat lengthy letter, but there were a number of issues I thought was appropriate to share with you.

Thank you for any possible consideration of these concerns and suggestions, which may in turn reflect the preferences of the local community and the wider citizens, truly stated.

Kind regards
David Treadwell
A local resident of Acocks Green Birmingham
30th January 2016

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

Dear Sir/Madam

Boundary Commission’s Draft Recommendations: Acocks Green

I am writing in connection with the Boundary Commission’s draft recommendations for Birmingham, and I particularly object to the proposed boundary change in north Acocks Green from the Grand Union Canal to the Chiltern Railway line. I am dismayed to see that one of the oldest parts of Acocks Green (north of the railway line) has been included into the new ward of Yardley West which has no connection to the area in which I live and am actively involved.

Historically, Birmingham was made up of several urban villages. With Acocks Green being one of the oldest, it still maintains its “Village” characteristics and, particularly with the new improved Smart Route, reflects the interests and identity of the local community, with the residents totally committed to retaining that “village” ethos, character and individuality. With the new boundary to the north, Acocks Green would be separated from its Police Station, Railway Station, the Baptist Church, and Westley Vale Millennium Green, together with very active and vocal section of Acocks Green community. The proposed Conservation Area will also be split in half.

Having lived in [REDACTED] Acocks Green since 1989, my Husband and I (both now retired) are fully involved and committed to Acocks Green Village, taking an active part in many of the ward activities and supporting our local Councillors.

I am a Trustee of Westley Vale Millennium Green Trust which, officially opened in 2000 as part of the Government initiative for the Millennium celebrations, is only one of two Millennium Greens in Birmingham. This five and a half acre conservation and bio diverse site, located between The Avenue and the Grand Union Canal, has been part of the “Acocks Green Village in Bloom” route over the last four years, being awarded “Gold” by the Royal Horticultural Society in 2015. I am also a very active member of the Acocks Green Village in Bloom Team, maintaining sites through out the centre, and providing artwork where required. We work very closely with our local ward Councillors to maintain this environment. With the proposed boundary changes, the Millennium Green would no longer be part of Acocks Green Ward.
I maintain a keen interest in all aspects of Acocks Green, attending Acocks Green History Society, Arts and Media Group, and the Swansong concerts organised locally, as well as shopping on a regular basis and use of the Library and local Restaurants. I actively support many activities such as Acocks Green Carnival, Fun Days, Fox Hollies Forum events, Fox Hollies Park clear up days, and many events organised by the local Churches in the Village.

I regularly attend the Acocks Green Ward meetings, taking an active part in decision making on all aspects relating to the Ward. I am concerned that, with the boundary changes and having only one Councillor in the Yardley West Ward, will the Ward meetings continue? Will I, as a concerned Resident, still have a say in my community?

I strongly feel that the current recommendations would damage a close-knit community and threaten the work to protect and enhance a cohesive community with a strong trading centre. I note that one of the Boundary Commission’s aims is to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities. I fervently believe that, by the splitting up of Acocks Green and moving part into Yardley West, goes against this Aim.

I would like to offer an alternative suggestion for Acocks Green Ward Boundaries as follows:- (see attached map)

Grand Union Canal from Yardley Road bridge to Solihull Boundary to remain as the North boundary.
Solihull border to form the Eastern boundary as at present.
Lakey Lane linking up to the Solihull border to form the South boundary.
Fox Hollies Road and Stockfield Road, leading into Mansfield Road, to form the West boundary.
To be called “Acocks Green Ward”

Although losing the Yarnfield Estate, perhaps to Yardley West, and the Fox Crescent area perhaps to Hall Green, I understand that the numbers of residents would match the requirement for a two Councillor Ward.

I hope that you are able to review these recommendations in order to retain the close-knit and enthusiastic community which exists in Acocks Green Village.

Yours faithfully,
Veronica Treadwell (Mrs) BA (Hons) BSc (Hons)
Trustee of Westley Vale Millennium Green
FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOUNDARY COMMISSION
SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE BOUNDARY CHANGE FOR AOCKS GREEN WARD
2 COUNCILLORS WITH APPROXIMATELY 17,500 RESIDENTS/ELECTORS.

