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Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

We live closer to Erdington Village and Railway than Stockland Green!! I can walk to these locations but not Stockland Green.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jennifer Lancelott
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

The only thing that comes to mind about Tyseley is the tip. It is an industrial area with many factories that have closed down. There is no community. Hall Green is a historic area within Birmingham. I have lived in Hall Green all my life and am proud to live in a community where history is so strong, with Sarehole mill and links to Tolkein. I attend the Middle Earth Festival every year it's held at Sarehole Mill and go to the markets and events held there. Hall Green Station is a busy station with a lot of footfall and a vital link in the midlands. I used to go to a teenage reading group at Hall Green Library and spent a lot of time there as a child. My parents have lived in Hall Green for over forty years and love living here. My mother used to ride her bike around Hall Green hoping one day she could live here. The Hall Green area in Birmingham is a wonderful area and to call some of us Tyseley would split up a thriving multi cultural community that is proud to call itself Hall Green. I wasn't surprised the meeting held about this name change had over 200 in attendance. I would strongly be in favour of the Labour councillors proposal to keep Hall Green in the title of the new wards.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

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

Dear Sir,

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary changes for Hall Green to be split into three wards: Tyseley, Hall Green North and Hall Green South.

I understand that there are 3 points under consideration while conducting this exercise, namely,
1) to create wards where each councilor represents approximately the same number of voters,
2) to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities, and
3) to provide for effective and convenient local government.

However it is obvious that the proposals are being made to comply only with point 1) without any consideration given to points 2) and 3) above.

Splitting Hall Green as in the proposal will break the strong community that exists today. The proposal completely disregards important communal institutions and historical landmarks such as Sarehole Mill, where several communal festivals are held every year. It also ignores the location of educational institutions that are supported and also influence the community: South & City College, Hall Green school, Hall Green Infant and Junior School (and here please consider also that the proposed changes will potentially leave out of the catchment areas a large part of the current population of Hall Green).

A number of societies also exist which will be potentially affected: Hall Green History Society, Hall Green Photography Society and Hall Green Arts Society.

Also Hall Green station, Hall Green parade, Hall Green United Community church, Hall Green Medical Centre and will all be left completely left out of Hall Green. This shows how little thought has been put into this proposal.

Imposing such changes which break the community structure already established and will interfere rather than facilitate the provision of an effective and convenient local government (the very point that you say it needs to be considered).

Furthermore those residents that according to your proposal would be moved “out” of Hall Green will become part of the proposed Tyseley ward. Tyseley is mostly an industrial area with its own problems and local needs, that are very different from those of Hall Green. This will not help in representing the needs of current Hall Green local community neither effectively nor conveniently.

Please, I urge you to drop the current boundary changes proposal for something that really reflects, not breaks the thriving community of Hall Green.

Sincerely
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

One has to ask the question, "What are these changes designed to achieve?" If there are economic benefits, what are they? Again, if there are social benefits, what are they?

Erdington had a long history as a community. Indeed some of its landmarks, such as Erdington Abbey, have been central to its ethos. Local people have a focus on areas, schools etc, etc which are all part of the Eringle Tradition. We strongly object to the proposed boundary changes.

Yours Sincerely

Pete & Valerie Hanr

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

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

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

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

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

**Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!**
We urge the Commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham. The Erdington Ward should represent a Castle Vale Ward, a 2 member Erdington Ward, a 2 member Gravelly Hill Ward, a 2 member Kingstanding Ward, a 2 member Oscott Ward, together with Perry Common, Pype Hayes, and Stockland Green Wards.

The Erdington Ward borders should be Court Lane in the West, Sutton in the North, Pype Hayes & Holly Lane in the East and Kingsbury Road/Wood End Road, in the South.

Peter & Valerie Lane
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

I support the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together Group if changes have to be made, but as the boundaries work well at the moment why waste money altering what works well. Spend the money on better local amenities. ie library - leisure centre - local parks. All of which we use.

Yours Sincerely,
Name:
Address:
Postcode:
Email:
Phone no.
North Birmingham Community Together

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

Regarding the proposed two-Councillor ward of Bournbrook and Selly Park, it is my opinion that an alternative proposal of a ward for Bournbrook and a separate ward for Selly Park, each with one Councillor would better serve the interests of both groups of residents. Bournbrook and Selly Park are very different areas with different needs and priorities and differing demographics, housing stocks, community groups and conservation areas.

Bournbrook
- Population: Mainly transient students predominantly in rented accommodation.
- Housing: Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation.
- Community and Residents’ Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.
- Conservation Areas: None.

Selly Park
- Population: Mainly settled families and couples with a high proportion of owner occupiers.
- Housing: Mainly detached and larger terraced.
- Conservation Areas: Selly Park Conservation Area, Selly Park Avenues Conservation Area.

In terms of defining each ward, I suggest introducing an ‘internal’ boundary within the proposed two-Councillor ward, thus creating two one-Councillor wards with no wider impact. This would allow the needs of both areas to be represented with no conflict of interest at council level. Already there is encroachment by the student population on the residential areas to the detriment of the housing stock and character of Selly Park with issues of on-road parking, health and safety concerns including household refuse piling up on frontages sometimes spilling onto the pavement and unreasonable noise at night.

In summary, an independent advocate is required to represent the Selly Park residents. This proposal will result in better, more localised representation for the people of Bournbrook and Selly Park and will have no effect on the proposals for the rest of Birmingham.

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

Yours faithfully,

Christine Langrick, Selly Park owner-occupier
Dear Sirs

Further to previous submissions please find attached one additional piece of data in regard to Acocks Green, sourced by David Treadwell, Chair of Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum. This is the Parish Map of Acocks Green: we note that Parish maps can be taken into account according to your notes on submissions for Boundaries revisions.

This map supports in the main the submission put forward by Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum, a submission which I personally support.

Yours faithfully

Julia Larden
Dear Sir/Madam

I write in connection with the Boundary Commission’s draft recommendations for Birmingham. I object to the proposal to break up the present Acocks Green ward at the Chiltern Railway line on the north side, whilst the current ward boundary is at the bridge of the Union canal which run below Yardley Road. I would strongly dispute the offered justification that the proposed new ward: ‘[…] reflects community identity in this area’. Anyone who lives in Acocks Green will recognise this claim as nonsense.

This recommendation fails to understand the established community that is Acocks Green. Groups like Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum, Acocks Green Focus Group, Acocks Green History Society, Acocks Green Village Partnership and Acocks Green in Bloom contain many individuals drawn from both sides of the railway line, with the contribution from the north side being very strong. Local activists work together, with the same ward councillors, and attend the same ward meetings, being involved with numerous and ongoing projects and campaigns. There is great vigilance in connection with the local shopping centre known as 'The Village or 'the Green', and there have been very successful campaigns for conservation and improvement. The gold-award winning Acocks Green in Bloom team now provides floral displays and maintenance for both the village centre and Millennium Green which is in the presently excluded area in the north. The Bloom team is very actively supported by all three local councillors.

Other work includes a nearly complete community Conservation Area proposal straddling both sides of the suggested new border. These historically related roads contain many examples of distinctive architecture commissioned for newly commuting industrialists who availed themselves of the 1850 railway station.

The current recommendations would damage a close-knit community and threaten the work to protect and enhance an historic area and a strong trading centre. We also have a history of working with the Fox Hollies estate area, and this area has always supported Acocks Green centre and there is cross-working between Acocks Green in Bloom and Westley Vale Millennium Green in the north and the Friends of Fox Hollies Park and the same ward councillors. I therefore ask you to retain the present north border of Acocks Green at the clear demarcation of the canal and instead, in order to allow for the correct balancing of electoral numbers, to consider introducing a new boundary at Fox Hollies/Stockfield Road, along the line of the A4040 road placing the Yarnfield Estate area in a separate ward with the current Tyseley/ Hay Mills area as recommended by the Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum. I believe this would most reasonably reflect the area which is currently known as Acocks Green, and which takes part in Acocks Green activities. I would further point out that [REDACTED] Yardley Labour Party but that I disagree with their recommendations for the revised boundary division because I feel that this would unduly damage the cohesive unity of my suburb.
Yours faithfully

Julia Larden
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: robert lardner
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Is this some sort of joke? Moseley hall is going to be in balsall heath, Moseley village is going to be in balsall heath, Moseley park is going to be in balsall heath. Our house prices are going to be affected, moseley is a desirable area balsall heath is not. Why change something that has been the same for centuries? How much is all this going to cost and what is the reasoning behind it?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Hazel Larking  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** Neighbourhood Watch

**Comment text:**

I live in [REDACTED] and would like this to remain as Kings Norton and not West Heath. The boundary line should be in Ivy House Road. We were told by Persimmon that we would be Kings Norton. The boundary line being proposed is along a footpath which is notorious for crime. Most of the residents feel the same about this issue.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Review Officer, I’m writing to express my concern over the proposed changes to the Birmingham boundaries. As a resident of Moseley (or, the proposed Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill ward), I have specific worry about the Moseley redraw. While I understand that boundary adjustments may be necessary to improve the distribution of councillors, the current proposal seems devastatingly illogical for the following reasons: 1. The proposed changes disregard existing community boundaries — the most obvious (but by no means only) example being Moseley Village high street no longer being captured within the Moseley ward. But to have Moseley Park, Moseley Parish Church, and the Moseley Exchange cut out of the ward is confusing to say the least. 2. Shattering the geographical centre of the historic Moseley community into so many single-councillor wards will act as a barrier to cohesive decision-making across the village. This is ominous for local businesses, for community groups, and residents alike. 3. What’s bad for Moseley is bad for Birmingham: a careless decision at this junction — made for expediency, or worse — may hinder the village in its continual progress as one of the nation’s most liveable places. It is worrisome to imagine that the momentum behind Moseley’s success as a diverse, cohesive, and thriving community could be dampened by some hastily-drawn lines. Please re-think the proposal. Shannon Lattin

