

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Analysis and further draft recommendations	3
Submissions received	3
Warding patterns	4
Draft recommendations	4
Further draft recommendations	10
Detailed wards	11
City centre and surrounding area	11
East of city centre	18
North of city centre	23
South-east of city centre	28
South-west of city centre	35
Sutton Coldfield	40
Conclusions	48
Parish electoral arrangements	48

## Appendices

A Table A1: Further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council	51
B Submissions received	57

# Summary

## Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

## Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

## Why Birmingham?

We are conducting a review of Birmingham City Council following a recommendation by Sir Bob Kerlake (now Lord Kerlake) in his review of the governance and organisational capabilities of Birmingham City Council. That review followed on from concerns about the effectiveness of current operational arrangements in the Council. We subsequently agreed to undertake such a review, stimulated by Lord Kerlake's objective of improving effective and convenient local government in Birmingham.

## Timetable

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
14 July 2015	Council size decision
21 July 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
29 September 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 December 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
9 February 2016	Analysis of submissions received
10 May 2016	Publication of further draft recommendations and consultation
21 June 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
6 September 2016	Publication of final recommendations

## Our proposals for Birmingham

Birmingham City Council currently has 120 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we considered that a reduction in council size to 100 members would ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively. In developing the draft recommendations for Birmingham we identified that a council size of 101 members would provide for a better warding pattern across the city. Our draft recommendations were therefore based on a council size of 101.

During consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 2,000 submissions commenting on the warding pattern. In light of the local evidence received we have decided to modify our draft recommendations. We have therefore decided to publish further draft recommendations and welcome comments on these.

Our further draft recommendations therefore propose that Birmingham City Council's 101 councillors should represent 41 single-member wards and 30 two-member wards across the city. Two of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Birmingham by 2021.

## Consultation

**You have until 20 June 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. You can make your views to us by:**

**Online consultation portal – <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

**Email – [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)**

**Writing – Review Officer (Birmingham)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London SW1P 4QP**

# 1 Analysis and further draft recommendations

1 Legislation<sup>1</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>2</sup> in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

2 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

3 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of Birmingham	728,730	813,401
Number of councillors	101	101
Average number of electors per councillor	7,215	8,053

4 Under our further draft recommendations, two of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the city by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Birmingham.

5 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

6 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Birmingham City Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

## Submissions received

7 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Warding patterns

8 During consultation on warding patterns, we received a total of 116 submissions. This included four detailed city-wide proposals from the Council's Conservative and Labour groups and from two local residents. The Conservative Group submission was based on a council size of 101, while the Labour Group's submission was based on a council size of 99. The two city-wide submissions from local residents were both based on a council size of 100.

9 We also received a detailed proposal for the Sutton Coldfield area from the Sutton Town Council Referendum Group. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the city.

10 Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of wards largely resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the city and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. We also considered that much of the localised evidence we received was invaluable in helping us to identify communities.

11 Our draft recommendations were largely based on a combination of the city-wide proposals that we received. In many areas of the city we also reflected the localised evidence that we received which provided further evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas we considered that the proposals did not necessarily provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and we therefore identified alternative warding arrangements in some parts of the city with the assistance of localised evidence and with regard to our statutory criteria. In formulating our draft recommendations we also visited the city in order to look at the various different proposals on the ground. This tour of Birmingham informed our decision-making.

12 Our draft recommendations were based on a council size of 101 which provided for 53 single-member wards and 24 two-member wards. We published our draft recommendations on 15 December 2015 and consultation closed on 8 February 2016.

## Draft recommendations

13 In response to consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 2,000 submissions. We received submissions on every ward we proposed as part of our draft recommendations. In some parts of the city we received a mixture of support and objection to our proposals and in other parts we received submissions objecting to the ward boundaries and ward names.

14 We received city-wide comments on our draft recommendations from the Conservative Group, Labour Group and Liberal Democrat Group. We also received city-wide comments from a member of the public.

15 In parts of the city we received a large volume of submissions on specific wards.

## **Moseley**

16 We received over 460 submissions in regard to our proposals for the Moseley area including submissions from the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups on the City Council; local organisations including the Combined Community Groups of Moseley, The Moseley Society, Moseley Tennis Club, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Regeneration Group and Moseley Community Development Trust; a number of city councillors; and from local residents.

17 Having considered the evidence received we note the considerable opposition to our draft recommendations in the Moseley area. Having considered the opposition to our draft recommendations and the evidence received during consultation we are proposing a significantly different warding pattern for the area as part of our further draft recommendations.

18 Under our draft recommendations we proposed a single-member Moseley ward which many respondents considered did not provide an accurate reflection of the Moseley community. We received a number of alternative proposals for the area and we have based our revised two-member ward on these proposals. Our proposed two-member ward reunites the centre of Moseley into one ward and also incorporates a number of other residential areas that were previously included in our Stirchley, Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill, Sparkhill and King's Heath wards. The revised ward also includes Moseley Bog and Moseley Golf Club, neither of which were included in our original Moseley ward.

19 We consider that, based on the evidence received, our revised two-member Moseley ward provides a vastly improved reflection of community identity in this area whilst also balancing our other two statutory criteria.

## **Acocks Green**

20 During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 60 submissions in regards to the Acocks Green area. These included submissions from the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups on the City Council; local organisations including Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum, Acocks Green Village in Bloom, Acocks Green Focus Group and Fox Hollies Green Neighbourhood Forum; Jess Phillips MP; a number of city councillors; and from local residents.

21 The majority of respondents opposed our draft recommendations on the basis that the northern boundary of our Acocks Green ward divided the Acocks Green community in following the Chiltern Main Line. Having visited the area on our second tour of the city we accepted this view and we therefore examined the alternative proposals put forward to us and whether we could create an Acocks Green ward that would be more reflective of the Acocks Green community.

22 Under our further draft recommendations our revised ward incorporates the historic core of Acocks Green that lies on both sides of the railway line and is bounded by the A4040 to the west. We are content that the boundaries used are clear and identifiable and that our alternative proposal also provides a reasonable level of electoral equality. Based on the evidence put forward to us, we believe that this ward is more reflective of community identity in Acocks Green.

## **Hall Green**

23 We received over 330 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations that commented on the Hall Green area. Whilst we did receive some support for our proposals, most of the submissions that we received objected to our draft recommendations, particularly in regard to our single-member Hall Green North and Tyseley wards. We received submissions from the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups on the City Council; local organisations including WeAreB28, Hall Green Residents' Association and Hall Green & District Amateur Gardeners' Society; a number of city councillors; and from local residents.

24 Under our draft recommendations we proposed a pattern of three single-member wards of Hall Green North, Hall Green South and Tyseley. Having considered the evidence gathered during the consultation and having re-visited the area during our second tour of the city, we have made some amendments as part of our further draft recommendations. We have combined our two single-member wards in this area to form a two-member Hall Green North ward. We consider that in doing so we have avoided dividing part of the Hall Green community along the railway line, which we are content does not act as a barrier between those on either side of it.

25 In the north-east of the ward we have made a slight amendment to the boundary between our revised two-member Hall Green North ward and our new Tyseley & Hay Mills ward. Under our further draft recommendations the boundary between these two wards runs to the west of the Shaftmoor Industrial Estate. Based on the evidence received we consider that this revised Hall Green North ward provides an improved balance between our statutory criteria.

### **Edgbaston**

26 During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 170 submissions in regard to the Edgbaston area including submissions from the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups on the City Council; Gisela Stuart MP; local organisations including Birmingham SouthWest Group, Edgbaston Cricket Ground and The Harborne Society; a number of city councillors; and from local residents. Based on the evidence received we propose two amendments to the Edgbaston ward as part of our further draft recommendations.

27 In the west of Edgbaston we have moved the boundary from Harborne Park Road to Metchley Lane. As a result the residential area that lies between these two roads will be included in our Harborne ward rather than in Edgbaston, which we believe provides an improved reflection of community identity in this area.

28 In the east of the ward we have extended the boundary so that it now runs to the east of Edgbaston Cricket Ground and Tally-Ho Grounds. We recognise that the cricket ground is a key feature of the Edgbaston area and the evidence that we received also suggests that the residents who live to the west of it also consider themselves part of the Edgbaston community.

29 To the north of our proposed Edgbaston ward we also received over 80 submissions in regard to our proposed Summerfield ward. The majority of these submissions argued that the residential area that lies to the south of Edgbaston Reservoir (and indeed, the reservoir itself) are considered part of Edgbaston and should be included in the Edgbaston ward. Having considered the evidence put forward in this regard, whilst we note the strength of feeling of local residents in this

area, we do not propose any amendments to the boundary of this ward. Moving such a large number of electors into Edgbaston ward to the south would require the creation of a three-member Edgbaston ward, which we consider would not allow for effective and convenient local government.

30 We have, however, decided to rename our Summerfield ward North Edgbaston to reflect the Edgbaston community. We do not, therefore, propose any changes to the northern boundary of our Edgbaston ward under our further draft recommendations.