? MOVE INTO
YARDLEY WEST

? MOVE INTO
HALL GREEN EAST

AS PROPOSED BY VERONICA TREADWELL

RECEIVED
02 FEB 2016
PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE BOUNDARY CHANGE TO ACOCKS GREEN WARD
2 COUNCILLORS WITH APPROX. 17,500 ELECTORS
VERONICA TREADWELL

30TH JANUARY 2016
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Catherine Treanor  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

Please don't split distinctive, historic and cohesive Moseley - it will punish a proud, vibrant and caring community. It's where I live - I love it. Please think again.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Karen Trench
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

1) Splitting Perry Barr ward into two areas causes even more complications to the local area. Walsall Road already splits into 3 councils (Walsall/Sandwell/Birmingham) 2) Having one councillor per ward does not help the representation of individuals. If meetings are held during the day and you have a councillor who works they cannot attend these meetings and make themselves easily available for residents. The councillor role is supposed to always be a part time role so that the distance from the council is kept. Unless that person is retired or financially independent, they have to work. Having two councillors per ward allows work load to be shared. If someone is sick, on holiday, unavailable for any reason there is another councillor who knows the ward and can provide continuity. 3) One ward councillors will mean that diversity will be lost as only those with resources will be able to take on the role. Younger people, those from different socio economic backgrounds will find it difficult to work and be a one ward councillor We have a lack of diversity in politics and it will become even worse if these changes go ahead. 4) Birmingham is unique because of its size but also because of its diversity. There should have been more consultation with councillors and residents before drawing the boundaries of the wards. The reasons for the redraw is to enable better accountability, democracy and communication but his seems to be lost in this process.

Uploaded Documents:
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Emma Trevis  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]  
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