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Brendan Lavelle
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live in [redacted] in Moseley, Birmingham and I am writing to the Boundary Commission to express my objection to the proposed Ward boundary changes. I live right in the heart of Moseley village. It is nonsensical that the proposed change would put my central Moseley street instead in Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Ward. The centre of Moseley has to be in Moseley Ward! Furthermore, the proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines. Your decision appears to be based only on numbers, and is not taking into account all your criteria. Your current proposal would dismantle a very well-established community of place and will wreck local governance. The proposed boundary would destroy the fantastic work that the community has achieved over many years in Moseley, including the Moseley Big Plan, which was the result of collaborative working between Moseley residents, businesses and the Council. All the effort made to improve economic development in this part of the city would be destroyed. We have nationally and internationally events that take place in Moseley. It is a ‘brand’. Yet the changes want to move Moseley Park out of Moseley Ward - crazy. Similarly the Moseley Exchange, a vibrant hub of co-working and ideas, must be in Moseley Ward, and so it goes on. Moseley has an amazing number of active volunteers who work for the Moseley community to nurture and develop the place they live in and love. If Moseley is split as proposed, their workload would increase intolerably by the need to liaise with different Ward councillors and officers, thus killing off that spirit. In particular there would be problems caused for Moseley Forum, Moseley in Lights, the Moseley Exchange, the Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Park & Pool, Moseley Festival, Sustainable Moseley, Moseley Arts Market, Moseley Farmers Market, and Moseley B13 Magazine. Surely that list alone emphasises just how important Moseley is to the people who live there - the COMMUNITY- and how active a place it is thanks to the coherence of the current Ward boundary... and how it could continue to be through the alternative new boundary proposed by the 'Your Moseley – fight for it NOW' campaign.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
To Whom this may concern,

I'm writing to strongly object to the proposed changes to the borders of the Wards in Birmingham. As an Erdington resident, I'm extremely concerned that no consultation has been attempted with local residents around these proposed changes and that you are attempting to re-zone the city without the consent of the residents affected.

I am in favour of the following proposal put forward by northbirmingham altogether of:

A Pype Hayes Ward including Birches Green, a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a Perry Common Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, a two member Kingstanding Ward, a Stockland Green Ward, and a two member Oscott Ward. With an Erdington Ward which boundaries are the border of Sutton Coldfield to the North, Court Lane to the West, to the South, the traditional border with Gravelly Hill / Birches Green of Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road is used. To the east, the border is the border of Pype Hayes, enabling Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive to remain in Erdington.

I have also signed the northbirmingham altogether petition which can be found at: https://northbirmingham altogether.wordpress.com/

I urge you to please rethink this proposal and consider the residents.

regards,

Daniel Law
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Frances Lawes  
**E-mail:** 
**Postcode:** 
**Organisation Name:** 

**Comment text:**

As a resident of Moseley, I am strongly opposed to the current draft proposal by LGBCE, which would place my road (along with others known locally as the Moseley Triangle) in the Kings Heath ward. This area has long-standing historical links with Moseley, and residents regard themselves as living in Moseley rather than Kings Heath. I was born in Moseley not very far from where I live now. I have lived in and around Moseley for all my years, and when the time comes hope to die in Moseley. I know the exact window of the room in the house where I was born, as my mother pointed it out to me. I am horrified by the proposal that the area I have lived in all my life should in future be known as Kings Heath. I therefore support the submission for a two-councillor Moseley ward made by the joint Moseley community groups, who have widely consulted local residents, and include representatives with years of local experience and knowledge. I am also writing on behalf of my husband David, who although he has not lived here for as many years as I have, feels very strongly about this as well.

** Uploaded Documents: **

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam

I write in connection with the Boundary Commission’s draft recommendations for Birmingham. I object to the proposal to break up the present Acocks Green ward at the Chiltern Railway line on the north side, whilst the current ward boundary is at the bridge of the Union canal which run below Yardley Road. I would strongly dispute the offered justification that the proposed new ward: ‘[…] reflects community identity in this area’. Anyone who lives in Acocks Green will recognise this claim as nonsense.

This recommendation fails to understand the established community that is Acocks Green. Groups like Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum, Acocks Green Focus Group, Acocks Green History Society, Acocks Green Village Partnership and Acocks Green in Bloom contain many individuals drawn from both sides of the railway line, with the contribution from the north side being very strong. Local activists work together, with the same ward councillors, and attend the same ward meetings, being involved with numerous and ongoing projects and campaigns. There is great vigilance in connection with the local shopping centre known as 'The Village or 'the Green', and there have been very successful campaigns for conservation and improvement. The gold-award winning Acocks Green in Bloom team now provides floral displays and maintenance for both the village centre and Millennium Green which is in the presently excluded area in the north. The Bloom team is very actively supported by all three local councillors.

Other work includes a nearly complete community Conservation Area proposal straddling both sides of the suggested new border. These historically related roads contain many examples of distinctive architecture commissioned for newly commuting industrialists who availed themselves of the 1850 railway station.

The current recommendations would damage a close-knit community and threaten the work to protect and enhance an historic area and a strong trading centre. We also have a history of working with the Fox Hollies estate area, and this area has always supported Acocks Green centre and there is cross-working between Acocks Green in Bloom and Westley Vale Millennium Green in the north and the Friends of Fox Hollies Park and the same ward councillors. I therefore ask you to retain the present north border of Acocks Green at the clear demarcation of the canal and instead, in order to allow for the correct balancing of electoral numbers, to consider introducing a new boundary at Fox Hollies/Stockfield Road, along the line of the A4040 road placing the Yarnfield Estate area in a separate ward with the current Tyseley/ Hay Mills area as recommended by the Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum. I believe this would most reasonably reflect the area which is currently known as Acocks Green, and which takes part in Acocks Green activities. I would further point out that Yardley Labour Party but that I disagree with their recommendations for the revised boundary division because I feel that this would unduly damage the cohesive unity of my suburb.

My partner wrote this. I was going to do my version, but she has said everything that I also thought about this issue.
Yours faithfully,

Michael Lawley
Sutton Coldfield

As a resident of Four Oaks Ward, Sutton Coldfield, and a Council Tax payer to Birmingham City Council of nearly 30 years, I am writing to object to the current proposal to reduce the number of Councillors representing Sutton Coldfield to 10.

It is accepted that the overall number of Councillors is to be reduced, but the proposed reduction to 10 for our area is unfairly low, given the level of population in the area.

This is unacceptable because it will leave our area under-represented and is clearly an attempt at a political and undemocratic move by the current administration designed to increase left-wing influence on Birmingham City Council at the expense of democracy in our town.

Sutton by and large returns Conservative politicians in all elections, and it is therefore in the interests of left wing parties to undermine democracy and increase their influence on the Council by other, underhanded means. We see this methodology from Labour in national politics, and currently even within the Labour Party itself!!

The residents of Sutton Coldfield pay a disproportionately high Council Tax contribution because of the value of houses in the area. We should be over-represented in those circumstances, not under-represented. We would also by virtue of any change suffer a cut in funding and that is most unfair in the circumstances.

The Boundary Commission have proposed that, on average, councillors in Sutton Coldfield should have over 600 more electors than in Birmingham. Indeed the proposals would mean that the smallest Birmingham ward might have only 60% of the electors per councillor that we would have to accept in Sutton. Why should our area have to tolerate that outcome?

The honest and fair outcome to the calculation is clearly to place the number of Sutton Coldfield Councillors at 11.

Thank you for taking this submission into account.

Tim Lawrence
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jacky Layland
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

We do not know why or by who. The ridiculous idea to change the Yardley boundary. Is somebody trying to justify their wage by coming up with one of the most absurd ideas yet. Please LEAVE THINGS ALONE! For generations my family have been born, christened, married and buried in Yardley and would like to keep it that way.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Karen LEACH
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I don't agree with a) the entire basis for the changes being made, and how they damage our already problematic local democracy b) the boundary proposals for my own ward or c) the boundary proposals for other parts of the city. a) c) Most importantly, the entire rationale for these proposals seems flawed. With already the largest number of people per councillor in the UK, we are now having our overall number of councillors reduced. This is deeply undemocratic. We are being punished for perceived or actual council failings by being used as a guinea pig for single-councillor wards, which no other English city has opted for or had imposed on them. Although there are advantages and disadvantages to both systems, three-councillor wards gives a slight flavour of proportional representation and slows down the swing between parties, giving more co-operative politics and compromises which better reflect public opinion than strong party majorities. If Birmingham's challenges are addressed, the solution is in a thought-out, locally endorsed and considered reform, not this unfair and ill-considered imposition. Please can we be given a rethink, to save long term costs and hardship. b) In the Moseley ward, the proposal does not conform to the Boundary Commission's own priority of reflecting community identities, with Moseley Centre ("Moseley Village") being outside Moseley. This is absurd, and also causes functional problems for all community and business organisations for the part of their community that is busiest and needs most attention - its local centre - to be working across ward boundaries. Whilst I am sure no boundary will suit everyone, this is astonishingly wrong and nearly everyone I have spoken to lately says they don't care where their own house is, but feel Moseley's key places - its park, church, local centre, community 'exchange' - should be in Moseley. Likewise, Balsall Heath's park and Balsall Heath Forum should be in Balsall Heath. Although I don't have enough knowledge of the numbers to propose exact boundaries, there are a number of streets in 'grey areas' that could be shifted to make new boundaries work in population terms. For example, my own area: Chestnut Road and its environs - which are identified as Moseley in the proposals but could easily become Balsall Heath without causing any real dislocation. c) While I know less about these, I am aware there are other places where the local centre is separated from its ward in the proposals, including Erdington, and this is also problematic.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

I am concerned that the proposed Ward of Moseley excludes the centre of Moseley. As such, there is a danger that the emerging strength of Moseley will be diluted and the efforts that the community, local businesses and BCC have put into building an identifiable entity will be dismissed. Moseley has a somewhat special history and culture a large part of which is centred around the Village as we call it. To split the ward would be to deny this reality and would be present an option that lacks any face validity or rationality. Local people have a right to demand that the area in which they live has to be seen as a coherent political, social and geographically congruent area; it has to make sense. This proposal lacks an understanding of what is values within Moseley, what has been achieved and more importantly what can be sustained and developed in the future. There is almost an emotional element and argument that has to be respected and I would suggest that the overt levels of opposition this proposal presents a direct argument behind the need to reconsider this poorly conceived proposal.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

When we first bought our home we were B17_ Harborne. Although our back garden fence is the boundary for Harborne Golf Club we had to change our post code to B32_Bartley Green. This change in post codes a few years ago cost us all many thousands of pounds on the value of our properties. You are now suggesting we should change to B29 Weoley Castle. This move would further devalue our property prices by even more than the previous change. I have spoken to many residents about your proposal and I have to say it has filled our community with utter outrage and bewilderment. Our nearest shopping centre hub is, and always has been Harborne. If there was any sense in the World of Boundary changes we should be put back, where we belong in B17 Harborne. Just to finish my point. At the entrance to our road on the correct side there is a sign which reads HARBORNE. Yours faithfully Mr &Mrs D W Lealan [REDACTED]

Please don't let this happen.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Jen Leavesley  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

Not terribly impressed with changes to Erdington ward and Boldmere ward. The abbey and high street need to remain in Erdington and Boldmere Gate into Sutton Park needs to remain within Boldmere!