### **Erdington**

31 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 360 submissions that commented on our proposed Erdington ward. These included submissions from the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups on the City Council; Jack Dromey MP; local organisations including Friends of Short Heath Park, Jarvis Road Tower Block Action Group, Standing Up Together For Our Community Identities in Erdington, Erdington Conservative Association, Friends of Spring Lane and North Birmingham Together; and from local residents.

32 Whilst we did receive some support for our proposed Erdington ward, the majority of respondents wrote in opposition to our draft recommendations. Based on the evidence received we propose a number of amendments to Erdington and its neighbouring wards. Under our draft recommendations we proposed a single-member Erdington ward. It was implicit in many of the submissions that we received that many residents who were included outside our Erdington ward consider themselves to be a part of the Erdington community. We also re-visited the area on our second tour of the city and our observations have also informed our thinking.

33 As part of our further draft recommendations we have included our single-member Short Heath ward in an expanded two-member Erdington ward. We have also amended the boundary between Erdington and Stockland Green to include Erdington Abbey and Erdington railway station in Erdington ward. These changes incorporate the historic core of Erdington into the ward of that name.

34 In the east of the ward we have amended the boundary so that it extends to Holly Lane, including the residents to the west of Holly Lane in our Erdington ward. As well as reflecting community ties we consider that this amendment also provides a clearer and more identifiable boundary between our Erdington and Pype Hayes wards.

35 We did receive a number of alternative proposals, most notably to the north of our proposed Erdington ward where a number of respondents suggested that the area immediately to the north of Chester Road should also be included in the Erdington ward. We have examined the possibility of including this area in our revised two-member Erdington ward; however, removing any further electors from our proposed Pype Hayes ward would result in a poor level of electoral equality for that ward. We therefore do not propose any changes to the northern boundary of our Erdington ward under our further draft recommendations.

### **Sutton Coldfield**

36 We received over 130 submissions during the consultation on our draft

recommendations that commented on the Sutton Coldfield area. This included submissions from the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups on the City Council; Sutton Coldfield Conservative Association; Rt Hon Andrew Mitchell MP; local organisations including Banners Gate Neighbourhood Forum, Boldmere Neighbourhood Forum, Wylde Green Neighbourhood Forum, Boldmere Futures Partnership and Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group; a number of city councillors; and from local residents. These submissions raised a number of issues that we have sought to address in our further draft recommendations; however, in some cases we have not been able to do so.

37 Over 50 of these submissions argued that the area was under-represented under our draft recommendations in which 10 councillors were allocated to the area and that Sutton Coldfield should be represented by 11 city councillors. In formulating the draft recommendations we carried out an allocation exercise to determine how many councillors should be allocated to Sutton Coldfield. Firstly, our allocation was based on the boundary of the new parish council; we considered this important in order to reflect community identity. Secondly, it is important to make it clear that, when considering electoral equality, our calculations are based on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. This is a consistent approach to how we undertake allocations in reviews of county councils. In the case of the Birmingham review, we are therefore using electorate projections to 2021. We do not undertake an allocation based on the current electorate.

38 Based on the projections that we have for Birmingham City Council, the projected electorate for Birmingham is 813,401 by 2021. Based on a council size of 101 this means that each councillor will represent an average of 8,053 electors. The Sutton Coldfield area is forecast to have an electorate of 83,765 by 2021. We therefore did the following sum:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 83,765 \\
 \text{(total electorate of Sutton Coldfield – 2021)} \\
 \hline
 8,053 \\
 \text{(average number of electors for Birmingham} \\
 \text{City Council by 2021)}
 \end{array}
 = 10.40 \text{ (therefore rounded to 10)}$$

39 We are therefore content that in allocating 10 councillors to Sutton Coldfield we have been able to provide fair representation and wards that result in a good level of electoral equality.

40 We also received a number of submissions that commented on our parish warding arrangements for Sutton Coldfield. Some respondents argued that we should amend the council size of Sutton Coldfield Town Council and others suggested that we should hold a further consultation on parish wards and others.

41 Although we are able to make recommendations for changes to parish electoral arrangements, we will not normally propose changes to the total number of councillors to be elected to a parish council. We believe that this is a matter which is best determined locally by a Community Governance Review. In the case of Sutton

Coldfield such a review was undertaken in order to establish the new parish council and determined that 24 was an appropriate number of parish councillors.

42 Whilst we do welcome comments on our proposed parish wards, it is important to note that parish wards are created as a consequence of our recommendations for warding arrangements. Where we divide a parish between different wards, we create parish wards with boundaries that are coterminous with the ward boundaries. In addition, when recommending parish warding arrangements there is no requirement in legislation for us to provide for electoral equality. We do not, therefore, consult on parish warding arrangements.

43 As part of our draft recommendations we proposed a single-member Sutton Parkside ward and a single-member Sutton Boldmere. We received over 25 submissions that argued that these two wards should be combined to form a two-member Sutton Vesey ward. Having considered the evidence received and having re-visited the area during our second tour of the city, we are content to recommend a two-member Sutton Vesey ward as part of our further draft recommendations.

44 Under our draft recommendations we included the entirety of Sutton Park into our proposed Sutton Four Oaks ward. In response we received over 35 submissions arguing that the park should be divided between the wards that surround it. Based on the evidence received we have amended the southern boundary of Sutton Four Oaks ward so that the southern part of the park is included in the wards of Sutton Trinity and Sutton Vesey.

45 Elsewhere in Sutton Coldfield we have made a number of minor amendments to boundaries to reflect the evidence that we received during the consultation on our draft recommendations.

### **Ward names**

46 The ward names used for our draft recommendations were all based on submissions that we received during our first consultation on warding arrangements. During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 250 submissions that commented on ward names and made alternative suggestions for one or more wards. In a number of wards it is clear that some of our ward names did not reflect the identity of the communities they included. We also received a number of submissions that remarked on historic ward names such as Longbridge, Selly Oak and Sutton Vesey that were not included in our draft recommendations.

47 Accordingly, we have amended the names of 16 wards as part of our further draft recommendations. These amended names are based on the evidence received during the consultation period; however, we would welcome further comments on ward names during the consultation on our further draft recommendations.

## **Further draft recommendations**

48 The submissions we have received have informed us in the formulation of our further draft recommendations. The tables below detail our recommendations for

each ward. We welcome comments on these in response to the further consultation.

## City centre and surrounding area

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Aston</b>	2	-3%	This ward is bounded by Birchfield Road (A34) to the west, the Aston Expressway (A38) to the south-west and the M6 to the north. The ward includes Aston Hall and Aston Park.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received eight submissions specifically relating to our proposed Aston ward; however, we did not receive any persuasive alternative proposals. Having considered the evidence received during consultation, we are content that our proposed Aston ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore do not propose any amendments to our Aston ward as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>Birchfield</b>	1	-5%	Birchfield ward is bounded by Handsworth Park to the west, Wellington Road (A4040) to the north and Birchfield Road to the east (A34).	We received 17 submissions that commented on our proposed Birchfield ward during consultation on our draft recommendations. Based on the evidence received we have made an amendment to the western boundary of the ward which previously divided Handsworth Park. Under our further draft recommendations the entirety of the park will be included in the neighbouring Handsworth ward. A number of respondents suggested that our Handsworth and Birchfield wards should be combined to form a two-member ward. However, having considered the evidence received we are content that a single-member Birchfield ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria.
<b>Bordesley &amp; Highgate</b>	1	-8%	This ward includes the Bordesley and Highgate communities and is bounded by the Birmingham loop railway line to the north.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 20 submissions that made comments specifically relating to our proposed Bordesley & Highgate ward. A number of respondents suggested that the Highgate area should be combined in a ward with neighbouring Balsall Heath. However, these submissions did not take into account the effect this would have on neighbouring wards

				and we consider that there is not persuasive evidence in support of making such a change to our draft recommendations. Accordingly, we do not propose any amendments to Bordesley & Highgate ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Bordesley Green</b>	1	-7%	Bordesley Green is bounded by the B4128 to the north and comprises the Bordesley Green community.	We received six submissions that commented on our Bordesley Green ward during the consultation on our draft recommendations; however, we did not receive any persuasive alternative proposals for this area. Having considered the evidence received during consultation, we are content that our proposed Bordesley Green ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore do not propose any amendments to Bordesley Green as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>Edgbaston</b>	2	-5%	This ward comprises the community of Edgbaston and the Birmingham University campus.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 170 submissions in regard to the Edgbaston area. Based on the evidence received we propose two amendments to Edgbaston ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the west of the ward we have moved the boundary from Harborne Park Road to Metchley Lane. As a result the residential area that lies between these two roads will be included in our Harborne ward rather than in Edgbaston, which we believe provides an improved reflection of community identity in this area.</p> <p>In the east of the ward we have extended the boundary so that it now runs to the east of Edgbaston Cricket Ground and Tally-Ho Grounds. We recognise that the cricket ground is a key feature of the Edgbaston area and the evidence that we received also suggests that the residents that live to the west</p>