My family and I have lived in the affected part of [Redacted] for over 12 years and I strongly object to the proposed boundary changes which would move our property from the Edgbaston ward to the new Summerfield ward. 1) We have only recently been officially informed by our local councillor of the proposed changes. The official consultation process has been inadequate and provided us with insufficient information. 2) When we purchased our property we made a conscious decision to live in Edgbaston. I consider my community to be Edgbaston. I work in Edgbaston, I shop in Edgbaston, I spend my leisure time at the Edgbaston Priory Club, I eat at restaurants in Edgbaston, our friends live in all areas of Edgbaston. Our local ties and community identity are quite clearly with Edgbaston and have always been so on historical analysis. 3) Our local church is St Augustine’s and draws a congregation from all of Edgbaston, not just the roads now proposed to join the Summerfield ward. As such the proposed boundary changes would cut through that parish. 4) I understand that it is considered that there is no evidence of adverse impact on house prices. I am also aware that neighbours have provided views of local estate agents that this is unlikely to be the case. I am already aware of a situation whereby potential purchasers of a house on a North Edgbaston road affected by the proposed changes have not proceeded with the purchase on the grounds that the road might be removed from the Edgbaston ward. It is clearly the case that there is potential for house prices to be adversely affected and to suggest that they will not be and/or to dismiss this fact in its entirety is unjust when so many families have invested so heavily in the area. 5) The proposed changes would put North Edgbaston in the same ward as areas such as Winson Green and Ladywood. The residents of the proposed ward of Summerfield have few common interests. It is therefore difficult to see how the changes could result in effective representation of such a diverse group of residents. 6) I appreciate that the ward sizes need to be reasonably consistent but feel that this could be achieved in other ways. Perhaps by leaving the part of Harborne which it is proposed should join Edgbaston in Harborne? There will no doubt be other ways that numerical equality can be achieved and in any event find it hard to believe that this should be the overriding factor. 7) The proposed boundary line is not clearly identifiable. It has been arbitrarily drawn around the businesses to the north of the Hagley Road. The relevant local boundary would be more appropriately and clearly drawn around the Harborne Walkway and the banks of the Edgbaston reservoir which, of course, would also logically sit in, or at least adjacent to, Edgbaston. We would urge you to reconsider the drawing of the boundary and would be happy to be contacted to assist further.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: james trevis
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I object to the proposal for part of the Edgbaston ward to form a new ward, with other areas with which we have no connection, known as Summerfield. We have lived at the [REDACTED] end of [REDACTED] for over 12 years. We moved there because we wanted to live in Edgbaston - we had friends active in the North Edgbaston Residents Association, St Augustine’s Church, Edgbaston Golf Club, Edgbaston Priory Club and wanted to be part of that community. There has never been any distinction between our part of Edgbaston and the rest of this great suburb. I have therefore been astonished by the suggestion that we may find ourselves no longer in Edgbaston if these proposed boundary changes go through. How can this be right? By any historical or common sense analysis we live in Edgbaston. Our lives revolve around all that Edgbaston has to offer – we love our community, the active North Edgbaston Residents group which has been re-invigorated by many families like ours with young children who have moved to the area. How can a council endanger that sense of identity on a whim supposedly based on council election efficiency. If you want less councillors, then have less councillors – if that means bigger wards or less frequent rotation then so be it. I would prefer to be in a bigger ward or have less frequent rotation but that represents all Edgbaston residents (and means we are were with the same friends and neighbours with whom we form our community) rather than risk not being in Edgbaston at all. Anything else would be undemocratic. I have no affiliation with “Summerfield” and I suspect less in common with most of the residents to the north of Edgbaston Reservoir and to the west of the old railway line which form a natural border. There will no doubt be lots said in this consultation about prestige/kudos of being Edgbaston and even the impact on house prises. I will not dwell on that here save as to point out that the proposals appear to differentiate between businesses at the end of my road and that run along the north of the Hagley road and the residences that neighbour them. If this didn’t matter, how on earth has the consultation come up with that distinction? In addition, this does not form any logical boundary border which I believe is one criteria for the new wards. To my mind that northern “boundary” clearly comes as currently constituted along the edges of the “Edgbaston” Reservoir (the clue is in the description!) - anything else is totally arbitrary and discriminatory to those of us in the northern part of the Edgbaston community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Ivan Troth, where I have lived for the past 37 years. I'm afraid I can't see the logic of placing us in the Perry Hall Ward rather than Perry Beeches. Although I have never seen the A34 as a barrier, often using services on the opposite side, if I had to choose it would be to stay with the latter. Having said that I STRONGLY feel that a more natural ward would be for the two proposed wards of Perry Hall and Perry Beeches to be amalgamated. The current proposal would leave us cut off and isolated from the main part of the new ward by the A34 when it comes to developments in the area. I would urge you seriously to reconsider this proposal.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Frederick Trowman
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Since I have lived at [REDACTED] there have been two boundary changes, both of which reduced the value of my property. These proposed changed should have been announced by the Commission circulating households with official documents. This extremely flawed set of proposals seems to have attracted little publicity and it appears that this may have been done to prevent proper consultation and make this scheme fait accompli.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Antony Troy
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Dear Sirs As a resident of Hall Green in Birmingham I wish to register my objections to the draft recommendations from the Local Government Boundary Commission for the new city council ward boundaries, particularly focusing on my local ward of Hall Green. As stated on the LGBC website "the three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation and are to: • Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; • Reflect community identity; • Provide for effective and convenient local government" It is clear from the proposed alterations to Hall Green ward (as well as others across the city) that the second and third criteria have largely been ignored when determining the new ward boundaries. Under the LGBC proposals the existing three-member Hall Green council ward would be broken up into three single-member wards; Hall Green North, Hall Green South and Tyseley. As part of these proposals my home on [REDACTED] would be transferred from Hall Green into the newly created ward of "Tyseley". This proposed ward would be made up of an amalgamation of the northern part of Hall Green, the eastern portion of Springfield ward and parts of Acocks Green ward, which while this may group together an acceptable number of voters to satisfy the "equality" criteria it certainly does not reflect any recognizable community. Nor is it likely to improve the effectiveness of local government, which I believe if anything is likely to be made worse by these proposals. Hall Green is a historical entity, with the first record of "Hawe Green" dating back to 1562. The Church of the Ascension has stood for over 300 years, there has been a Hall Green School for 300 years, a station in Hall Green for over 100 years, Hall Green Parade has existed for over 100 years and Sarehole Mill dates back more than 250 years. If the ward of Tyseley is created, Hall Green will lose: • Sarehole Mill • Hall Green station, • Hall Green Parade, • Hall Green School, • South & City College: Hall Green Campus, • Hall Green Medical Centre, • Hall Green United Community church, etc. Our community was built around these institutions and historical buildings and they should be at the heart of any revised Hall Green ward. To split them off into this new ward of Tyseley would rip our community apart. For the new boundaries to have any credibility in terms of how they reflect the extent of our community these locations must be retained within Hall Green. As well as failing to respect the physical boundaries of our community I also fail to see how the proposed changes would do anything to provide more effective or convenient local government. Hall Green residents who are concerned about a particular location or institution within their community currently have a choice of three local ward councillors with which to raise their concerns. If the new LGBC boundary proposals remain unchanged there will surely be situations where residents find themselves on the 'wrong' side of a newly created ward boundary, faced with a situation where their now single elected councillor no longer has the same influence over the location in question as they did previously since it no longer forms part of his or her constituency. This will leave residents far less connected to how their community is governed or how the assets of their community are managed, even though their physical proximity to and reliance on these institutions has not changed. The other advantages of the existing larger multi-member wards are that it ensures residents almost always have access to at least one councillor, where even if one member is unavailable (i.e. due to illness or holidays) there is usually another ward councillor to cover. This is far less likely to be the case with a single-member ward. The multi-member system also allows for members of several different political
parties to be elected to office in the same ward, thereby giving residents a better chance of finding a councillor who is sympathetic to their views, more choice as to who to raise certain issues with as well as more accurately reflecting the diverse political make-up of the area. My preferred scenario would be to leave the existing ward boundaries as they are, however since this is sadly not an option I would like to lend my support to the following proposal put forward by our local Hall Green councillors: (Please see attached Hall-Green-Option-3.pdf) This would involve splitting the existing three member ward into two, thereby creating a new two-member and single-member ward respectively. I feel this option will do the most to minimise the division in the community that will be created by this boundary review, as well as ensuring that our local historical landmarks and institutions all have a place within the new Hall Green. ------