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Eddie Lee
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:
I support the JQNF counter proposal to put the Jewellery Quarter in to its own ward. As a resident of the Jewellery Quarter I am concerned about the consideration to merge us with Winsom Green. It should not be included with Winsom Green as they have very different requirements and needs.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Proposed Sutton Parklands and Sutton Boldmere Wards Further to the proposal to split Sutton Vesey Ward into Sutton Parklands and Sutton Boldmere, I would like to make the following comments/requests: The proposed Sutton Parklands and Sutton Boldmere Wards to be reunited as a single ward with two councillors. This ensures electoral equality as the number of electors remains consistent with the number of councillors without breaking up an already existing electoral ward. Breaking up this ward is splitting up an existing, integrated community which has been established for many years. The proximity of New Oscott to Boldmere (and vice versa) means that New Oscott residents (such as myself) use Boldmere's facilities (shops, restaurants), while Boldmere residents shop at Princess Alice Park and use Bannatyne's gym. The two areas are in reality part of the same area. Given that wards "should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities" it would be a mistake to separate the electoral wards in the proposed way. The name of Sutton Vesey should be retained for the single ward. This is a historic name that has been linked with the town since Tudor times and so is very much part of the town’s heritage. As an old town with a long history (it is mentioned in Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part 1) I would like to see the links to the past retained for present and future generations. The part of Sutton Park that is proposed to be removed from the ward and added to Four Oaks should also be retained. Banners Gate is one of the main features of the ward and is used by many of the area’s residents as their entrance to the park. I understand that local ward funding is used to provide facilities at Banners Gate and that this would be removed if this part of the park is put into Four Oaks. Many thanks for the opportunity to give my point of view.

Uploaded Documents:
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Susan Lee
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live in , Moseley and strongly object to the split of Moseley into different wards. The proposed boundary would destroy so much that the Moseley community has built up over many years. The proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines. The current proposal would dismantle a very well established community of place and will wreck local governance (local decisions by local people). The losses that would affect me most are that the centre of Moseley village must be in Moseley, Moseley Parish church and St.Columba's church must be in Moseley ward, Moseley Park must be in Moseley ward, the two conservation areas must be in Moseley ward. Moseley volunteers who help to make the place one of the best places to live in the country must not have their workload increased by the need to liaise with different ward councillors and officers. I feel most strongly about the unnecessary problems caused for Moseley in Bloom, Sustainable Moseley, Moseley Park and Pool and the Moseley markets. The proposed changes are unnecessary and arbitrary, and, would, in my opinion, produce a profound negative effect on the quality of life here.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir

I am a resident of 35 years in Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield.

I have been concerned for many years about the destructive way Birmingham City Council treats this whole area. This is apparent in so many ways from the run down state of the main town to the slow deterioration of the once lovely park.

Sutton Coldfield could be a substantial feather in Birmingham’s cap and should be used to increase the wealth, heritage, respect and standing of the City yet they choose to ignore all this for reasons beyond my comprehension and instead systematically allow and even encourage the whole town to fall into disrepair.

Now I understand you plan to reduce the number of councillors allowed to represent this area. How can you possibly consider doing this?
If you look at a map of Birmingham you will see that Sutton Coldfield is visibly approx 20% of the whole Birmingham area.

I understand that you intend to reduce the total number of councillors to 101 and that only 10 of this number will represent Sutton Coldfield. An under-representation which will undoubtedly lead to even more neglect of Sutton Coldfield by Birmingham City Councillors who for reasons known only to themselves will not be satisfied until Sutton Coldfield is reduced to a pile of rubble.

I urge your department to think again about these proposals and ensure a more fair number of Councillors are allowed to represent the town. A number of 11 or 12 would seem to be a more sensible option. Please send an officer to come and look at the way Birmingham treats Sutton Coldfield. I know I may sound melodramatic but since I moved here all those years ago I have seen how the whole place has declined and have personally witnessed derisory and negative comments made by Councillors from other parts of the City. I assure you that if Sutton Coldfield is left without true and proper representation on the main Council it’s fate will be sealed forever.

Thank you for your attention

Yours Sincerely

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

27.01.16

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have lived in Moseley all my life (over 72 years) and am extremely upset by your plans to create new boundaries and to split a very individual and thriving community.

Hopefully the local community’s views on these proposals will not be ignored. Are we not to be considered? Are our views not worthy of your consideration? We are very proud of our history and our heritage.

My husband and I urge you to keep Moseley as a united identified place where we can continue to live in a very special area.

Hoping you will take note of the very important wishes of the Moseley community.

Yours faithfully,

Estelle Lesser (and Laurence Lesser)
6th February 2016

The Review Officer
(Birmingham) LGBCE 14th Floor Millbank Tower Millbank London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir or Madam

Re: Objection to Proposed Boundary Changes in Moseley, Birmingham B13. I am writing to express my objection and deep concern over the proposed boundary changes which I believe will rip the heart out of Moseley, Birmingham if they are allowed to go ahead. I have lived in Moseley for the last 44 years. Moseley has a unique identity centred around a ‘village’ which is over 100 years old. The people in Moseley ‘Moseleyites’ care about their community and about the historical area in which they live and want to preserve both of these. Locals are proud to say that they live in Moseley because of these attributes. Moseley includes two conservation areas, Moseley Conservation Area and St Agnes Conservation area and includes a lake and surrounding parkland right next to the Village centre. The lake and parkland is managed by a group of local resident who formed the Moseley Park and Pool Company. Annual music festivals are held in the park, as well as many other events. Some of the many local groups in Moseley include the Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Community Development Trust, Sustainable Moseley Interfaith Group. Each group adds something different to the area and all are are successful in promoting and maintaining the community spirit in the area. Moseley has a well-established thriving café-culture and nightlife and an award-winning monthly Farmers Market in the village centre. There is also a monthly Moseley Magazine ‘B13’ which has been running for many years and which many of the shops in the village centre sell. The Moseley Society maintains an historic dovecote and icehouse. Under the current proposals, Moseley would be ‘shared’ between 5 different wards and six different Councillors, only one of which has Moseley as its primary focus. This is the proposed new ward of ‘Moseley’, however the central shopping/socialising area of Moseley and the very heart of Moseley, would be outside its boundaries! Nor would the parkland and lake that residents in Moseley are so proud of or the icehouse or dovecote maintained by the Moseley Society. If the proposal goes ahead, for anything to be achieved in the area currently known as Moseley, it would mean that six councillors from five different wards would need to consult each other and reach agreement. Bearing in mind that only one of these wards would have Moseley as its primary focus, it is likely to be an uphill battle to get anything achieved. I believe that the proposed boundary changes to Moseley will not meet two of the three main considerations in conducting an electoral review as set out in legislation: 1) The proposed new boundaries will not reflect community identify. 2) The proposed boundary changes will not provide for effective and convenient local government. For all of the above reasons, I urge you to please review your boundary proposals for the existing area well-established as Moseley, Birmingham. Yours faithfully Naomi Lesser
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Feature Annotations

1: Jewellery Quarter
2: Alternative Jewellery Quarter and Gun Quarter ward
3: Alternative Winson Green and Lozells ward

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Jewellery Quarter
Annotation 2: Alternative Jewellery Quarter and Gun Quarter ward
Annotation 3: Alternative Winson Green and Lozells ward

Comment text:
The Jewellery Quarter, as shown on the map, is vastly different in characteristics to the remainder of the proposed Winson Green ward. The Jewellery Quarter attracts young professionals who mainly work within the city centre area, which remains part of the Ladywood ward. In contrast Winson Green is a more deprived area. The combination of the Jewellery Quarter and Gun Quarter would be more effective in working for the community that lives there. In balance the Lozells and Winson Green ward would also have similar characteristics therefore councillors could work more effectively to deal with local issues.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ellen Levick
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

1. Hall Green Station - Must remain in Hall Green
2. Hall Green Health Centre - Must remain part of Hall Green
3. Hall Green School - Must remain part of Hall Green
4. Sarehole Mill - Is historically a major landmark in HALL GREEN

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Hall Green Station - Must remain in Hall Green
Annotation 2: Hall Green Health Centre - Must remain part of Hall Green
Annotation 3: Hall Green School - Must remain part of Hall Green
Annotation 4: Sarehole Mill - Is historically a major landmark in HALL GREEN

Comment text:

The redrawing of the boundary does not make sense. The way the lines have been drawn means that the ward will lose its only secondary school, its Health Centre and its railway station, all of which are clearly marked on all maps as being IN HALL GREEN, otherwise they would be Tysley School, Tysley Health Centre and Tysley Railway Station - which would be very confusing as there is already a Tysley Railway Station! The shopping area between the railway station and the health centre is know as Hall Green Parade, so again is an integral part of the area. As for Sarehole Mill - if you look in every history book on the area you will clearly see that it has been in Hall Green for hundreds of years. How can the councillors represent the area properly if major parts of the local area have been handed over to another district.