				<p>of it also consider themselves part of the Edgbaston community.</p> <p>We also received over 80 submissions arguing that the residential area that lies to the south of Edgbaston Reservoir (and indeed, the reservoir itself) are considered part of Edgbaston and should be included in the Edgbaston ward.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence received in this regard, whilst we note the strength of feeling of local residents in this area, we do not propose any amendments to the boundary of this ward. Moving such a large number of electors into Edgbaston ward to the south would require the creation of a three-member Edgbaston ward, which we consider would not allow for effective and convenient local government. As detailed in the North Edgbaston section of this report, we have decided to rename this ward North Edgbaston to reflect the Edgbaston community. We do not, therefore, propose any changes to the northern boundary of our Edgbaston ward under our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Handsworth</b>	1	-3%	This ward is bounded by Soho Road to the south, Rookery Road to the west and Church Lane to the north. The eastern boundary extends to the eastern edge of Handsworth Park.	We received over 20 submissions that commented on our proposed Handsworth ward during consultation on our draft recommendations. Based on the evidence received we have made an amendment to the eastern boundary of the ward which previously divided Handsworth Park. Under our further draft recommendations the entirety of the park will be included in the Handsworth ward as proposed by a number of respondents. Some respondents proposed that our Handsworth and Birchfield wards should be combined to form a two-member ward; however, having considered the evidence received we are content that a single-member

				Handsworth ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria in this area.
<b>Handsworth Wood</b>	2	-2%	Handsworth Wood ward is bounded by the A4040 to the south, by the Birmingham-Walsall railway line to the east and by the authority boundary to the north and west.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 12 submissions specifically relating to our proposed Handsworth Wood ward including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposal. Having considered the evidence received during consultation, we are content that our proposed Handsworth Wood ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria and we do not propose any changes as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>Harborne</b>	2	11%	This ward incorporates the Harborne area of Birmingham and is bounded by the A456 to the north, the authority boundary to the north-west and Bourn Brook to the south.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 40 submissions in regard to the Harborne area including both support for and opposition to our proposals. Based on the evidence received we have made two amendments to Harborne ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the east of the ward we have moved the boundary from Harborne Park Road to Metchley Lane. As a result the residential area that lies between these two roads will be included in our Harborne ward. In the south-west of the ward we have amended the boundary to include St Andrews Close, Vale Close and Wentworth Way as part of our Harborne ward based on evidence provided by residents in this area.</p> <p>Whilst our proposed Harborne ward would have 11% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2021, we consider that we have received persuasive evidence of community identity to justify such a variance and we</p>

				consider that our proposals provide a good balance between our statutory criteria.
<b>Holyhead</b>	1	-4%	Holyhead ward is bounded by the A4040 to the north, Rookery Road to the east and by the authority boundary to the south and west.	We received six submissions that commented on this part of the city during the consultation on our draft recommendations. We did not receive any well-evidenced alternative proposals for this area and we are therefore content that the proposal provided a good balance between our statutory criteria. Accordingly, we do not propose any changes to Holyhead ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Ladywood</b>	2	-4%	This ward incorporates much of Birmingham City Centre, running from Edgbaston Reservoir in the west to New Street railway station in the east.	<p>During consultation on our draft recommendations we received 23 submissions in regard to our proposed Ladywood ward.</p> <p>A number of submissions proposed including part of our Ladywood ward – the St Mark’s area in the north of the ward – in a revised Soho &amp; Jewellery Quarter ward. We received a number of other submissions which made different alternative suggestions for the area. We also received a good level of support for our proposed Ladywood ward including submissions from residents in St Mark’s who supported their inclusion in our Ladywood ward.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence received we consider that by including the St Mark’s area in Ladywood ward we have provided an accurate reflection of community identity. Given the level of support that we received for our proposed Ladywood ward and in the absence of any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals we are content that the ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria. We do not propose any changes to our Ladywood ward under our further draft recommendations.</p>

<b>Lozells</b>	1	-2%	This ward comprises the Lozells community and is bounded by Soho Hill in the west and Birchfield Road to the east.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received eight submissions that commented specifically on the Lozells area; however, we did not receive any persuasive alternative proposals. Having considered the submissions received, we are content that our single-member Lozells ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria and would facilitate effective and convenient local government. We therefore do not propose any changes to our proposed Lozells ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Nechells</b>	1	7%	Nechells ward is bounded by the Aston Expressway (A38) to the west and railway lines to the south and east.	We received seven submissions that commented on the Nechells area during the consultation on our draft recommendations. Based on the evidence received, we consider that our single-member Nechells ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Nechells as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>Newtown</b>	1	-4%	This ward comprises the Newtown community to the north and south of New John Street West, which runs through the middle of the ward.	We received six submissions that commented on this part of the city during the consultation on our draft recommendations. We did not receive any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals for this area and we are therefore content that the proposal provided a good balance between our statutory criteria. Accordingly, we confirm our draft recommendations for Newtown as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>North Edgbaston</b>	2	-1%	North Edgbaston ward is bounded by the Birmingham Canal to the north and the authority boundary to the west.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 115 submissions that commented on our proposed Summerfield ward. The majority of these submissions opposed the draft recommendations with many respondents arguing that the residential area that lies to the south of Edgbaston Reservoir (and indeed, the reservoir

				<p>itself) are considered part of Edgbaston and should be included in the Edgbaston ward.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence put forward, whilst we note the strength of feeling of local residents in this area, we do not propose any amendments to the boundary of this ward. Moving such a large number of electors into Edgbaston ward to the south would require the creation of a three-member Edgbaston ward, which we consider would not allow for effective and convenient local government. Other alternative proposals would not provide for a pattern of wards with reasonable levels of electoral equality.</p> <p>We do, however, propose to change the name of this ward from Summerfield to North Edgbaston, a name which we consider more accurately reflects the nature of the area covered by the ward.</p>
<b>Soho &amp; Jewellery Quarter</b>	2	-7%	Soho & Jewellery Quarter ward includes the Jewellery Quarter and the communities of All Saints, Hockley and Winson Green.	<p>In response to our draft recommendations we received over 40 submissions that commented on this part of the city including a number of alternative proposals.</p> <p>A number of respondents suggested the creation of a single-member Jewellery Quarter ward and we did receive some well-evidenced proposals for such a ward. In order to provide for a reasonable level of electoral equality, it was suggested that the St Mark's area in the north of Ladywood ward could be included in a revised Jewellery Quarter ward. However, we also received some submissions in opposition to this proposal from residents in St Mark's who supported their inclusion in Ladywood ward. Accordingly, we also examined whether it would be possible to create a viable Jewellery Quarter ward by including part of the All Saints or</p>

				<p>Hockley areas; however, this would require the division of communities in this area. On balance we are therefore content that our proposed ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria in providing a good level of electoral equality and not dividing communities.</p> <p>We do, however, propose a change of name to this ward. Under our draft recommendations it was named Winson Green, a name that was proposed to us during our initial consultation on warding arrangements. We received numerous alternative proposals for the name of this ward including Jewellery Quarter, Soho, All Saints, Hockley, Hockley Brook and various combinations of these names. Having considered the names put to us we have renamed this ward Soho &amp; Jewellery Quarter.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

### East of city centre

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Alum Rock</b>	2	9%	This ward comprises the community of Alum Rock and is bounded by railway lines to the north, south and east, and by Belchers Lane to the east.	<p>Under our draft recommendations for this area we proposed two single-member wards of Alum Rock and Saltley, with the boundary between the two wards following Alum Rock Road. During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 25 submissions that commented on our proposals for this area, including a mixture of support and opposition.</p> <p>Whilst we did receive some submissions in support of our single-member Alum Rock and Saltley wards, a number of respondents argued that rather than acting as a boundary, the Alum Rock Road acts as a focal point for the community and that amenities on the road draw in residents from both</p>

				<p>the north and the south. Although we had already visited the area during our first tour of the city, we returned during our second tour to take a further look at Alum Rock Road and its neighbouring residential communities.</p> <p>Based on the evidence received and on our observations made during our two tours of Birmingham we have decided to combine the two-single member wards of Alum Rock and Saltley into a two-member Alum Rock ward as part of our further draft recommendations. We consider that a two-member ward provides a better reflection of community and identity and uses clearer and more identifiable boundaries.</p>
<b>Bromford &amp; Hodge Hill</b>	2	-6%	This ward is bounded by Bromford Lane to the west, the M6 to the north and the River Cole to the south. It contains the communities of Bromford and Hodge Hill.	We received eight submissions that commented on our proposed Bromford & Hodge Hill ward during the consultation on our draft recommendations including a mixture of support and opposition. Based on the evidence received, we are content that our two-member Bromford & Hodge Hill ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore do not propose any amendments to our draft recommendations for Bromford & Hodge Hill at this stage.
<b>Garretts Green</b>	1	-8%	Garretts Green ward includes the communities of Lea Hall and Garretts Green and is bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 10 submissions that commented on the Garretts Green area. Based on the evidence received we propose one amendment to our draft recommendations as part of our further draft recommendations. In the west of the ward we have amended the boundary so that it follows Cockshut Hill. As a result the residential area to the west of Cockshut Hill will now be in our proposed Yardley East ward.
<b>Glebe Farm &amp; Tile Cross</b>	2	6%	This ward includes the communities of Glebe Farm, Kitt's Green and Tile Cross,	We received 17 submissions that commented on this area of Birmingham. The majority of the submissions argued that we had included areas in the west and north of the ward that