As an aside I would also like to raise a separate objection to the proposed name for the new "Tyseley" ward. Tyseley is an industrial area of Birmingham located roughly 2 miles to the north-east of Hall Green within the current council ward of South Yardley. Tyseley is accessible from Hall Green ward only after first passing through the neighbouring wards of Springfield and/or Acocks Green. Under the LGBC proposals the geographical area of Tyseley would then fall within a new council ward of Yardley West, but bizarrely would still not be accessible from the new "Tyseley" ward without first having to pass through the wards of Acocks Green and/or Sparkbrook. This situation highlights just how inappropriate the "Tyseley" name would be for this new ward, which is simply too far away from the real Tyseley to justify imposing the name of this industrial quarter onto our residential neighbourhood. Ideally the ward name should retain a "Hall Green" prefix, however the name "Sarehole" would also be appropriate as an acknowledgment of the historic water mill, as well as the wider area that was once the childhood home of the author J.R.R. Tolkien and had such a strong influence on his work. Kind Regards, Antony Troy
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Deborah Trueman
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the Moseley ward boundary. I have been a Moseley resident for over 30 years, currently in [REDACTED]. I’m very proud of Moseley’s unique and well established character and community, which would be destroyed by the changes. It would be ludicrous to have the landmarks of Moseley village, Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley Hall Hospital, Moseley Bog and Moseley Golf Club, to name but a few, outside the Moseley ward. The boundary changes would damage the community, including the regular and thriving Arts and Farmers markets as well as the yearly music festivals. I care passionately about it remaining an identified and special place. I strongly object to being in a Balsall Heath and Canon Hill ward and wish you to consider my objections. I request that the LGBC reconsiders the proposal and either leaves the ward intact or takes up the Moseley Community groups’ proposal.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

I live in Yardley and I want to stay living in Yardley if I want to live in Stechford I could move to Stechford. Leave our boundary alone !!!! Yardley is historic so PLEASE leave it alone. it is all an unnecessary expense why does it need to change??? We the people of YARDLEY don't want it to change so surely we should be listened too?!?!? Yardley is a part of Birmingham's history with a lovely parish church.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Rob Tulk
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

1: Northfield not Kings Norton

Annotation 1: Northfield not Kings Norton

Comment text:

This area is in the Parliamentary ward of Northfield, the parish of Northfield and has a Northfield post code so why is it now Kings Norton? Stop messing.
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Dear Sirs, having lived and worked in Erdington for almost 40 years, I am very concerned to see your proposals for the ward changes in our area. I cannot understand how you can propose an Erdington ward that does not include Erdington Abbey, Erdington Railway station, Erdington police station or Erdington Royal Mail sorting office (where I worked for over 30 years). I would ask that you reconsider your proposals for the North Birmingham area, to keep the historic parts of the ward together. I, along with many others would ask you to change your proposals to the following; A Pype Hayes ward including Birches Green, a Castle Vale ward, a two member Erdington ward, a Perry Common ward, a two member Gravelly Hill ward, a two member Kingstanding ward, a Stockland Green ward and a two member Oscott ward. With an Erdington ward of which the boundaries are the border of Sutton Coldfield to the North, Court Lane to to the West, to the South the traditional border with Gravelly Hill/Birches Green of Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road is used. To the East the border is the border of Pype Hayes, which enables Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive to remain in Erdington. I hope you will give consideration to my objections, as I am sure I will not be the only person contacting you about his matter.

Yours Faithfully, Mr T.R.Tumelty.
Hello

As a resident of long time resident (37 years) Yardley, I don't want Yardley to be re-named East Stechford.