Uploaded Documents:
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The Review Officer,

I would like to add to the general dismay at the proposals made by the Boundary Commission to split our village which is much loved by those of us who live here and have brought up our families in this place, residents and visitors alike contribute to making Moseley unique. and it must remain a whole!

We must remain as one community served by 2 councillors.

Please consider what people want

Yours,

Mrs C. A. Levin
Dear Sir/Madam,

I have live in Yardley as far back as when it came under Warwickshire and have chosen to live for the rest of my life. Please leave the boundary as it stands as this will not only alter house variations but car and home insurances too. Yardley Old Church is Yardley bough not anything else other than! I note your address in in London! Perhaps you could change Hackney for example to Mayfair or visa versa. I don't think London residents would be very pleased. So please leave it as it is and save tax payers monies.

Yours sincerely,

Lesley Lewis.

Resident of Historic Yardley.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

There are clearly some completely daft things in this proposal, such as the centre of Moseley not being in Moseley. Wards should be based primarily around the notion of the areas / centres that people identify with, not arbitrary regions of the map with meaningless names.

Uploaded Documents:
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Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

IF NOTHING ELSE, HOW CAN ERDINGTON RAILWAY STATION NOT BE A PART OF ERDINGTON!

Yours Sincerely,

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
Dear Sir/Madam,

My husband and I live in Erdington, right in the middle of Erdington Abbey, Erdington Train Station and Erdington Police Station. We are two minutes walk from Erdington High Street. As far as we are concerned we couldn't be any more in the centre of Erdington and feel very strongly about plans to change the boundaries. We implore you to change your proposal for the north Birmingham area to be a Pype Hayes Ward including Birches Green, a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a Perry Common Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, a two member Kingstanding Ward, a Stockland Green Ward and a two member Oscott Ward. With an Erdington Ward which boundaries are the border of Sutton Coldfield to the north, Court Lane to the west, to the south the traditional border with Gravelly Hill/Birches Green of Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road is used. To the east the border is the border of Pype Hayes, enabling Holly Park Drive and Quincey Drive to remain in Erdington.

Yours faithfully,
Mr and Mrs Lewis
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Brian Lingard
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I have lived in Moseley for more than 40 years, and have watched it develop into a tight, well run community, with all the trappings and infrastructure necessary for inhabitants like me, to live a happy and full life. I've seen little of politicians and councillors, but plenty of local Moseley people, getting involved and making this the community it is. At someone in London's will- some anonymous bunch of bureaucratic pen-pushers- things must suddenly change. I ask myself why. What possible reason could someone in London have to inflict change, where none is necessary? Why try and break what isn't broken? I think the people suggesting these changes should come out their ivory towers, and explain their logic to us, and tell us what they expect to gain. What really is in it for them. People in Moseley aren't stupid! If the present government want to lose a lot of voters this madness is going to help them!

Uploaded Documents:
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Gillian Lingard
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I strongly object to the current proposals to change the boundaries in Birmingham. I have lived in Moseley for nearly 30 years and understand and value how it has retained its identity as a thriving community; with committed residents who tirelessly work together to engage with each other, with local communities and further afield by hosting events of national significance. By moving boundaries, there will be a lack of cohesion, identity and the soul of Moseley will be destroyed as it will no longer exist. Surely, when we are experiencing severe cut backs that are impacting on communities in all sorts of ways, it is even more important for residents to identify with the area in which they live and have invested in for many years in order to create a strong, caring, creative and resourceful place within a recognized established boundary that reflects local needs and aspirations. I currently live within the Moseley Conservation area; what a nonsense, that the proposals would place us outside of Moseley. Similarly under the current proposals, Moseley Park and Moseley Village would no longer be within the Moseley boundary. I strongly urge the Boundary Commission to reconsider its current proposals.
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Download
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this document has been led by the Moseley Regeneration, with the assistance of officers from Birmingham City Council Planning & Regeneration. Thanks must, however, be extended to the following for their generous support and advice:

- Moseley and Kings Heath Ward Councillors
- West Midlands Planning Aid, Staff & Volunteers
- Students from the University of Birmingham Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS)
- Residents, businesses and school children of Moseley
- Photographic credits; Moseley CDT, William Baldwin, Brett Wilde & Moseley Local History Society

CONTACTS

- Economy Directorate
  Birmingham City Council
  1 Lancaster Circus
  Birmingham B4 7DJ

  BY POST:
  PO Box 28
  Birmingham B1 1TU

  E: planningandregenerationenquiries@birmingham.gov.uk
  T: (0121) 303 3121

- Moseley regeneration Group / CDT
  The Moseley Exchange
  149 - 153 Alcester Road
  Moseley
  Birmingham B13 8JP

  E: administrator@moseleycdt.com
  T: (0121) 449 8585

You can ask for a copy of this document in large print, another format or another language. We aim to supply what you need within ten working days.

Call (0121) 303 3121

If you have hearing difficulties please call us via Typetalk 18001 0121 303 3121 or e-mail us at the address above.

Plans contained within this document are based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

© Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Birmingham City Council. Licence number 100021326, 2013.
CONTENTS

Forward

1 Planning Policy

1.0 Introduction
1.1 The production process
1.2 Purpose of this plan
1.3 Moseley: the place and people
1.4 Sustainability

2. The Moseley Plan

2.0 Planning policy context
2.1 The Moseley Plan
2.2 Moseley local policies

3. Implementation

4. Relevant Development Plan Policies

Glossary

Appendix:

The following appendicies can be found on either
Birmingham City Council's Planning website www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleyspd
or on Moseley CDT's at www.moseleycdt.com

1 Big 7 Consultation summary report
2 Moseley Proposals map
3 Proposed Community Assets
4 Moseley Shop Front Design Guide 1992
5 Survey plans - Historic assets
   - Open Space
   - Employment sites
FORWARD

Birmingham has a long history of community planning, stretching back to the Urban Renewal programmes of the 1970’s. I welcome this community-led document as a continuation of that tradition.

Sitting within the hierarchy of Development Framework plans, this Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is another tool in the planning ‘toolkit.’ Taken together with other regeneration strategies and Ward Development Plans, the SPD will provide justification for, and add weight to funding bids, as well as helping to determine planning applications and promoting the economic welfare of the area.

The production of this spatial Planning Document, is testament to the positive value of community engagement. Local people, together with their elected Ward Members, have worked closely with officers of the City Council to deliver a vision for Moseley that will provide robust guidance for the future. In so doing, it will make a distinctive contribution to the city’s diverse economic and cultural life, whilst retaining its sense of place and character.

Cllr Tahir Ali
Cabinet Member for Development, Jobs and Skills.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.0.1 In preparing this land use framework, the views and aspirations of a wide spectrum of Moseley people have been sought. Collating the diverse responses to the Moseley Big Plan conversations, and then combining them with the comments from the myriad interest groups that make up Moseley, has been challenging. However, following amendments made to the plan as a result of the extensive consultation exercise undertaken during the summer of 2013, it has now been adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and forms part of the City Council’s statutory land use framework.

1.0.2 The local community and other local stakeholders believe that they can make a real contribution to the development of economic, social and environmental initiatives in Moseley. These will strengthen the neighbourhood’s character and preserve the qualities that the stakeholders value most.

1.0.3 The plan has been developed as a partnership between the local community and Birmingham City Council (BCC). A community organisation, the Moseley Regeneration Group (MRG), led its preparation and fed in the thoughts and aspirations of the local business and community organisations. The SPD will replace the Moseley Action Plan SPG (1992).

1.0.4 To help ensure that these aspirations are delivered, this document has been prepared in the context of the Birmingham Plan, 2005 Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the draft Birmingham Development Plan 2014 (BDP) and other relevant city wide land use policies.
MOSELEY - THE COMMUNITY’S VISION

1.0.5 Moseley will be a creative and enterprising urban neighbourhood that makes a distinctive contribution to the city’s economic and cultural life, whilst retaining its unique sense of place and history.

1.0.6 The Moseley SPD will take forward the City’s draft BDP objectives for sustainable growth, investment and job opportunities, while reducing its carbon footprint.

1.0.7 Moseley will become a neighbourhood where:

• there is a diverse local economy based around small businesses, tourism and cultural activity;

• there is diversity within the local community and people feel secure, well-connected and able to make a contribution to their community;

• residents, businesses and stakeholders have influence over the quality of life in the neighbourhood;

• its historical legacy is protected;

• its strong sense of place is retained;

• its natural environment(s) enhance the communities health and well being;

• the Village is a vibrant independent local centre – people want to live, work, shop and spend their leisure time;

• there is a diverse and active community sector.

The plan covers the area shown on the map, including Moseley Village centre and surrounding areas.
1.1 THE PRODUCTION PROCESS

1.1.1 In preparation for this plan, a public consultation exercise was undertaken by the Moseley Regeneration Group with support from Planning Aid West Midlands. This exercise was called Moseley’s Big Plan and involved residents responding to the ‘Big 7 Questions’ that the Regeneration Group had posed (see Appendix). The consultation was promoted to all residents in the study area, businesses, community organisations and schools. Residents were able to respond on the Moseley Community Development Trust website, by writing their comments on a postcard that could be left at various outlets in the Village Centre, by attending public workshops or by completing street surveys in Moseley Village.

1.1.2 The results of the consultation were analysed and can be found at www.moseleycdt.com. Informal local consultation and dialogue with Birmingham City Council and other organisations has been ongoing and has informed the objectives, guidance and proposals in this document.