			<p>bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the south and the River Cole to the north.</p>	<p>would be not be considered part of Glebe Farm or Tile Cross communities; however, we did not receive any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals for these areas.</p> <p>In formulating our further draft recommendations we considered whether we could amend the northern or western boundaries of our wards to reflect the evidence received; however, this would have significant knock-on effects on the neighbouring wards. Whilst our proposals combine some communities that may be considered disparate we are content that we have not divided any communities in this area. Accordingly, whilst we note that there is some opposition to our proposals in this area, we are not proposing any amendments to our draft recommendations. 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.</p>
<b>Heartlands</b>	1	0%	<p>Heartlands ward is bounded by Hob Moor Road to the south, the River Cole to the east and the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north.</p>	<p>In response to the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received five submissions that commented on our proposed Heartlands ward. Having considered the evidence received, we are content that this ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a good balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore do not propose any changes to Heartlands ward under our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Shard End</b>	1	8%	<p>This ward comprises the community of Shard End and is bounded by the River Cole to the south and the authority boundary to the north and east.</p>	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received five submissions specifically relating to our proposed Shard End ward. Having considered the evidence received during consultation, we are content that our proposed Shard End ward provides the best balance</p>

				between our statutory criteria and we therefore do not propose any amendments to our Shard End at this stage.
<b>Sheldon</b>	2	-3%	Sheldon ward includes the areas of Sheldon, Gilbertstone and Lyndon Green and is bounded by the authority boundary to the south and east.	We received eight submissions that commented on this part of the city during the consultation on our draft recommendations. We did not receive any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals for the Sheldon area and we are therefore content that our draft recommendations provided a good balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore do not propose any amendments to Sheldon ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Small Heath</b>	2	-8%	This ward is bounded by Muntz Street, Coventry Road and Wordsworth Road to the west and the River Cole to the east.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received nine submissions specifically relating to our proposed Small Heath ward. Having considered the evidence received, we are content that our proposed Small Heath ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria and we do not propose any amendments to it as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>South Yardley</b>	1	-3%	South Yardley ward includes the South Yardley area and is bounded by the authority boundary to the east, Hob Moor Road to the north and by Holder Road, Wash Lane and the Grand Union Canal to the west.	In regards to our draft recommendations for this part of the city we received over 60 submissions, although most of these related to the neighbouring areas of Acocks Green and Hay Mills. Having considered the evidence received we are content that the boundaries of our proposed ward provide a good balance between our statutory criteria. However, we received over 10 submissions that commented on the name of the proposed ward and suggesting that the name South Yardley would provide a more accurate reflection of the area covered by the ward. Accordingly, we propose the name South Yardley as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>Sparkbrook</b>	2	0%	This ward includes the community of Sparkbrook and is bounded by the Birmingham to Stratford railway line in the	We received over 30 submissions that commented on this area, including over 10 submissions in support of the proposed Sparkbrook ward. Having considered the evidence received, we are content that our Sparkbrook ward provides

			north and east and by the A435 and the A4540 to the west.	a good balance between our statutory criteria and we do not propose any amendments under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Ward End</b>	1	7%	This ward is bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north and west and by Bromford Lane to the east.	We received over six submissions that commented on this ward, including a number of submissions in support of our proposed ward. Having considered the evidence received we are content that our Ward End ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria and we do not propose any amendments under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Yardley East</b>	1	5%	This ward includes much of the historic core of Yardley and is bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north and by Station Road and Stoney Lane to the west.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 185 submissions that commented on our proposals for this ward, nearly all of which were made in opposition to our proposed name of 'Stechford East'. Based on the evidence received it is clear that the name of Stechford East is not one that the local community relate to. We therefore propose to rename the ward Yardley East as part of our further draft recommendations. Additionally, in the east of the ward we have amended the boundary so that it follows Cockshut Hill. As a result the residential area to the west of Cockshut Hill will now be in our proposed Yardley East ward which we believe provides a more accurate reflection of community identity.
<b>Yardley West &amp; Stechford</b>	1	0%	This ward incorporates parts of both Yardley and Stechford and is bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north, by Station Road and Stoney Lane to the east, the River Cole to the west and by Hob Moor Road to the south.	We received 14 submissions that commented on our proposals for this area. We did not receive any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals for this area and we therefore are not proposing any amendments to the ward boundaries at this stage. We have, however, amended the name of the ward, from Stechford West to Yardley West & Stechford, which provides a more accurate reflection of the area.

## North of city centre

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Castle Vale</b>	1	-8%	This ward includes the Castle Vale community and is bounded by Sutton Coldfield to the east, the A38 to the north and the authority boundary to the south.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 240 submissions that commented on our proposals for the Castle Vale area, including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposals. Having considered the evidence received we do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence to justify any amendments to our Castle Vale ward. We are content that our proposed ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a clear reflection of community identity in this area. We do not propose any amendments to this ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Erdington</b>	2	6%	Erdington ward is bounded by Chester Road to the north, Perry Common to the west and Kingsbury Road to the south.	<p>We received over 360 submissions that commented on our proposed Erdington ward. Whilst we did receive some support for our proposed Erdington ward, the majority of respondents wrote in opposition to our draft recommendations. Based on the evidence received, we propose a number of amendments. Under our draft recommendations we proposed a single-member Erdington ward. It was implicit in many of the submissions that we received that many residents that were included outside our Erdington ward consider themselves to be a part of the Erdington community. We also re-visited the area on our second tour of the city and our observations have also informed our thinking.</p> <p>As part of our further draft recommendations we have included our single-member Short Heath ward in an expanded two-member Erdington ward. We have also</p>

				<p>amended the boundary between Erdington and Stockland Green to include Erdington Abbey and Erdington railway station in Erdington ward. These changes incorporate the historic core of Erdington into the ward of that name.</p> <p>In the east of the ward, we have amended the boundary so that it extends to Holly Lane, including the residents to the west of Holly Lane in our Erdington ward. As well as reflecting community ties we consider that this amendment also provides a clearer and more identifiable boundary between our Erdington and Pype Hayes wards.</p> <p>We did receive a number of other alternative proposals, most notably to the north of our proposed Erdington ward where a number of respondents suggested that the area immediately to the north of Chester Road should also be included in the Erdington ward. We have examined the possibility of including this area in our revised two-member Erdington ward; however, removing any further electors from our proposed Pype Hayes would result in a poor level of electoral equality for that ward. We therefore do not propose any changes to the northern boundary of our Erdington ward under our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Kingstanding</b>	2	-4%	This ward is bounded by Kingstanding Road to the west and the A453 to the south.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 240 submissions that commented on our proposals for the Kingstanding area, including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposals. Having considered the evidence received we are content that our proposed Kingstanding ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a clear reflection of community identity in this area. We do not propose any amendments to this ward under our further draft recommendations.</p>

<b>Oscott</b>	2	-3%	This ward includes the community of Oscott, bounded by the M6 to the west and by Kingstanding Road to the east.	We received over 250 submissions that commented on the Oscott area during the consultation on our draft recommendations including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposals. Having considered the evidence received, we are content that our proposed Oscott ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a clear reflection of community identity in this area. We do not propose any amendments to this ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Perry Beeches</b>	1	-5%	Perry Beeches ward is bounded by the M6 to the east and by Walsall Road to the west.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 10 submissions that commented on our proposals for the Perry Beeches area. A number of respondents suggested combining our proposed Perry Beeches and Perry Hall wards into a two-member ward. Having considered these submissions we do not consider that the evidence put forward was persuasive and we are content that our proposed Perry Beeches ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a clear reflection of community identity in this area. We therefore do not propose any amendments to this ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Perry Common</b>	1	1%	This ward includes the Perry Common area and is bounded by College Road (A453) to the north.	We received over 240 submissions that commented on the Perry Common area during the consultation on our draft recommendations including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposals. Having considered the evidence received we are proposing a minor amendment to the boundary between Perry Common and Stockland Green to ensure that the entirety of Witton Lakes Park is included in the Stockland Green ward. We did not consider that we received any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals to make any further changes in this area and we therefore do

				not propose any other amendments to this ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Perry Hall</b>	1	-1%	This ward is bounded by Walsall Road to the east and by the Chase railway line to the west.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 10 submissions that commented on our proposals for the Perry Hall area. A number of respondents suggested combining our proposed Perry Hall and Perry Beeches wards to form a two-member ward. Having considered these submissions we do not consider that the evidence put forward was persuasive and we are content that our proposed Perry Hall ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a clear reflection of community identity in this area. Accordingly, we do not propose any amendments to this ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Pype Hayes</b>	1	-8%	This ward includes the Pype Hayes area and is bounded by Kingsbury Road (A38) to the south and by Plants Brook to the north.	<p>We received over 240 submissions regarding the Pype Hayes area during the consultation on our draft recommendations including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposals. Based on the evidence received we propose one minor amendment to Pype Hayes ward.</p> <p>In the west of the ward, we have amended the boundary so that it follows Holly Lane, including the residents to the west of Holly Lane in our Erdington ward. As well as reflecting community ties we consider that this amendment also provides a clearer and more identifiable boundary between our Pype Hayes and Erdington wards.</p> <p>We did receive a number of other alternative proposals, most notably to the north-west of our proposed Pype Hayes ward where a number of respondents suggested that the area immediately to the north of Chester Road should also be included in the Erdington ward rather than in Pype Hayes.</p>