Yardley was mentioned in the doomsday book, whereas, Stechford was not. Why should our history be erased, this is the place I have raised my family.

Could you inform me why it is even being considered. Is there a real reason or is it part of the adjustment of boundaries in a fraudulent attempt to hold on to power by absorbing a district like Yardley into a larger associated district (with different demographics). Stop meddling, if it isn't broken don't try and fix it.

Yours in cynicism.
Richard Tunnah
Dear Review Officer,

I note the 3 Aims of your Review.

You may have achieved mathematical accuracy in numbers of voters per Councillor. This is of little import in comparison to your failures with the other Aims.

You have completely failed in your Aim "To ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities". You have utterly destroyed Moseley - a village in Domesday - and promoted the splitting of churches from their congregations, district parks and amenities from their true neighbourhoods and even the name Moseley as a Ward or district.

As for "Promoting effective local government" in support of Aims 1 and 2, you have ensured difficulties in establishing responsibilities for provision of all city services, from the Policing of Moseley down to street cleaning.

I award you "Delta minus" for these lacklustre proposals. They are so irrelevant across so broad a front that I cannot attempt to put them right without going back to first principles and spending my time doing your job. That is not on; you are meant to be the professional expert.

This is a complete waste of taxpayers' money. You should go back to the drawing board and note the errors of your ways - look at other ratepayers' comments; they show where improvements must be made if they are worth the expense of implementation.

I believe you should allow the present state of affairs to continue, by withdrawing your proposals. Any further chargeable work is unnecessary public expenditure.

Yours faithfully,

Barry Tunnicliffe
Moseley Resident for 29 years.
I am at a loss to understand why the proposed boundary changes for the Moseley Ward do not include the Old Village, Parish Church, Hall (hospital) and Park. I would like to be informed of the rationale for the new changes. Moreover, as we live in a democracy the community's views should be taken into consideration. Has the Commission consulted the Moseley community and provided a forum for debate? If not, why not? Moseley has for centuries had a unique identity. It should not be eroded by bureaucratic unilateralism.

Derek P Turner

Sent from my iPad
I would like to make a number of representations in relation to the Birmingham electoral review. I understand that the statutory criteria are to: 1) Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; 2) reflect community identity; and 3) provide for effective and convenient local government. In relation to each of the ward boundaries, your report typically contends that the commission’s proposals provide the best balance between our statutory criteria for that area, but does not explain how in any details. My representations are based around these objectives.

**ELECTORAL EQUALITY** The consultation does not explain in detail why it is acceptable to have such large variations between the number of electors that each councillor represents. It does not seem acceptable, for example, that a vote in most of the Sutton wards is worth so much more than neighbouring Castle Vale. This is particularly confusing given that in many cases the proposed wards do not reflect community identity any better than the current ward boundaries, and in many cases the proposals make the situation worse – i.e. a poor balance between ward sizes and local identities appears to have been struck. Also, there no clear explanation is given as to why most wards have one councillor whilst a handful have two. This is more confusing than the current system where there are either two or three members for each ward.

**COMMUNITY IDENTITY** I am pleased to see that my local area (Bournville & Cotteridge) is recognised as a distinct local area. However, this is not the case in many other places. In my local area, the name of Bournbrook & Selly Park does not best reflect local perception. Selly Oak tends to be used for the high street (Bristol Road) and most of the terraced residential streets around, actually strictly speaking in Bournbrook, tend to be referred to as being located in Selly Oak. This is particularly confusing given that Selly Oak is not only the present ward name but a constituency in the current governance structure. As with Bournville, it is good to see that Stirchley is now recognised (which it is not in the current ward boundaries) but it would make sense that the Ten Acres area around Pershore Road is included in Stirchley rather than Bournbrook & Selly Park (there is some historical precedent here – for example in the Ten Acres & Stirchley Cooperative Society). Slightly further afield, the boundaries proposed for the Moseley and Balsall Heath do not at all reflect the local community identities. ‘Moseley Village’ (broadly around the junction with Alcester Road and St Mary’s Row) would be in the adjoining Cannon Hill & Balsall Heath ward. Conversely, a large part of what would be understood locally to be Balsall Heath is split between Moseley and Sparkbrook (e.g. Balsall Heath Park would be in the Moseley ward). As mentioned above, this lack of recognition of local geography is particularly confusing given the large variation in representation created – both of these wards would be quite significantly under-represented, which indicates that a poor balance has been struck. This is a specific concern in this area given that neighbourhood planning initiatives are currently underway in both Balsall Heath and Moseley and Kings Heath. In particular, the Balsall Heath Neighbourhood Plan (http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/balsallheathndp) successfully passed its referendum stage in October 2015. The new ward boundary would be at odds with the one subject to the neighbourhood plan. Elsewhere, it is striking how many places understood to be in a certain area are not located in the corresponding proposed ward. For example, Aston station is not in Aston but in the enormous Nechells ward, and Erdington station is not in Erdington but Short Heath (not a name I have ever come across other than on an OS map). In the centre of the
city, there is a missed opportunity to reflect established and emerging identities that are not marked on a map. It is disappointing that the existing confusing arrangement of placing the entire city core in the Ladywood ward (Ladywood actually being a relatively constrained but ill-defined area to the west of the city centre) is retained. One key difference is that the Jewellery Quarter/Hockley would now be attached to the large Winson Green ward, when I suspect most local people would see Icknield Street/Middleway as a very firm functional boundary between the two areas (had you attempted to cross this street during your visit you would have quickly seen the perversity of including the two in the same ward). There are also other newer identities being created by Council initiatives (e.g. Eastside, Southside, Smithfield) that are not recognised, which is a shame especially given that there are plans for a large number of residential developments in these areas. EFFECTIVE LOCAL GOVERNMENT Whilst there is some merit in very local representation, the small wards, with single councillor representation, are possibly a cause for concern. One of the strengths of the current system is that the wards are of a large enough size, with enough councillors, to have some degree of power and influence within wider city governance, especially on, for example spending on small local projects. This would only be diluted under the new structure.
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Personal Details:

Name: Janet Tween
E-mail: [obscured]
Postcode: [obscured]
Organisation Name: 
Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Include Edgbaston Reservoir in the ward of Edgbaston
Annotation 2: Leave Harborne in Harborne

Comment text:
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Alexander Twynholm
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

**Comment text:**

Sir/Madam The proposed boundary changes for the Moseley area do not reflect at all the "interests and identities " of the local community. The proposals seem to have been decided on an arbitrary carving up of the map based on population figures alone. My daily life is led along two main axes - the A435 Alcester Road and the Wake Green Road/Salisbury Road and their intersection point, Moseley village. Your proposals cut the A435 into 2 wards and make an inexplicable zigzag line through St Mary's Row and the 'Green'. Moseley is a fragile district (newspaper property columns and well-attended protest meetings notwithstanding ).If your proposals are carried out they will undermine its administrative cohesion and make necessary improvement far more difficult. I have no wish to seek advantage for Moseley over other districts of the city but the proposals would seem to have a perverse effect in creating wards which have no recognized identity (Sparkhill South???) while seriously weakening those which do.
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For the attention of Review Officer Birmingham

From David Tyler

I have recently learned of the Boundary Commission's proposal to reassign my address to TYSELEY ward. I have lived in Hall Green for 35 years and I am appalled at your misguided proposal - Tyseley and Hall Green have little in common.

My neighbours feel equally strongly about this.

I urge you to reconsider this matter as soon as possible!

David Tyler
25th January 2016

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

Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

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

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

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

Bournbrook

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

Selly Park

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,
Sirs/Madam,

I have lived in Handsworth Wood and Handsworth since 1967 representing the former Sandwell Ward from 1995 to 2004. I continue to live in the area and am involved in community associations. When much of Sandwell Ward became Handsworth Wood I was dismayed to see the boundary run along Rookery Road which I regarded as the centre of the community with shops, a public house and a community facility with the fire station.

Handsworth Wood has lost amenities including Hawthorn House, which members of the community campaigned for. This included a library, meeting facilities and offices and space where a number of activities could take place. It had facilities for playgroup and nursery. It also housed the City Council’s Social Service Department area offices and a playground. All that is left is the Pavilions on Hamstead Playing Fields, apart from a smaller children’s playground being reinstated against the wishes of the new private owner of Hawthorn House.

Another sizeable pub in a building that if not listed should have been considered as such was the Uplands. It changed hands a fortunes but at its best was an asset to the community. In Camp Lane there was a large training, education and cultural centre.

The existing Handsworth Wood Ward had Laurel Road Sports Centre. It continues to exist but assets have been transferred to the private sector. I, my fellow councillors and our constituents used this as a centre for activities and were able to use it freely, sometimes late at night after elections for example.

So the community cohesion/interest you refer to had already been compromised before the current set of proposals were presented.

One of the key ideas was, when I was a City Councillor, devolution, something supported strongly. That is still being talked about. What, in terms of a table administrative district capable of developing with a range of amenities, can be developed with the new Handsworth Wood being sliced off at the waist. This leaves two 1 member wards carved up as a butcher carves up the meat. The former heart, Rookery Road is sliced down the middle.