The process involved using volunteers from local community groups, University of Birmingham students and Planning Aid West Midlands staff and volunteers. Particular efforts were made to consult with the harder to reach groups: children, young people, 20-30-year olds and those from minority ethnic groups.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS PLAN

1.2.1 This Supplementary Planning Document sets out policies and proposals for the Moseley area. These develop the guidance provided in the UDP, draft BDP and other national and local policy and will help inform decisions on planning applications.

The City Council’s Planning Committee, residents, local traders, funding bodies and developers will all need to refer to this document while planning and making decisions about development in the area, or initiatives to improve the quality of life.

1.2.2. The existing Moseley Action Plan SPG (1992) was reviewed in the production of this new document; it has now been superseded.

1.2.3 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and an Equalities Assessment accompany this document and can be found on the web pages of the City Council. They examine the environmental and social effects of the strategies.
What local people said:

“Moseley should be an inclusive place recognising positive social change and looking forward. It can be a shop window for our city to showcase sustainable economic growth for Birmingham and be a truly creative village.”

“More trees and less traffic.”

and policies to ensure that the principles of sustainable development are met. The SA was reviewed as part of the consultation process and remains appropriate.

1.3 MOSELEY – THE PLACE AND PEOPLE

1.3.1 Moseley was originally a rural hamlet surrounded by farmland. It is now a mature residential suburb approximately 4km south of the city centre. One of Birmingham’s remaining Victorian suburbs, the area has a long standing reputation of being a home for the arts. It is known as a vibrant and creative neighbourhood, with active residents all working in different ways to improve their environment.

1.3.2 Moseley lies mainly within the electoral ward of Moseley and Kings Heath (and part of neighbouring Springfield Ward) within the Hall Green Constituency.

It is well-connected by road to the rest of the city and is dissected by two road corridors. The arterial road A435 (Alcester Road) connecting the centre to the south and the B4217 (Salisbury Road and Wake Green Road) that links the local centres at Acocks Green, Moseley and Five Ways.
1.3.3 Some of Moseley’s special features are that:

- it has a geographic identity, located on a hill between two river valleys (the Rea to the west and the Cole to the east), south of the city centre
- it is an urban village with a predominantly Victorian centre – known as ‘Moseley Village’
- there are buildings of architectural interest and merit throughout the area
- it has a tradition of independent retailers and street markets
- it has strong links with enterprise

- it has a mature green landscape making it a desirable place to live
- community events (jazz and folk festivals) are held in Moseley Park and Pool
- it is one of the region’s leading destinations for a night out, with a collection of well renowned bars, pubs and restaurants.

1.3.4 Some parts of Moseley have not changed significantly for over one hundred years. However, Moseley faces pressures, like other parts of the city, and some residents are concerned that new development could erode the character and appearance of the neighbourhood. In particular, attempts to open more restaurants and bars, create new housing and a supermarket within the village centre, have all prompted comment. This reflects the difficulty of striking the right balance between attracting new investment, whilst retaining the area’s character and quality of life. In addition, existing and new homeowners, seeking to make alterations and additions to their properties, could impact upon the appearance and character of the area.
THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

1.3.5 Moseley’s historic buildings and landscapes are among its greatest assets. Their importance has been recognised by the creation of two Conservation Areas. Moseley also contains several listed buildings including Highbury, two registered historic parks – Cannon Hill and Highbury, as well as Moseley Park and Pool – a landscape inspired by Humphry Repton.

What local people said:

“More serious enforcement of listed building status, conservation areas and reviving public interest and awareness of heritage among residents.”

“Enforce improvement notices on landlords/owners to maintain property in good condition.”

“Raise awareness of their importance to the community.”

“Tolkien Museum (and statue).”

“Protect the Victorian buildings and better use the upper spaces for residential development.”

“Develop and restore St Mary’s Churchyard.”

“The only way to protect them in the long term is to make Moseley Village a community and commercial success.”

1.3.6 Moseley residents have long-established links with sites in the neighbouring Springfield Ward. These are Moseley Bog (a local nature reserve and scheduled ancient monument) and Springhill College.

1.3.7 Significant people from the worlds of engineering, politics and literature such as Fredrick Lanchester, Joseph Lucas, Joseph Chamberlain and JRR Tolkien, have all lived here at some point in their lives.
THE VILLAGE CENTRE

1.3.8 Moseley’s main shopping area is clustered around the intersection of the Alcester Road, St. Mary’s Row and Salisbury Road – the Village. In the shopping and local centres SPD it is classified as a neighbourhood shopping centre and is considered to be stable. It has a reasonable food retail offer for daytime shoppers alongside banks, a post office, auto repair and some lifestyle retailers. However, the number of independent retailers has fallen significantly since the 1970s and now several national retailers provide an anchor for the daytime economy. Some retailers feel that daytime footfall is low and that the competition from neighbouring Kings Heath (a district shopping centre) has a detrimental impact. Also, the loss of large employers in the area has contributed to a reduction in daytime shoppers. A proposed health centre on the site of the former Meteor Ford garage (Wake Green Road) could help increase daytime trading in the village in the future.

1.3.9 There is a cluster of pubs, bars, restaurants and fast food outlets in the centre. This attracts many people from outside the area on weekend evenings and makes for a buoyant night-time economy. There is potential to build on this success to further diversify the evening economy and to develop complementary daytime activity. This will be progressed through local businesses, the Moseley Regeneration Group, and the ‘third sector’.

1.3.10 The community has an ambition to promote and maintain independent and niche retail shops in the Village centre, but in the current economic climate this is challenging. Incentives would need to be introduced to make investment in Moseley more attractive and to find a better balance between daytime and night-time footfall. Residents would also prefer to retain retail convenience shopping units throughout Moseley.

1.3.11 There are incidental or small parades of convenience shops in other parts of the neighbourhood. These can be found on Church Road, junction of Wake Green Road and Swanshurst Lane, on Wake Green Road and Billesley Lane. These provide a range of services such as groceries, pharmacies and post offices, as well as restaurants, hairdressers, takeaway food and solicitors.

1 Birmingham Shopping and Local Centres SPD 2012
2 Birmingham Local Centres Strategy (2006)
1.3.12 Being part of the city’s strategic highway network and an important bus corridor (the Nos. 1, 35 and 50 buses serve this area), Alcester Road carries a significant amount of through traffic. Moseley and Kings Heath Ward also has the largest number of commuter cyclists in the city (Census 2011).

1.3.13 Although the average speed is below 20mph through the centre, with 30,000 vehicles recorded passing through the main crossroad there is a negative perception of the traffic levels, with residents commenting on the apparent speed of vehicles and of a sense of danger and nuisance. Although initial pedestrian counts suggest that there may only be in the order of 5,000 pedestrian movements at the Village centre crossroads on weekdays, these can rise significantly to around 12,000 during busy periods, especially on market days. The potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflict is significant, especially given that a number of pedestrians choose not to use the recognised crossing points. A traffic calmed village centre would help to address this widely held concern. Having said that, the number of road traffic collisions has fallen considerably across the constituency and the ward. The only accident hotspot junction is at the Yardley Wood Road/Wake Green Road, and the only site where there have been three or more collisions involving cyclists, is at Moor Green Lane/Russell Road/Queensbridge Road.

1.3.14 Re-opening the Camp Hill railway line to passenger traffic is currently being considered by Centro, with a potential station in the centre; a popular request from local residents. At the time of writing, it is thought that the rail line’s re-opening to passengers is likely to be eight-to-ten years away.

1.3.15 Finding solutions to car parking in the shopping area drew conflicting comments during the initial consultation. Some residents and traders believe more parking is required if the shopping area is to be viable. Others, however, felt that the existing car park combined with the street parking was sufficient, and that encouraging car use will lead to greater congestion and pollution; particularly on the side roads adjacent to the shopping area.

1.3.16 The former Meteor Ford garage site on the corner of Oxford and Wake Green Roads has planning permission for retail and health uses, together with free parking. The impact of this potential development on the sustainability of existing retail outlets has caused concern to some local residents. A new retail / health use is also likely to add to the amount of traffic movements within the Village.

What local people said:

“Cycle lanes, separate bus services for schools, shoppers, etc etc ban parking on the Moseley Road.”

“Introduce speed limits of say 20mph in residential streets to encourage walking and cycling.”

“Re-open rail station. Restore right turn in to St. Mary’s Row. Lower traffic speeds.”

“By shared space as above – this will increase traffic flow as it will not have the stop start nature that pedestrian and traffic lights cause.”

“A car park offering free short stay parking to encourage use of local shops - I think that this is a major drawback at the moment.”

3 BCC survey undertaken in March 2012.
4 By 6% in the Hall Green Constituency as a whole since 2001 and 24% in Moseley and Kings Heath Ward.
5 Nine or more collisions in the last three calendar years (2007-2009).
What local people said:

“Moseley could set up an alternative location to the Custard Factory for the creative/music industries.”

“Seek to develop and extend the Exchange using businesses and organisations such as the churches to develop their premises.”

“Create office space for small businesses. Could create offices above shops.”

“Start to create jobs for the many unemployed and under-employed but highly talented and skilled graduates in the area.”

BUSINESS

1.3.17 Moseley’s local centre has a reputation for business start-ups and independent traders, as well as a buoyant evening economy. However, in recent years daytime retailers have suffered - this needs to be addressed. Measures to support innovative entrepreneurialism can be developed independently of this document, but will have its policy support. A notable exception to the decline in the day-time trade are the monthly Arts and Farmers’ Markets that are able to draw a much broader customer base to Moseley, generating significant benefits for the centre’s other traders. The evening restaurant and leisure sector continues to play an important role in the ‘character’ of Moseley, as well as providing employment opportunities for younger people.

1.3.18 The wider Moseley area has lost a number of major employers and major employment sites – Britannic Assurance training centre, the James Gracie Centre, The Ideal Benefit Society. However, there is one major employer in the area with over 500 employees – Moseley Hall Hospital (Birmingham Community Healthcare NHS Trust). The number of smaller employment sites has also reduced. However, national supermarkets (Co-operative and Sainsbury’s – 154-162 Alcester Road), Moseley and District Housing Association (106-108 Alcester Road), the Moseley Exchange (149-153 Alcester Road), are significant employment locations in the Village.