				<p>We have examined the possibility of including this area in our revised two-member Erdington ward. Our investigations indicated that removing any further electors from our Pype Hayes ward would result in a poor level of electoral equality. We therefore do not propose any further changes to our Pype Hayes ward under our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Stockland Green</b>	2	-11%	<p>Stockland Green ward is bounded by the M6 to the west, by Gravelly Hill to the east and by Short Heath Road to the north.</p>	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 300 submissions that commented on the Stockland Green area including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposals. Having considered the evidence received we propose two amendments to the Stockland Green ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the north-east of the ward we have amended the boundary between Stockland Green and Erdington so that it follows Summer Road and the railway line to the south of Erdington railway station. This results in including some key Erdington landmarks such as Erdington Abbey in the Erdington ward and provides an improved reflection of community identity in that area.</p> <p>In the north-west of the ward we have made a minor amendment to the boundary between Stockland Green and Perry Common wards. As a result the entirety of Witton Lakes Park will be included in Stockland Green ward under our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>Whilst our proposed Stockland Green ward would have 11% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2021, we consider that there is persuasive evidence to justify such a variance and that we have struck a good balance between our statutory criteria.</p>

<b>Tyburn</b>	1	4%	Tyburn ward is bounded by the M6 to the south, by Gravelly Hill to the west and by Kingsbury Road to the north.	We received over 230 submissions regarding the Tyburn area during the consultation on our draft recommendations including a mixture of support for and opposition to our proposals. Having considered the evidence received we are content that our proposed ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a clear reflection of community identity in this area. We therefore do not propose any amendments to Tyburn ward under our further draft recommendations.
---------------	---	----	---	---

### South-east of city centre

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Acocks Green</b>	2	9%	Acocks Green ward is bounded by Warwick & Birmingham Canal to the north, the A4040 to the west and Lakey Lane to the south.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 60 submissions in regards to the Acocks Green area. The majority of respondents opposed our draft recommendations on the basis that the northern boundary of the ward divided the Acocks Green community in following the Chiltern Main Line. Having visited the area on our second tour of the city we accepted this view and we therefore examined the alternative proposals put forward to us and whether we could create an Acocks Green ward that would be more reflective of the Acocks Green community.</p> <p>Under our further draft recommendations our revised ward incorporates the historic core of Acocks Green that lies on both sides of the railway line and is bounded by the A4040 to the west. We are content that the ward boundaries used are clear and identifiable and that our alternative proposal also provides a reasonable level of electoral equality. Based on the evidence put forward to us, we believe that this ward is</p>

				more reflective of community identity in this part of the city. We therefore welcome comments on our further draft proposal for Acocks Green.
<b>Balsall Heath</b>	1	-4%	This ward includes the community of Balsall Heath and is bounded by the A4540 to the north and by Cromer Road to the south.	<p>We received over 470 submissions that commented on this part of the city during consultation on our draft recommendations with the vast majority of them opposed to our draft recommendations. We have therefore made some significant amendments to our proposals in this area.</p> <p>As part of our draft recommendations we proposed a two-member Balsall Heath &amp; Cannon Hill ward. Based on the evidence received during our consultation it was clear that this proposal did not reflect community identity in this part of Birmingham. As a result we propose a single-member Balsall Heath ward as part of our further draft recommendations. We did receive a number of submissions that suggested that Balsall Heath ward should extend to the north and/or to the east; however, we did not receive any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals. We welcome comments on our proposed single-member Balsall Heath ward.</p>
<b>Billesley</b>	2	-4%	This ward is bounded by Alcester Road South to the west and by the Dingles to the east.	<p>In response to the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 30 submissions that commented on our proposals for the Billesley area including some support for our proposed two-member ward. Having considered the evidence received we have proposed a minor amendment to the northern boundary of the ward as a result of changes to ward boundaries in the Moseley area.</p> <p>Under our further draft recommendations the northern boundary of Billesley ward runs along Swanshurst Lane, incorporating Swanshurst Park and the residential area to the east of the park into Billesley ward. We consider that this</p>

				provides a clear and identifiable boundary and an improved reflection of community identity in this area.
<b>Hall Green North</b>	2	5%	Hall Green North ward is bounded by the authority boundary to the east and the River Cole to the west.	<p>We received over 330 submissions in total that commented on the Hall Green area during the consultation on our draft recommendations. Whilst we did receive some support for our proposals, most of the submissions that we received objected to our proposals, particularly in regard to our single-member Hall Green North and Tyseley wards.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence gathered during the consultation and having re-visited the area during our second tour of the city, we have made some amendments as part of our further draft recommendations. Firstly, we have combined our two single-member wards in this area to form a two-member Hall Green North ward. We consider that in doing so we have avoided dividing part of the Hall Green community along the railway line which we are content does not act as a barrier between those on either side of it.</p> <p>In the north-east of the ward we have made a slight amendment to the boundary between our revised Hall Green North ward and our new Tyseley &amp; Hay Mills ward. Under our further draft recommendations the boundary between these two wards runs to the west of the Shaftmoor Industrial Estate.</p> <p>Based on the evidence received we consider that this revised Hall Green North ward provides an improved balance between our statutory criteria, not least in providing a better reflection of community identity.</p>
<b>Hall Green South</b>	1	6%	Hall Green South ward is bounded by the authority	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 330 submissions in total that commented on

			boundary to the south and east and the River Cole to the west.	<p>the Hall Green area, most of which were made in regard to our single-member Hall Green North and Tyseley wards.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence gathered during the consultation and having re-visited the area during our second tour of the city, we are content that our Hall Green South ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria. Whilst we did receive some alternative proposals for the southern part of Hall Green, we did not consider that they were persuasively evidenced to justify any changes under our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Highter's Heath</b>	1	6%	This ward contains the community of Highter's Heath, bounded by the Stratford-upon-Avon Canal to the north and Alcester Road South to the west, with the authority boundary to the east and south.	We received seven submissions that commented on our Highter's Heath ward during the consultation on our draft recommendations. Having considered the submissions received we are content that our proposed ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria. Accordingly, we do not propose any amendments to Highter's Heath ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>King's Heath</b>	2	-4%	This ward contains the community of King's Heath and the park of that name and is bounded by Alcester Road South to the east.	<p>Our draft recommendations for this area comprised two-single-member wards of King's Heath and Brandwood. During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 270 submissions that commented on this area. Based on the evidence received we have made some significant amendments to this area under our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>Firstly, we have combined our Brandwood and King's Heath wards to form a two-member ward. The evidence that we received suggested that this would provide a more accurate reflection of the King's Heath community.</p>

				<p>Additionally, we have amended the boundary between Moseley and King's Heath wards. Under our further draft recommendations the boundary between these two wards runs along Springfield Road and School Road. As a result the residential area that lies between these roads and Moseley Golf Club, as well as the golf club itself, are part of our revised Moseley ward. We consider that these amendments use clear and identifiable boundaries and provide an improved reflection of community identity in this area whilst also resulting in a good level of electoral equality.</p>
<b>Monyhull</b>	1	2%	<p>Monyhull ward is bounded by Alcester Road South to the east and by Broad Meadow Lane, with the authority boundary to the south.</p>	<p>We received seven submissions that commented on the Monyhull area during the consultation on our draft recommendations. Having considered the submissions received we are content that our proposed ward uses clear and identifiable boundaries and provides a clear reflection of community identity in this area. We therefore do not propose any amendments to Monyhull ward under our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Moseley</b>	2	8%	<p>This ward is bounded by Yardley Wood Road to the east and by Brighton Road and Taunton Road to the north.</p>	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 460 submissions in regard to our proposals for the Moseley area. Having considered the evidence received we are proposing a significantly different warding pattern for the area as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>Under our draft recommendations, we proposed a single-member Moseley ward which many respondents considered did not provide an accurate reflection of the Moseley community. We received a number of alternative proposals for the area and we have based our revised two-member ward on these proposals. Our proposed two-member ward reunites the centre of Moseley into one ward and also incorporates a number of other residential areas that were</p>