To have an administrative area capable of having its own devolved powers it needs to be large enough. In this case Handsworth Wood, Handsworth and Holyhead need to be kept together. Even if carved up they need some sort of unity. I don’t think isolating councillors is a good idea to have single councillor wards.

Birmingham Councillors represent far more people (around 7,000 than any other place in UK, with Leeds coming second (around 4,000). The last boundary change recognised that in its plans. Proposals for the three wards increase the ratio again. So Birmingham residents are poorly represented compared to other places already.

With devolution there will be a need for area committees (Sutton Coldfield is having its own council - I thought this was a model that would be followed.) As far as I have seen there are no proposals or even projections for the creation of other Parish Councils to be created out of this.
I am also a member of a great City with orchestra and other considerable arts and cultural institutions. We are being set up without funds. How will these central activities be supported in the future just as we see them crumbling away?

This seems to me to a way backwards,

Yours sincerely,
John Tyrrell
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** Fiona Tyson
- **E-mail:** 
- **Postcode:** 
- **Organisation Name:** 

**Comment text:**

In 1975 I moved to Moseley as a student fresh from school. How I loved the vibrant local area and what fun I had in Gracie Hall, Moseley Park and Pool, the Jade, the Bull and the Fighting Cocks. In 1991 I moved back to Moseley with my husband when we got married and bought our first house together. We wanted to bring up our children in a multi-cultural and cultural community with a strong identity. We wanted to be part of a committed local community where we could work with others to make things better for ourselves and our neighbours. 25 years on I feel the same. I am proud to live in Moseley and so proud of what it says about community cohesion, local endeavor and peoples’ democracy. We cannot let the LGBC split Moseley into smaller parts, breaking up something that works so well democratically, economically and socially. The boundaries of Moseley are clear to all of us who live here. They are as submitted by the Moseley Community Groups and on the map attached. As Chair of Moor Green West Residents Association I will be submitting a detailed response and would like all the comments made in that submission to be considered as part of my own personal response.

**Uploaded Documents:**

[Download](#)
In 1975 I moved to Moseley as a student fresh from school. How I loved the vibrant local area and what fun I had in Gracie Hall, Moseley Park and Pool, the Jade, the Bull and the Fighting Cocks. In 1991 I moved back to Moseley with my husband when we got married and bought our first house together. We wanted to bring up our children in a multi-cultural and cultural community with a strong identity. We wanted to be part of a committed local community where we could work with others to make things better for ourselves and our neighbours. 25 years on I feel the same. I am proud to live in Moseley and so proud of what it says about community cohesion, local endeavor and peoples’ democracy. We cannot let the LGBC split Moseley into smaller parts, breaking up something that works so well democratically, economically and socially. The boundaries of Moseley are clear to all of us who live here. They are as submitted by the Moseley Community Groups.

As Chair of Moor Green West Residents Association I will be submitting a detailed response and would like all the comments made in that submission to be considered as part of my own personal response.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Helen Tyson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live in [redacted] in Moseley and am concerned about the boundary changes. It doesn't feel appropriate to split Moseley over several wards, when the area likes to have a strong identity where people work together to decision make for the area. It would make decision making for the moseley community very challenging, which could impact on cohesion.
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A personal view on proposed LGB Boundary Changes in relation to Birmingham and ‘Moseley’ in particular

General Comment
My view on the proposed LGB changes in general is that these are an unnecessary distraction from the issue of efficient governance in Birmingham, and, in many cases, seem to bear no relation to the communities which they would serve. Examples of this are the ‘Jewellery Quarter’ being in Winson Green and ‘Moseley Village’ not even being in Moseley! Other Ward names of historical significance, such as ‘Longbridge’, seem to have disappeared altogether, suggesting that whoever drew up the boundaries knew nothing about Birmingham whatsoever! They certainly didn’t know anything about Moseley. The LGB say that they have been guided by three main Principles: 1) Numbers; 2) Community Identity; and 3) Providing for effective and convenient local government. I suggest, in relation to Moseley, that the only Principle that they have been guided by is ‘Numbers’, and that this, quite frankly, smacks of ‘gerrymandering’!

My first preference, therefore, would be that these proposals are abandoned altogether. However, if for some obscure reason, they need to go ahead, I am making further suggestions in relation to the ‘precious’ area in which I live. I use the term precious in relation to the strong sense of community identity that has been forged over many many decades and not just the fact that it is, undoubtedly, one of a number of ‘gems’ within Birmingham.