1.3.19 The A435 Alcester Road / Moseley Road area is becoming a growth area for the creative industries, with links between the cultural and media quarter in Digbeth in the city centre to Moseley Village. The civic and heritage value of this corridor is recognised later in this document, but the opportunities for overall enhancement, presented by the Kings Heath Business Improvement District and the Balsall Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan, should be embraced.

1.3.20 During the evidence gathering for this Plan, support was expressed for providing starter units, lower rents and a business hub, as ways to attract new jobs and businesses to Moseley. The Moseley Exchange already supports the growth of SME’s but more can be done.

OPEN SPACE AND LEISURE

1.3.21 Moseley is fortunate to have parks, open spaces, woods, allotments, playing fields and a local Nature Reserve, mainly to the south and west of the neighbourhood.

Many residents can reach Highbury Park, Cannon Hill Park, Holders Lane Woods or Moseley Bog (a local Nature Reserve) within a 15-20 minute walk from their homes. However, some residents cannot access green open spaces and enjoy wildlife as easily. Streets closer to the River Rea corridor have more opportunities than other parts, as do those on the eastern boundary of the neighbourhood, near to Moseley Bog, The Dell, Shire Country Park, Swanshurst Park and Wake Green playing fields. Although, in the main these sites neighbour the Moseley SPD area, they are important to Moseley.
residents and help form a green corridor between the River Rea and Cole. But access to green open space can be difficult in the central parts of the neighbourhood.

1.3.22 There are significant parts of the central neighbourhood (to the east of the Village centre, such as in North Moseley and the streets between Greenhill Road and Cambridge Road), that do not meet the UDP target for public and private playing fields, as they are further than 400m from open space. Improving access to open space (including private open space, such as Moseley Park and Pool) is a priority for further study.

1.3.23 In addition, there are also a number of private sports clubs and pitches in the neighbourhood for those interested in tennis, golf and cricket. There is no public library in Moseley, instead residents travel to neighbouring Balsall Heath or Kings Heath Libraries. Residents also need to travel to visit public and private leisure centres, gyms and swimming pools.


What local people said:

“More parks needed.”

“Protect Moseley Park and promote its use.”

“It would be good to provide coherent green links between the various green spaces – Swanshurst Park, Moseley Bog, Billesley Common, Moseley School, Cannon Hill Park, Highbury Park – extending beyond Moseley itself.”

“Opening the private park to all, albeit with rules and restrictions on behaviour.”

“Allotments have become a much sort after resource, particularly in the Moseley/Kings Heath area, and seem to continue to be so.”

“Public open spaces – we need more.”
There are three small children’s play areas in the neighbourhood: on Trafalgar Road, Twickenham Road (off Reddings Road) and Oak Leaf Drive. Otherwise children travel to Cannon Hill or Kings Heath Parks to use larger playgrounds; more recently an informal play area has been created in Highbury Park.

Residents make good use of allotments on Moor Green Lane and Billesley Lane and there is high demand in the south east of the city and in Hall Green constituency in particular; only 7% of the available plots were vacant in 2012.

The draft BDP describes how the demand for housing in the city is growing. However, it also recognises that Conservation Areas and mature suburbs may not be able to make a considerable contribution towards meeting this demand, or with the diversification of housing stock in neighbourhoods.

The availability of land for the creation of new housing has been assessed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2010, but only identified 25 relatively small sites within the study area. All are in private ownership and 14 are under construction or have been granted planning permission. There are however, two significant sites in this list, 120 Alcester Road (the former Moneywise Shop) and the former Woodnorton site on Alcester Road (between Moor Green Lane and Woodnorton Drive) – it is estimated that these sites could accommodate around 102 housing units.

With the growing housing needs, there is pressure for intensification of existing housing stock, and the redevelopment at higher densities of infill plots or back gardens. Local residents are concerned that the character, design standards, infrastructure and open space are threatened by over-development. Birmingham City Council (BCC) planning policy does however recognise that higher densities are not always appropriate and that lower densities can be a positive characteristic.

The need for affordable 2-3 bedroom private housing for purchase was highlighted in the public consultation. Residents were also concerned that new housing should be sympathetic to the area and existing and new properties should have a low carbon footprint.

Demand for social housing in the neighbourhood remains high and exceeds supply at the moment. In 2006/7, there were 20 Registered Social Landlords operating in the neighbourhood, providing 1,816 properties, out of a total of 8212 residential addresses. Social housing providers, such as Moseley and District Housing Association had substantial waiting times for all its properties. Although only a relatively small percentage, some residents have expressed concerns about the management of social housing in the area.

The City Council (Overview and Scrutiny Committee) report into allotments (October 2010).

50,600 additional dwellings 2006-2026

Mature Suburbs (SPD) 2008 and Places for Living (SPG) 2001
THE MOSELEY COMMUNITY

1.3.31 According to the 2011 Census, Moseley has a resident population of 25,669, slightly higher than a decade ago (24,273). Most of the age groups correlate to the Birmingham average, although in the 25-44 group, the figure is higher.

1.3.32 Today, 54% are White British, 22.3% Asian or Asian British, 4.5% Black or Black British, 5.2% Mixed and 0.8% were Chinese and 12.9% others. Again, these percentages are broadly in line with the city average. There is now a significant Pakistani community in North Moseley. Overall however, the majority of the population remains white (and Christian) and is of working age (16-59). It is within North Moseley that the greatest ethnic diversity can be found. A significant number of the Muslim population attends Hamza Mosque in Church Road. Over recent years this has increased its floor area to meet the needs of its community. A small local Buddhist community also has a centre in Park Road.

1.3.33 Some 35.9% of Moseley residents are classified as ‘professional’, compared to 11.56% in Birmingham as a whole. This has increased from the 28.9% recorded in the 2001 census.

1.3.34 Although the level of unadjusted unemployment for the Moseley and Kings Heath Ward stood at 6.0% in February 2014, compared with the city average of 9.2%, within Moseley there are islands of relative wealth, with neighbouring areas that are more deprived. Most of the wealth can be found in the south of Moseley, while in the north (centred around Church Road) is an area that falls within the government’s definition of an area that suffers from multiple deprivation

1.3.35 The Ward Development Plan highlights the need for a successful local centre and to reduce worklessness in the northern part of the ward in particular.

1.3.36 Although there was no specific question in relation to health in the initial public consultation, there are some local health issues including low birth weight in parts of North Moseley – above 15% compared to the national average of 5.04%, and the ward ranks 37th out of 40 for infant mortality.

1.3.37 Access to health professionals remains important to residents. They can access primary care through the established GPs and dentists in the neighbourhood. Alongside the NHS provision, Moseley has a range of complementary and alternative therapy practitioners. Currently, most health services are delivered from converted domestic properties, although a purpose built health centre with a range of in-house primary care services is planned, as part of the supermarket development on the former Meteor Ford garage site on St. Mary’s Row.

1.3.38 The draft BDP gives priority to improving accessibility, health and mobility.

1.3.39 The City’s draft BDP reiterates the vision set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy (2008) of residents being able to influence decision making, be part of a cohesive community, for an active voluntary sector and to bridge the digital divide.

1.3.40 Moseley residents have maintained an active community sector for many years now; it is an important component of Moseley’s character and why the area is often called a Village. During consultation local people confirmed that active residents are essential if the village atmosphere is to remain. Community life has also helped residents to build feelings of identity, safety and loyalty.

11 The Ward Development Plan – 19.1% of residents in the ward reported a limiting long-term limiting illness in 2001 and in terms of general health 10.2% reported that they considered their health to be ‘not good’ compared to 10.9% across Birmingham.
1.3.41 Within Moseley there are only a few places that children and young people can call their own. There are no City Council-managed youth clubs in the neighbourhood and there are no public children’s centres for the under-fives; although community groups try to help and private nurseries cater for some. Consultation with local primary schools highlighted children’s concerns about the quality of the environment, traffic and lack of play facilities.

1.3.42 Churches host activities and meetings for uniformed organisations such as Scouts and Guides. In addition, the Creation indoor climbing centre and skate-park, Riverside Church and Hamza Mosque provide meeting rooms as well. In the consultation, young people requested a place to meet in the centre of Moseley (along with indoor sports facilities). It is a similar situation for the elderly in Moseley. They rely mainly on local churches and their volunteers for support in the community alongside the statutory agencies.

1.3.43 The loss of ‘Centre 13’ in School Road means Moseley no longer has a dedicated community centre. As the population has become more diverse, there is a need to ensure that new people are able to participate in community life. The consultation highlighted that meeting rooms can be booked at the The Moseley Exchange local churches, Mosque, Tennis Club, All Services Club, but they cannot accommodate all of the demand, and many are in need of modernisation. In addition, Moseley Park and Pool, the ‘Village green’ and even some of the pavements (where wide enough) on the Alcester Road, are utilised as meeting space for outdoor community events.

1.4 SUSTAINABILITY

1.4.1 Birmingham City Council recognises the importance of sustainable development and the challenge it faces in improving the quality of life for current and future generations without jeopardising our natural resources. To inspire others, the City Council is seeking projects that others can learn from, such as energy-saving buildings, better public transport, greater recycling and individuals changing their behaviour to help reduce climate change.

1.4.2 Moseley has the potential to develop and engender an even more sustainable approach to urban living in its households, businesses and community organisations by investing more effort and resources in:
- conservation of the historical environment
- encouraging a resilient and diverse local economy
- generating wealth and recycling it locally
- renewable energy and water conservation
- neighbourhood recycling
- better integration of green infrastructure
- improved access to a network of green open spaces
- improved access to public transport
- increasing walking and cycling journeys
- improved housing stock
- equality of movement for pedestrians, cyclists and those with a disability
- community hubs

What local people said:

“Maximise opportunities for renewable energy, including the provision of plug-in points for electric vehicles from renewable sources.”