				<p>previously included in our Stirchley, Balsall Heath &amp; Cannon Hill, Sparkhill and King's Heath wards. The revised ward also includes Moseley Bog and Moseley Golf Club, neither of which were included in our original Moseley ward.</p> <p>We consider that, based on the evidence received, our revised two-member Moseley ward provides a vastly improved reflection of community identity in this area whilst also balancing our other two statutory criteria.</p>
<b>Sparkhill</b>	2	-7%	<p>Sparkhill ward is bounded by Yardley Wood Road to the west, by the River Cole to the east and by Wake Green Road to the south.</p>	<p>We received over 260 submissions that commented on the Sparkhill area during the consultation on our draft recommendations. Based on the evidence received during consultation we have made a number of amendments to our proposals for the Sparkhill area.</p> <p>Under our draft recommendations we proposed two single-member wards of Sparkhill North and Sparkhill South. We received a number of alternative proposals for this area and having considered the evidence we have included the area that lies between Swanshurst Lane and Wake Green Road, including Moseley Bog, into our revised Moseley ward. We have also included the area to the south of Swanshurst Lane into Billesley ward. As a consequence of these changes we have included a significant number of electors from what was our Sparkhill South ward.</p> <p>As a result we have combined the remainder of our Sparkhill South ward with our Sparkhill North ward to create a two-member Sparkhill ward as part of our further draft recommendations. We consider that, based on the evidence received, these amendments provide a good balance</p>

				between our statutory criteria. We welcome comments on this proposal as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>Tyseley &amp; Hay Mills</b>	1	1%	This ward runs from York Road in the south to Hob Moor Road in the north and comprises the communities of Tyseley and Hay Mills.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 60 submissions in regard to our proposals for this part of Birmingham. Having considered the evidence received we are proposing a significantly different warding pattern for the area as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>Under our draft recommendations the area to the north of the railway line was included in our single-member Yardley West ward whilst the area to the south of the railway line was included in our two-member Acocks Green ward. We have made some significant amendments to our proposals for Acocks Green, using the A4040 as the western boundary of the ward. As a result we have decided to combine the communities of Tyseley and Hay Mills to form a single-member ward. Having visited the area during our second tour of Birmingham, we consider that this and the neighbouring wards provide a better balance between our statutory criteria in the south-west of the city. We welcome comments on this proposal as part of our further draft recommendations.</p>

## South-west of city centre

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Allens Cross</b>	1	0%	Allens Cross ward is bounded by the A38 to the east and by Shenley Lane to the north.	We received 13 submissions that commented on the Allens Cross area during the consultation on our draft recommendations. Having considered the submissions received we are content that our proposed ward strikes a good balance between our statutory criteria in this area. We therefore do not propose any amendments to Allens Cross ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Bartley Green</b>	2	5%	This ward contains the Bartley Green community and is bounded by Bourn Brook to the north and by Shenley Lane and Barnes Hill to the east. The authority boundary lies to the south and east.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 17 submissions that commented on our Bartley Green ward. Having considered the evidence received, we propose one minor amendment to this ward. In the north east of the ward we propose that the boundary should follow Bourn Brook to where the brook meets California Way. As a result the residential properties on Dunnigan Road and its adjoining roads will be included in Bartley Green ward rather than in Weoley & Selly Oak ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>Bournbrook &amp; Selly Park</b>	2	3%	Bournbrook & Selly Park is bounded by Bourn Brook to the north, by the Cross-City railway line to the west and by the River Rea to the east.	We received over 60 submissions that commented on our Bournbrook & Selly Park ward including both support for and opposition to our proposals. Over 45 of these submissions argued that this area should be divided into two single-member wards, whilst a number of submissions expressed explicit support for our proposed two-member wards and the joining of the communities of Bournbrook and Selly Park.  In formulating our further draft recommendations we did examine the possibility of two single-member wards; however, we were unable to identify a boundary that didn't

				result in the division of the Bournbrook community between wards. Accordingly, we consider that our two-member Bournbrook & Selly Park ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria and we do not propose any amendments to this ward as part of our further draft recommendations.
<b>Bournville &amp; Cotteridge</b>	2	-1%	This ward contains the communities of Bournville and Cotteridge and is bounded by the A38 to the west and by the Cross-City railway line to the east and south.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 24 submissions that commented on our proposed Bournville & Cotteridge ward. Having considered the evidence received, we are proposing a minor amendment to the western boundary of the ward as part of our further draft recommendations. Our proposed amendment means that the boundary between Bournville & Cotteridge and Northfield wards runs through Victoria Common, placing part of the common as well as the entirety of the Northfield shopping centre in Northfield ward.
<b>Frankley Great Park</b>	1	8%	This ward includes the entirety of the parish of Frankley and some additional residential areas to the south and east of the parish.	In response to our draft recommendations we received 13 submissions that commented on our proposed Frankley ward. We did not receive any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals for the ward; however, we did receive a number of alternative proposed ward names. Having considered the evidence received, we have decided to rename this ward Frankley Great Park as part of our further draft recommendations. We do not propose any amendments to the boundaries of the ward.
<b>King's Norton North</b>	1	2%	This ward includes the community of King's Norton and is bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the north.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 19 submissions that commented on King's Norton North including some support for our proposals. Having considered the evidence received, we are proposing one minor amendment to the south-western boundary of the ward as part of our further draft recommendations.

				We received a number of submissions arguing that King's Park West should be included in a King's Norton ward. We have therefore amended the boundary so that it runs to the west of King's Park West. As a result the road is now included in our King's Norton North ward, which provides an improved reflection of community identity and a more identifiable boundary. We do not propose any further changes to King's Norton North ward under our further draft recommendations.
<b>King's Norton South</b>	1	0%	King's Norton South ward includes the southern part of King's Norton and is bounded by the authority boundary to the south and east with Parson's Hill to the north.	We received 10 submissions in response to our draft recommendations for this area. Under the draft recommendations we had named this ward Hawkesley. Having considered the evidence received during our consultation, we have decided to rename this ward King's Norton South as part of our further draft recommendations. We did not receive any persuasively evidenced alternative proposals for the boundaries of this ward and we therefore do not propose to make any amendments in that regard.
<b>Longbridge &amp; Rubery Rednal</b>	1	2%	This ward is at the southern edge of the authority, bounded by Callow Brook to the north.	We received 11 submissions that commented on our draft recommendations for this area. Most of the submissions related to the name of the ward with the loss of the name Longbridge from the political map being cited by most respondents. We therefore propose renaming our Rednal & Rubery ward to Longbridge & Rubery Rednal as part of our further draft recommendations. In addition, we propose a minor amendment to the north-eastern boundary of the ward. We have moved part of the boundary that ran along Longbridge Lane slightly further to the north, so that the new development on either side of Devon Way is included in our Longbridge & Rubery Rednal ward under our further draft recommendations.

<b>Northfield</b>	1	2%	This ward is bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the east and Callow Brook to the south.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 20 submissions that commented on this ward. Having considered the evidence received, we are proposing one minor amendment to the north-eastern boundary of the ward as part of our further draft recommendations. Our proposed amendment means that the boundary between Northfield and Bournville &amp; Cotteridge wards runs through Victoria Common, including part of the common as well as the entirety of the Northfield shopping centre in Northfield ward.</p> <p>We also propose a change to the name of this ward. Under the draft recommendations this ward was named Northfield West; however, given the change of name to our Northfield East ward we have named this ward Northfield under our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Quinton</b>	2	-2%	Quinton ward is bounded by the authority boundary to the north and west and by Woodgate Valley Country Park to the south.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 16 submissions that commented on our proposals for the Quinton area including some support for our proposed ward. We did not receive any persuasively evidenced proposals to justify amending our Quinton ward and we are content that the ward strikes a good balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore do not propose any amendments to Quinton ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Stirchley</b>	1	-1%	Stirchley ward is bounded by Dad's Lane to the north with the Cross-City railway line to the west.	<p>We received over 240 submissions that commented on our proposals for the Stirchley area, with the vast majority made in regard to the northern part of the ward. Based on the evidence received we have amended the northern boundary of this ward as part of our further draft recommendations. The northern boundary of the ward now runs along Dad's Lane, with the area to the north becoming part of our revised</p>

				Moseley ward. We consider that this provides a better reflection of the community identity of this area as well as resulting in a better level of electoral equality for Stirchley.
<b>Weoley &amp; Selly Oak</b>	2	4%	This ward is bounded by Shenley Lane and Barnes Hill to the west, by Bourn Brook to the north and by the A38 to the east.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 30 submissions that commented on our proposed Weoley ward. We are proposing one minor change to our Weoley ward as part of our further draft recommendations. We have amended the boundary in the north-west of the ward so that it runs along Stonehouse Lane. As a result part of the residential area to the north of Stonehouse Lane has been included in our revised Harborne ward, with part of this area becoming part of our revised Bartley Green ward. Based on the evidence received we consider that this provides a better reflection of community identity in this area.</p> <p>In addition, we propose to change the name of this ward. Under our draft recommendations, we used the name Weoley; however, we received over 10 submissions that argued that the name Selly Oak should be retained in this area. We have decided to rename this ward Weoley &amp; Selly Oak as part of our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>West Heath North</b>	1	-4%	This ward is bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the west and by West Heath park to the east.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 20 submissions that commented on this area. Having considered the evidence received, we are content that the ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria and uses clear and identifiable boundaries. We did receive five submissions that argued that West Heath North would be a more appropriate name for this ward than Northfield East. We have therefore amended the name of this ward as part of our further draft recommendations.