Specific Proposals for Moseley
Moseley is steeped in history, and has formed many strong community partnerships over the years. Examples of these are: Moseley Forum; Moseley Community Development Trust; The Moseley Society; Moseley in Bloom; Moseley Farmer’s Market; Moseley Park and Pool; Moseley Interfaith Group; Moseley Festival; Moseley B13 Magazine, to name but some. There are also many businesses in Moseley Village that work together and need consideration as well. In other words, there is a very strong sense of ‘community identity’ in Moseley and very strong links with the Local Government in Birmingham through our Councillors and Local MPs, none of whom seem to support these proposals, particularly in relation to Moseley.

If Moseley does need to be divided up, then this has to be done in a way that bears a strong resemblance the community links, local government links and geographical links that already identify with Moseley, as already these work so well. Why would you want to completely tear apart something that works so well and has been recognised as such nationally by, for example, national newspapers, who voted Moseley the best (suburban) place to live in Britain only last year (Daily Telegraph)?

****

I have attached a map with the currently proposed LGB Boundaries but have made suggested changes to these in black pen. I have also suggested Ward name changes in order that people that identify with Moseley can still feel a part of it, despite the split! I have suggested that ‘Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill’ Ward is split
into a newly named ‘Balsall Heath’ Ward (in the northern part - as this is where Balsall Heath is!) and a newly named ‘Moseley West’ Ward. I have also suggested that the currently proposed LGB ‘Moseley’ Ward should be renamed ‘Moseley East’ Ward.

In order to match ‘Numbers’, reflect ‘Community Identity’ and maintain ‘Effective Local Government Links’, the following boundary adjustments should be taken into account (Please see Map A attached below):

‘Moseley East’ Ward (1 Member Ward) should include the adjacent ‘Moseley Bog’ (to the south east – no ‘Numbers’) and the houses immediately surrounding it but that it should lose the northern most houses in the currently proposed LGB ‘Moseley’ Ward to the new ‘Balsall Heath’ Ward (see next paragraph) or ‘Sparkhill North’, as these would have much more community identity with those Wards.

‘Balsall Heath’ Ward (1 Member Ward) should extend eastwards to include Balsall Heath Park and the houses in the north of the currently proposed LGB ‘Moseley’ Ward, as mentioned in the previous paragraph. It should also include all the houses north of Cannon Hill Park, as these identify themselves with Balsall Heath.

‘Moseley West’ Ward (1 Member Ward) should include Highbury Park (which has no ‘Numbers’) and also Elizabeth Road and the rest of Moor Green Lane (which amount to few ‘Numbers’), as these roads definitely identify with Moseley and not ‘Stirchley’ or ‘Kings Heath’ Wards! Kings Heath Park has rightly been placed in ‘Kings Heath’ Ward by the LGB proposals. As has been mentioned in the previous paragraph, the area north of Cannon Hill Park should be in ‘Balsall Heath’ Ward, with the possible exception of Edgbaston Cricket Ground, which could be placed in Edgbaston!

**Final Comment**

As I said at the outset, my preference would be to abandon the LGB Proposals altogether. I have attached a second map (Map B below) as the preferred option for a single ‘Moseley’ Ward (2 Member Ward), which is very similar to the current Boundary but excludes ‘Kings Heath Park’ and includes ‘Moseley Bog’. I would also like to fully endorse what the Chair of ‘Moor Green West Residents’ Association’ has said in her excellent submission to the LGB and Greg Clark.

There was an overwhelming vote against the LGB Proposals by many hundreds of people living in Moseley at a public meeting held on the 16 January 2016, which I attended. I trust that you will listen to and act upon what the people of Moseley have to say.

Peter Tyson
(Moseley Resident)

cfi. Greg Clark; David Cameron; Roger Godsiff;
Claire Spencer; Martin Straker Welds; Timothy Huxtable
Map A (Based on Moseley being split into two 1 Member Wards)
Map B (Based on a single ‘Moseley’ 2 Member Ward – more or less as now – this was the preferred option by the overwhelming majority of residents of Moseley that were present at the public meeting held on 16 January 2016. It is also my preferred option, as it better represents the area and the people who identify with Moseley and keeps Moseley together, which is how it should be! This includes: all of Moor Green Lane, Elizabeth Road and Highbury Park in the south western area, together with Moseley Bog in the eastern area but places Kings Heath Park in ‘Kings Heath’ and Balsall Heath in ‘Balsall Heath’, which is where they belong.)