“Open the train station, relieve the traffic flow…”

2.0 PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

2.0.1 National government has developed a spatial planning system to guide development so that it improves the quality of life. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides overarching guidance and within this context there is a tiered structure of documents that are connected to one another. Birmingham City Council has developed a Local Development Framework (a key component of this is the draft Birmingham Development Plan) to replace the current Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (2005).

At the time of writing, the UDP remains the principal land use document to manage development in Moseley; chapter 20 (Selly Oak) contains references to development opportunities and what is to be protected in the area.

2.1 THE MOSELEY PLAN

2.0.2 The Moseley SPD vision supports both the objectives and policies contained within these two key policy documents, as well as other strategic documents, such as the emerging Birmingham Mobility Action Plan (www.birmingham.gov.uk/bmap). Further details of which policies in particular are relevant to Moseley, are included at the end of this plan.

2.1.1 Moseley will be a creative and enterprising urban neighbourhood that makes a distinctive contribution to the city whilst retaining its unique sense of place and history.

2.1.2 The following section seeks to marry local aspirations for Moseley, with the strategic objectives of Birmingham. The policies and guidance set out here are supplementary to that contained in the UDP and emerging BDP. They will help inform investors and, where appropriate, manage development, to help Moseley thrive, while retaining its unique qualities and character.
2.2 MOSELEY LOCAL POLICIES 

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

VILLAGE RETAIL AREA

2.2.1 Moseley’s economy has undergone significant changes since the early 1990s. This process raises new challenges for the neighbourhood but also provides new opportunities, to build a more resilient future for the local economy. Therefore, a new approach is needed to improve the daytime and evening economies, making Moseley an all-day destination. This could lead to more jobs, retention of young people and better services / facilities for residents, the business community and visitors. The economic activity generated by local events that draw people into the area (such as the Folk and Jazz festivals in Moseley Park and Pool, events in Cannon Hill Park and the international cricket matches at Warwickshire Cricket Club) is also noted. Positive actions to build upon such activity will help diversify the range of offer in Moseley, thereby strengthening the local economy.

This Planning Framework will help create the right environment for this objective whilst safeguarding what people value most about the centre.

2.2.2 The Shopping and Local Centres SPD (2012) defines the centre boundary, identifies the Primary Shopping Area (shown on the proposals map), in which retail development will be concentrated and sets out policies for controlling non-retail uses including hot-food takeaways, cafes, restaurants and pubs.

2.2.3 The 2011 survey that informed the local centres policy, identified 109 properties (out of a total of 129 within the local centre boundary) that fell within the government’s use class definitions A1-A5, which are used to differentiate between types of properties. The survey revealed that, 30.2% were restaurants and cafes (A3), bars and pubs (A4) or hot food takeaways (A5), 17.4% were banks/ building societies (A2) and 52.2% were retail shops (A1). The figures included vacant units within the A1-A5 classes (16 in total). The survey also showed that within the Primary Shopping Area, 51.8% were A1 retail uses. A survey undertaken by the MRG in 2010, found that of the 129 premises in the area, 14% were vacant or waiting development.

2.2.4 The level of A1 uses in the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) is only just above the 50% threshold set out in the Shopping and Local Centres SPD 2012. This SPD seeks to prevent further loss of A1 units in the PSA. There is therefore limited scope for further A2-A5 and other non-retail uses.
THE FOLLOWING POLICIES RELATE TO THE MOSELEY LOCAL CENTRE AND OTHER SMALL PARADES WITHIN THE PLAN AREA.

**POLICY CONTEXT**

UDP chapter 7 and chapter 20 – para 20.4
Draft BDP policy context: Objectives 3.5, 3.14, 3.17, 3.19
Thematic policies TP21, TP22, TP23, TP24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Moseley Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Support the primary shopping function of the Moseley local centre.</td>
<td><strong>EA1</strong> New development, redevelopment or conversion should be located within the local centre boundary and provide services locally, in order to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Promote the centre as a focus for independent traders.</td>
<td>• enhance the viability and vitality of the centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Improve infrastructure to foster increased economic activity.</td>
<td>• encourage economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Increase opportunities for the accommodation of SMEs in Moseley’s centre.</td>
<td>• maintain its predominantly retail function and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reduce the need to travel by car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EA2** Encourage development and redevelopment for the following uses within the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) at ground floor:

- retail (class A1)
- service sector and food activity, such as banks, cafés, estate agents, etc. (class A2-A5), provided the balance of uses complies with the requirements of the Shopping and Local Centres SPD. Where proposals would take the level of A2-A5 uses above the 50% threshold, such change would be resisted
- development that brings non-A1 units into A1 use will be particularly welcomed, to encourage and increase daytime economic activity

**EA3** Encourage the following uses at ground floor level outside the PSA within the centre boundary, and at upper floor level throughout the centre:

- retail (class A1)
- offices (class A2)
- offices (class B1a);
- hotel (class C1);
- non-residential institutions (class D1) e.g. healthcare;
- small-scale leisure e.g. leisure centre, gym (class D2);
- studios;
- small workshops;
- live work units;
- community uses.

**EA4** Street markets including farmers’ and arts markets, etc will be supported.

**EA5** In order to maintain the daytime vitality of the centre, an overconcentration of A3, A4 and A5 uses within frontages (and the centre overall) will be resisted. In line with the Shopping and Local Centres SPD, no more than 10% of A5 uses will be permitted within a frontage (or the centre overall).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moseley Policies (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA6</strong> Until May 2016, the interim use of properties allowed under the amendment to the TCP (general Permitted development) Order 2013 is to be encouraged. Any permanent change of use will be considered on its merits when a planning application is received, and its impact on policies EA2, EA3 and EA5 have been taken into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA7</strong> Where planning permission is required for the above uses, applicants will need to demonstrate that the proposals will have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity and that any parking implications have been considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA8</strong> The scale and design of any new development will need to have regard for, and be sympathetic to, the predominantly Victorian/Edwardian architectural character of the centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA9</strong> Measures to secure improvements to the public realm, especially the Village green, but including pavements, street furniture, etc will be supported and financial contributions sought on the back of appropriate new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA10</strong> The loss of A1 convenience shops away from the centre in local parades and located throughout Moseley, will be resisted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT

2.2.5 Moseley's reputation for being a place where businesses begin\(^\text{12}\) and are a home to a high concentration of people from the creative industries, is a reality\(^\text{13}\).

2.2.6 Within the context of the wider Moseley Road area being recognised as an area for growth for the creative industries, making links between the cultural and media quarter in Digbeth, to Moseley Village, will be actively encouraged. Increased diversity and entrepreneurial activity will provide complementary employment opportunities, especially in the local centre. Building upon the existing hospitality, tourism and leisure offer will strengthen Moseley’s reputation as one of the city’s cultural assets. Policies aimed at supporting existing employment uses and encouraging new ones, particularly within the Village, will be applied.

\(^{12}\) BCC Economic Data, percentage in Moseley and KH Ward in self-employment in 2001 was 8.8%, percentage for Birmingham was 5.5%.

\(^{13}\) SOC code 34, Culture, Media and Sport with 4.8% of all people in creative occupations as compared to 1.5% for Birmingham as a whole.
### POLICY CONTEXT

**UDP Chapter 20, Commerce – C24: Moseley Centre**

Draft BDP policy context: Objective 4.8.

Thematic policies TP19, TP20, TP25, TP45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Local Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Maintain existing and grow new employment opportunities.</td>
<td><strong>BE1</strong> Applications for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) will be encouraged in the local centre (above ground floor within the PSA), where consistent with policy EA3 and the Shopping and Local Centres SPD. Active frontages at ground floor will be required outside the PSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Encourage entrepreneurial activity and local business development.</td>
<td><strong>BE2</strong> To maintain diversity of employment opportunities, seek to retain existing employment sites, and maintain employment uses on key sites, such as Moseley Hall Hospital, Pitmaston, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BE3</strong> The interim use of existing empty properties or vacant land to support new ventures will be encouraged, subject to normal planning considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BE4</strong> New development will be subject to the need to agree a sustainable transport plan with BCC that reduces the reliance on the car for business employees and encourages the use of public and alternative modes of transport, including walking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### What local people said:

"Keep the village feel. The market, the small local traders."

"By making it a family-friendly centre in terms of shops, parking (for bikes and cars) and roads."

"We want shops that open during the day and restricted opening hours for the pubs and chip shops. Public toilets should be free in the centre."

"Shared space – fewer traffic signs/signals."

"We should incentivise businesses in tourism, leisure, media and creative sectors to come to Moseley."

"Market the village better as a key visitor destination in Birmingham."

"This place is very good, could do with more parking spaces."
URBAN DESIGN

2.2.7 Quality public realm is a key thread running throughout this document. However, the design and appearance of private property plays a crucial role in framing that community space. Examples of mediocre buildings that replaced characterful predecessors can be found in the Village. This section and the policies within do not decry change but seek to embrace positive contributions that add to the overall quality of the built environment.

What local people said:

“More affordable homes especially for young people, a vibrant rental section and new flats”

“Homes should be large enough for small families with green space.”

“No backland development or demolition. Extend the conservation area.”

“There is a shortage of small and medium-sized houses for families who need 2-3 bedrooms.”

“All new-builds should be eco-friendly (photovoltaics and insulation, etc).”

“Homes that are sympathetic to the history and architecture of Moseley. A good range of housing to attract people from all backgrounds and income levels.”

“Not quick-build rabbit hutch that are appearing everywhere else. Let some architects loose and get creative.”

“Maybe live work spaces related to the kind of businesses we will have.”