<b>West Heath South</b>	1	-5%	West Heath ward is bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the west and by King's Park West to the east.	<p>We received over 20 submissions that commented on our proposed West Heath ward during the consultation on our draft recommendations. Having considered the evidence received, we do propose one minor amendment to the north-eastern boundary of this ward. We received a number of submissions arguing that King's Park West should be included in a King's Norton ward rather than in West Heath. We have therefore amended the boundary in the north-east of the ward so that it runs to the west of King's Park West and as a result the road is now included in our King's Norton North ward.</p> <p>We have also made a change to the name of this ward. Under our draft recommendations this ward was named West Heath; however, based on the submissions we received we have amended the name of our Northfield East ward to West Heath North and our West Heath ward to West Heath South.</p>
-------------------------	---	-----	--	---

### Sutton Coldfield

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Sutton Four Oaks</b>	1	1%	This ward includes the Four Oaks area of Sutton Coldfield as well as the northern part of Sutton Park Nature Reserve.	We received over 130 submissions in regard to the Sutton Coldfield area during the consultation on our draft recommendations, over 50 of which commented on our Sutton Four Oaks ward. Having considered the evidence received in regard to Sutton Four Oaks we propose two amendments to the ward as part of our further draft recommendations.

				<p>Under our draft recommendations we included the entirety of Sutton Park into our proposed Sutton Four Oaks ward. In response we received over 35 submissions arguing that the park should be divided between the wards that surround it. Based on the evidence received, we have amended the southern boundary of Sutton Four Oaks ward so that the southern part of the park is included in the wards of Sutton Trinity and Sutton Vesey.</p> <p>In the east of the ward we have made a slight amendment to the boundary so that it now follows the railway line where it intersects with Belwell Lane, which we consider provides a clearer and more identifiable boundary between Sutton Four Oaks and Sutton Mere Green.</p>
<b>Sutton Mere Green</b>	1	6%	This ward comprises the Mere Green area of Sutton Coldfield.	<p>We received over 130 submissions in regard to the Sutton Coldfield area during the consultation on our draft recommendations, over 15 of which commented on our Sutton Mere Green ward. Having considered the evidence received in regard to Sutton Mere Green we propose two minor amendments to the ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the east of the ward, we have made a minor amendment to the boundary with Sutton Roughley ward which, under our draft recommendations, ran along Little Sutton Lane. We have moved the boundary slightly to the east so that all residents on Little Sutton Lane are included in our Sutton Mere Green ward.</p> <p>In the west of the ward, we have made a slight amendment to the boundary so that it now follows the railway line where it intersects with Belwell Lane, which we consider provides a</p>

				<p>clearer and more identifiable boundary between Sutton Mere Green and neighbouring Sutton Four Oaks.</p> <p>We consider that these changes provide an improved balance between our statutory criteria in this part of Sutton Coldfield based on the evidence received during our consultation.</p>
<b>Sutton Reddicap</b>	1	1%	This ward comprises the Reddicap area of Sutton Coldfield.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 130 submissions that commented on our proposals for Sutton Coldfield, including over 30 that commented specifically on our Sutton Reddicap ward. Based on the evidence received and on observations made during our second tour of Birmingham, we propose an amendment to the northern boundary of the ward.</p> <p>We received over 15 submissions that argued that our proposals for this area resulted in the division of the Whitehouse Common community. Based on the evidence received, we have amended the northern boundary of this ward so that it runs along Rectory Road and, where necessary, along the backs of the houses on Rectory Road. As a result the residential area that lies to the north of Rectory Road is no longer divided between two different wards and, having visited the area, we consider that this arrangement provides a better reflection of community identity in this area.</p>
<b>Sutton Roughley</b>	1	9%	This ward contains the Roughley area of Sutton Coldfield as well as the residential area of Whitehouse Common.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 130 submissions that commented on our proposals for Sutton Coldfield, including over 20 that commented specifically on our Sutton Roughley ward. Having considered the evidence received and based on observations made during our second tour of Birmingham</p>

				<p>we propose a number of amendments to this ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the west of the ward, we have made a minor amendment to the boundary with Sutton Mere Green ward which, under our draft recommendations, ran along Little Sutton Lane. We have moved the boundary slightly to the east so that all residents on Little Sutton Lane will be included in our Sutton Mere Green ward.</p> <p>In the south-west of the ward we have made a minor amendment to the boundary with Sutton Trinity ward which, under our draft recommendations, ran along Bedford Road. We have moved the boundary slightly to the east so that all residents on Bedford Road are included in our Sutton Trinity ward.</p> <p>Finally, we received over 15 submissions that argued that our proposals for this area resulted in the division of the Whitehouse Common community. Based on the evidence received we have amended the southern boundary of our Sutton Roughley ward so that it runs along Rectory Road and, where necessary, along the backs of the houses on Rectory Road. As a result the residential area that lies to the north of Rectory Road is no longer divided between two different wards and, having visited the area, we consider that this arrangement provides a better reflection of community identity in this area.</p>
<b>Sutton Trinity</b>	1	3%	This ward comprises Sutton Coldfield town centre as well as the Maney area of the town.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 130 submissions in regard to the Sutton Coldfield area, over 20 of which commented on our

				<p>proposed Sutton Maney ward. Based on the evidence received we propose a number of amendments to this ward.</p> <p>Firstly, we received a number of submissions that suggested that our Sutton Maney ward be renamed Sutton Trinity to reflect the historic ties to that name. We have therefore adopted the name Sutton Trinity for this ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the north-east of the ward, we have made a minor amendment to the boundary with Sutton Roughley ward which, under our draft recommendations, ran along Bedford Road. We have moved the boundary slightly to the east so that all residents on Bedford Road are included in Sutton Trinity ward.</p> <p>In the south of the ward, we have amended the boundary in order to include the properties on Beeches Walk and Driffold as well as the Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls in Sutton Trinity ward. Slightly to the east we have moved the boundary to the north to avoid dividing Maney Hill Road, which is included in our Sutton Wylde Green ward in its entirety.</p> <p>Finally, under our draft recommendations we included the entirety of Sutton Park into our proposed Sutton Four Oaks ward. In response we received over 35 submissions arguing that the park should be divided between the wards that surround it. Based on the evidence received we have amended the western boundary of the ward so that it incorporates part of Sutton Park.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				We consider that these changes provide an improved balance between our statutory criteria in this part of Sutton Coldfield based on the evidence received during our consultation.
<b>Sutton Vesey</b>	2	5%	This ward comprises the Boldmere and Banners Gate communities, bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the east and the authority boundary to the west.	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 130 submissions in regard to the Sutton Coldfield area, over 50 of which commented on this area. In the east of Sutton Coldfield we are proposing some significant amendments to our draft recommendations.</p> <p>As part of our draft recommendations we proposed a single-member Sutton Parkside ward and a single-member Sutton Boldmere. We received over 25 submissions that argued that these two wards should be combined to form a two-member Sutton Vesey ward. Having considered the evidence received and having re-visited the area during our second tour of the city, we are content to recommend a two-member Sutton Vesey ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>We have also amended the northern boundary of this ward. Under our draft recommendations we included the entirety of Sutton Park into our proposed Sutton Four Oaks ward. In response we received over 35 submissions arguing that the park should be divided between the wards that surround it. Based on the evidence received we have amended the boundary in this area so that the southern part of Sutton Park lies within our Sutton Vesey ward.</p>
<b>Sutton Walmley &amp; Minworth</b>	2	5%	This ward comprises the Sutton Coldfield communities of Walmley and Minworth.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 130 submissions that commented on our proposals for Sutton Coldfield, 15 of which commented specifically on our proposals for Sutton Walmley & Minworth.

				<p>Based on the evidence received we propose one minor amendment to this ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the north-west of the ward we have moved the boundary slightly to the east, in order that Bishop Walsh Catholic School is included in our Sutton Wylde Green ward, a change which does not affect any electors. We have not made any further amendments to Sutton Walmley &amp; Minworth ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Sutton Wylde Green</b>	1	1%	<p>This ward contains the Wylde Green area of Sutton Coldfield, bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the west and Maney Hill Road to the north.</p>	<p>During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 130 submissions that commented on our proposals for Sutton Coldfield, 15 of which commented specifically on our proposals for Sutton Wylde Green. Based on the evidence received, we propose two minor amendments to this ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In the north-east of the ward, we have moved the boundary slightly to the east, in order that Bishop Walsh Catholic School is included in our Sutton Wylde Green ward, a change which does not affect any electors.</p> <p>Additionally, in the north of the ward we have amended the boundary in order to include the properties on Beeches Walk and Driffold as well as the Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls in Sutton Trinity ward. Slightly to the east we have moved the boundary to the north to avoid dividing Maney Hill Road, which is included in our Sutton Wylde Green ward in its entirety. We consider that these changes provide an improved balance between our statutory criteria in this part</p>

				of Sutton Coldfield based on the evidence received during our consultation.
--	--	--	--	---

# Conclusions

49 Table 1 shows the impact of our further draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Further draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	101	101
Number of electoral wards	71	71
Average number of electors per councillor	7,215	8,053
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	13	2
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

**Further draft recommendation**  
 Birmingham City Council should comprise 101 councillors serving 71 wards representing 41 single-member wards and 30 two-member wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

**Mapping**  
**Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Birmingham City Council.  
**You can also view our further draft recommendations for Birmingham on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lqbce.org.uk>**

## Parish electoral arrangements

50 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

51 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Birmingham City Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to

conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

52 On the basis of Birmingham City Council making a Reorganisation of community governance order in December 2015 establishing a town council in Sutton Coldfield and as a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Sutton Coldfield. We have given consideration to our proposed ward boundaries and the existing ward boundaries, but have not taken into account the existing parish ward boundaries. We therefore welcome comments on these parish arrangements.

53 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for the new Sutton Coldfield parish.

**Further draft recommendation**

Sutton Coldfield Town Council should comprise 24 councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Four Oaks (returning two members), Mere Green (returning three members), Reddicap (returning two members), Roughley (returning three members), Trinity (returning two members), Vesey (returning five members), Walmley & Minworth (returning five members) and Wylde Green (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.



## Appendix A

**Table A1: Further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Acocks Green	2	15,887	7,944	10%	17,484	8,742	9%
2	Allens Cross	1	7,664	7,664	6%	8,018	8,018	0%
3	Alum Rock	2	15,461	7,731	7%	17,494	8,747	9%
4	Aston	2	14,133	7,067	-2%	15,576	7,788	-3%
5	Balsall Heath	1	6,824	6,824	-5%	7,730	7,730	-4%
6	Bartley Green	2	15,719	7,860	9%	16,905	8,452	5%
7	Billesley	2	14,565	7,283	1%	15,431	7,715	-4%
8	Birchfield	1	6,491	6,491	-10%	7,688	7,688	-5%
9	Bordesley & Highgate	1	6,803	6,803	-6%	7,393	7,393	-8%
10	Bordesley Green	1	6,898	6,898	-4%	7,470	7,470	-7%
11	Bournbrook & Selly Park	2	12,951	6,476	-10%	16,600	8,300	3%
12	Bournville & Cotteridge	2	14,557	7,279	1%	15,983	7,991	-1%

**Table A1 (cont.): Further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
13	Bromford & Hodge Hill	2	14,008	7,004	-3%	15,162	7,581	-6%
14	Castle Vale	1	6,740	6,740	-7%	7,408	7,408	-8%
15	Edgbaston	2	9,816	4,908	-32%	15,334	7,667	-5%
16	Erdington	2	14,905	7,453	3%	17,146	8,573	6%
17	Frankley Great Park	1	7,826	7,826	8%	8,670	8,670	8%
18	Garretts Green	1	6,741	6,741	-7%	7,435	7,435	-8%
19	Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	2	15,227	7,614	6%	17,041	8,521	6%
20	Hall Green North	2	15,184	7,592	5%	16,951	8,476	5%
21	Hall Green South	1	7,911	7,911	10%	8,523	8,523	6%
22	Handsworth	1	7,145	7,145	-1%	7,851	7,851	-3%
23	Handsworth Wood	2	13,837	6,919	-4%	15,755	7,878	-2%
24	Harborne	2	16,275	8,138	13%	17,832	8,916	11%
25	Heartlands	1	7,036	7,036	-2%	8,079	8,079	0%

**Table A1 (cont.): Further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
26	Highters's Heath	1	8,152	8,152	13%	8,503	8,503	6%
27	Holyhead	1	7,022	7,022	-3%	7,761	7,761	-4%
28	King's Heath	2	13,849	6,925	-4%	15,510	7,755	-4%
29	King's Norton North	1	7,752	7,752	7%	8,221	8,221	2%
30	King's Norton South	1	8,024	8,024	11%	8,070	8,070	0%
31	Kingstanding	2	14,289	7,145	-1%	15,456	7,728	-4%
32	Ladywood	2	12,310	6,155	-15%	15,389	7,695	-4%
33	Longbridge & Rubery Rednal	1	7,494	7,494	4%	8,180	8,180	2%
34	Lozells	1	6,364	6,364	-12%	7,903	7,903	-2%
35	Monyhull	1	7,944	7,944	10%	8,199	8,199	2%
36	Moseley	2	15,919	7,960	10%	17,382	8,691	8%
37	Nechells	1	5,945	5,945	-18%	8,617	8,617	7%

**Table A1 (cont.): Further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
38	Newtown	1	5,844	5,844	-19%	7,763	7,763	-4%
39	North Edgbaston	2	13,244	6,622	-8%	15,903	7,951	-1%
40	Northfield	1	7,696	7,696	7%	8,236	8,236	2%
41	Oscott	2	14,757	7,379	2%	15,629	7,815	-3%
42	Perry Beeches	1	6,893	6,893	-4%	7,621	7,621	-5%
43	Perry Common	1	7,116	7,116	-1%	8,169	8,169	1%
44	Perry Hall	1	7,500	7,500	4%	7,957	7,957	-1%
45	Pype Hayes	1	7,232	7,232	0%	7,404	7,404	-8%
46	Quinton	2	14,564	7,282	1%	15,751	7,875	-2%
47	Shard End	1	8,443	8,443	17%	8,663	8,663	8%
48	Sheldon	2	14,187	7,094	-2%	15,637	7,818	-3%
49	Small Heath	2	12,793	6,397	-11%	14,773	7,387	-8%
50	Soho & Jewellery Quarter	2	13,131	6,566	-9%	14,980	7,490	-7%

**Table A1 (cont.): Further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
51	South Yardley	1	7,237	7,237	0%	7,792	7,792	-3%
52	Sparkbrook	2	14,652	7,326	2%	16,136	8,068	0%
53	Sparkhill	2	13,109	6,555	-9%	15,005	7,503	-7%
54	Stirchley	1	7,290	7,290	1%	7,987	7,987	-1%
55	Stockland Green	2	13,497	6,749	-6%	14,270	7,135	-11%
56	Sutton Four Oaks	1	7,660	7,660	6%	8,129	8,129	1%
57	Sutton Mere Green	1	8,186	8,186	13%	8,524	8,524	6%
58	Sutton Reddicap	1	7,480	7,480	4%	8,133	8,133	1%
59	Sutton Roughley	1	8,664	8,664	20%	8,814	8,814	9%
60	Sutton Trinity	1	7,335	7,335	2%	8,274	8,274	3%
61	Sutton Vesey	2	15,940	7,970	10%	16,876	8,438	5%
62	Sutton Walmley & Minworth	2	13,187	6,594	-9%	16,891	8,445	5%
63	Sutton Wylde Green	1	7,555	7,555	5%	8,123	8,123	1%

**Table A1 (cont.): Further draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council**

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
64 Tyburn	1	7,525	7,525	4%	8,350	8,350	4%
65 Tyseley & Hay Mills	1	7,537	7,537	4%	8,153	8,153	1%
66 Ward End	1	7,562	7,562	5%	8,640	8,640	7%
67 Weoley & Selly Oak	2	15,479	7,740	7%	16,824	8,412	4%
68 West Heath North	1	7,076	7,076	-2%	7,725	7,725	-4%
69 West Heath South	1	7,378	7,378	2%	7,629	7,629	-5%
70 Yardley East	1	7,990	7,990	11%	8,416	8,416	5%
71 Yardley West & Stechford	1	7,323	7,323	1%	8,075	8,075	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>728,730</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>813,401</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,215</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,053</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Birmingham City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

# Appendix B

## Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/west-midlands/west-midlands/birmingham>

### Local authority

- Mr P. Wright (Democratic Services)

### Political groups

- Birmingham City Council Conservative Group
- Birmingham City Council Labour Group
- Birmingham City Council Liberal Democrat Group
- Erdington Conservative Association
- Sutton Coldfield Conservative Association

### Members of Parliament

- Mr R. Burden MP
- Mr J. Dromey MP
- Ms G. Stuart MP
- Mr R. Godsiff MP
- Mr S. McCabe MP
- Rt Hon. Mr A. Mitchell MP
- Ms J. Phillips MP

### Members of the House of Lords

- Lord Hunt
- Lord Bhattacharyya
- Lord Whitby of Harborne

### Councillors

- Councillor D. Alden (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor J. Alden (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor R. Alden (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor B. Beauchamp (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor M. Bennett (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor B. Bowles (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor M. Bridle (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor S. Burden (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor L. Collin (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor M. Cornish (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor I. Cruise (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor N. Eustace (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor E. Freeman (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor A. Hardie (Birmingham City Council)

- Councillor R. Harmer (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor J. Hunt (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor T. Huxtable (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor M. Idrees (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor K. Jenkins (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor M. Jenkins (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor C. Jones (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor M. Mahmood (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor K. McCarthy (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor G. Moore (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor P. Osborn (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor J. O'Shea (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor D. Pears (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor G. Sambrook (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillors A. Bore, K. Hartley & C. Rice
- Councillor R. Storer (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor L. Trickett (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor A. Yip (Birmingham City Council)
- Councillor K. Wood (Birmingham City Council)

#### **Parish councils**

- New Frankley in Birmingham Parish Council
- Sutton Coldfield Parish Council Steering Group

#### **Local organisations**

- 103 local organisations

#### **Residents**

- 2,010 local residents