“Future homes will be mainly the ones we have now, but with much greater levels of energy efficiency.”
**POLICY CONTEXT**

UDP Chapter 3 – Environment, para 3.14  
Draft BDP policy context: Objective 3.22, 3.23. Themed policy TP3  
Mature Suburbs SPD (2008)  
Places for Living SPG (2001)  
Places for All SPD (2001)  
Draft Places for the Future SPD (2012) [to be known as ‘Your Green and Healthy City SPD’, once adopted.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Local Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) Encourage good urban design principles in all new-build development and public realm improvements. | UD 1 Ensure all new development enhances or improves the quality of the built environment, and acknowledges the value of the natural environment and open space, as important components of good design.  
UD 2 In accordance with HE 5, ensure that any new development (especially within the conservation areas and Village centre) respects their character and is of the highest design standard.  
UD 3 The following principles will apply in the Village centre:  
• the design should enhance the predominantly Victorian/Edwardian street scene;  
• original features should be retained or restored.  
• The Moseley Shop Front Design Guide (1992) remains relevant and will remain as policy.  
UD 4 All new development should apply the guidance contained within Places for Living SPD, Places for All SPD and the draft Places for the Future SPD.  
UD 5 Density and design of new housing should respond to the local context and build on the unique character of Moseley. In particular, building plots should be of an appropriate size to reflect the typical form in the area. The frontage width, depth, height and massing, should be in keeping, and new buildings should respect established building lines. The importance of vistas is also to be acknowledged, where appropriate.  
UD 6 Where appropriate, bespoke high quality design will be encouraged that adds to the tradition of Moseley’s architecture.  
UD 7 All developments will be required to conform to the Mature Suburbs policy and the Places for Living SPD. Where it does not make a positive contribution to the character of the area, or where the principles of good quality urban design are not met, back-land development will be resisted. |
2.2.8 Local people are concerned that there should be greater awareness of the existing policies for the protection of the neighbourhood’s historical environment, and that they be used more effectively.

2.2.9 Although listed buildings are protected by legislation, other ‘characterful’ properties may not carry such protection. In circumstances where heritage assets become void, efforts to bring them back into productive use should be explored, including the use of Community Right to Bid.
POLICY CONTEXT

UDP Chapter 3 Environment – para 3.27
Chapter 17 – Sparkbrook and Small Heath,
Chapter 20 – Selly Oak, para 20.40, 20.43
Draft BDP policy context: Objective 3.10. Themed Policy TP12
Moseley Conservation Area Character Appraisal and
Management Plan (2005)
Mature Suburbs SPD (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Local Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) To respect, protect and enhance the character of Moseley.</td>
<td>HE1 Where appropriate, all development will be required to adhere to the Moseley Conservation Area Character Assessment and Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ensure that Moseley’s historic assets are recognised and contribute towards the area’s vitality and durability.</td>
<td>HE2 Statutorily listed buildings, their features, archaeological remains, landscapes, and local assets will be protected, enhanced, and managed in a sustainable way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE3 At appropriate locations, new architectural styles and innovative design that bring unique qualities and integrate with the historic environment will be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE4 Ensure that new development is of the highest design standard, especially within the conservation areas and Village centre to enhance their character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE5 Recognising the importance of the Alcester Road as a place with significant civic and heritage assets, will strengthen the character of Moseley and the adjoining areas of Balsall Heath and Kings Heath. Measures to emphasise this linkage will be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEISURE AND GREEN OPEN SPACES

2.2.10 Consultation confirmed that nature conservation, improvement of the local environment and ‘green’ initiatives were popular among Moseley residents. There are a number of local organisations already progressing environmental projects\(^\text{14}\). The variety of the open spaces in Moseley make a valuable contribution to its urban environmental quality, including the informal green infrastructure of street trees, hedges and front gardens. This SPD seeks to protect and enhance that provision, improving upon its value for formal and informal recreation and nature conservation, as well as increasing accessibility, management and safety for users. In addition there is a desire to retain allotments and explore how they can contribute to reducing climate change and improving biodiversity.

\(^{14}\) The Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Friends of Moseley Bog, Friends of Highbury Park and Sustainable Moseley.
**POLICY CONTEXT**

Draft BDP policy context: Objectives 3.8, 3.9.
Themed Policies TP1, TP2, TP5, TP7, TP8, TP9, TP11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Local Policies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conserve Moseley's Green open spaces.</td>
<td>L1 Development of the existing open space provision within the plan area, for non-recreational uses, will be resisted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Increase the enjoyment of open space by local residents.</td>
<td>L2 Redevelopment of green infrastructure assets (especially allotments) will be resisted, in accordance with current BCC policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Identify, manage and improve Moseley’s open space, green infrastructure and ecological networks.</td>
<td>L3 New development should not cause the loss of wildlife habitat but should improve biodiversity. New developments should contain landscape proposals that preserve, contribute to, or expand the green infrastructure between the Rivers Rea and Cole corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) To make open space more accessible to local residents.</td>
<td>L4 Protect and enhance the River Rea Nature Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L5 Protect and enhance the SINC/SLINC's and local nature reserve within the plan area and improve links to these assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L6 Green infrastructure such as street trees, front and rear gardens, hedges, etc should be encouraged in new developments. The removal / conversion of front gardens will be resisted where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L7 Small-scale micro-energy generation will be encouraged at suitable locations throughout the area, within the green infrastructure, ie parks / allotments, provided their appearance and operation are not detrimental to the residential amenity of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L8 Community involvement / management of parks and open spaces will be encouraged where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L9 Maximise the multi-functional use of open space in the north of the area, to help address the overall lack of provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L10 Encourage open space and play facilities in new developments, especially in areas deficient in such provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L11 Where development proposals generate ‘off site’ requirements for open space, the use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), together with financial contributions will be considered, to identify, manage and improve green infrastructure and play facilities, as well as increasing public access to private open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L12 Support Moseley Park and Pool Trust in widening free access to the park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRAFFIC AND MOVEMENT

2.2.11 The conflict of having the A435 Alcester Rd (a major arterial route and part of the city’s Strategic Highway Network) running through the Village centre, is acknowledged. However, this SPD promotes policies and measures to make it more pedestrian-friendly, such as giving pedestrians greater priority over car-borne traffic, increasing the number of informal cycle routes, better parking provision for cyclists and increased public transport.
### POLICY CONTEXT

**UDP Chapter 20 – Transportation para 20.11**

Draft BDP policy context: Objective 3.29, 3.34, 3.35. Themed policies TP37, TP38, TP39, TP39, TP40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Local Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Ensure Moseley’s streets enhance the quality of life in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td><strong>T1</strong> New development will be expected to demonstrate how it supports measures to increase the use of public transport, encourage walking across the neighbourhood, and contribute towards the implementation of the Birmingham Cycling Strategy 2011-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Improve transportation links.</td>
<td><strong>T2</strong> Within the local centre, the incorporation of shared space principles will be supported, secured in part from CIL/S106 contributions from new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>T3</strong> Throughout the plan area, measures to manage existing traffic flows to provide a better balance between the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles, will be supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>T4</strong> The reintroduction of passenger services on the Camp Hill railway line and associated services in Moseley Village centre will be supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>T5</strong> The interim use of the former rail station car park as a multi-functional space (including car parking, sports pitches), will be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>T6</strong> Measures to reduce car congestion around schools at peak times will be supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>T7</strong> Measures will be encouraged that improve the safety and usage of the in-centre car parks, including their management by a local community organisation, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ability to purchase property at full market rates in Moseley is now largely limited to those on higher earnings. The cost of homes far exceeds the means of those earning average wages in the city, and the supply of affordable homes is limited. This SPD contains policies for the development of small-scale housing schemes, to help address the need for all types of residential accommodation, including new-build and conversion. It also seeks to ensure that the quality of the existing built environment is respected, especially where new development and retro-fit is concerned.
**POLICY CONTEXT**

UDP Chapter 20 – para 20.40  
Draft BDP policy context: Objectives 3.22, 3.23  
Themed policies TP3, TP5, TP6, TP26, TP29, TP30, TP34  
Mature Suburbs SPD (2008)  
Places for Living SPG (2001)  
Draft Places for the Future SPD (2012) [to be known as ‘Your Green and Healthy City’ SPD, once adopted.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Local Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) Support a range of house types without compromising the unique character of Moseley.  
b) Support younger families to live in Moseley. |  
**H1** The provision of family-sized accommodation at appropriate locations in Moseley will be encouraged.  
**H2** Whilst acknowledging that the availability of sites for new residential accommodation is limited, in both number and size, where possible, the Council’s Affordable Housing policies will apply.  
**H3** Where the conversion of large domestic properties into Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMO) requires planning permission or for institutional purposes, such use will be resisted. The de-conversion of HMO back into single family accommodation will be supported.  
**H4** Seek to ensure that wherever possible, improvement to existing stock adheres to policy UD4 in respect to ‘Places for Living’ and the draft ‘Places for the Future’ SPD’s.  
**H5** Where buildings / sites become void for extended periods of time, their interim use will be encouraged, subject to normal planning considerations. Where this is not possible, formal action to bring them back into productive use will be supported, including the use of compulsory purchase powers. |
2.2.13 Sustainable community action can form more easily in places where residents can meet, organise, deliver services and build cohesion. Without community spaces the sustainability of local voluntary action becomes more difficult.
What local people said:

“Moseley needs a new Centre 13 (community centre). Since it went there is hardly any community help for the elderly.”

“Sports centre, encourage older people to use and have a multi-purpose buildings.”

“I think Moseley needs a community centre, a place where all ages can go for entertainment, possible childcare, a safe place to meet with friends, a nice place with facilities to cater for all etc and this would hopefully create more jobs within Moseley.”

“Leisure facilities are desperately needed. People have to go outside of Moseley to take advantage.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Local Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Enable the community to have a meaningful stake in the shared physical environment of the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>C1 Seek to secure CIL/S106 contributions to improve existing community venues and develop new ones, in particular for young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To maintain and develop new infrastructure to support community life in Moseley.</td>
<td>C2 Any sites / properties included on a community assets register, shall be acknowledged when proposals for development / redevelopment are being considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Increase the amount of land and buildings in community ownership or management.</td>
<td>C3 The out-of-hours use of educational facilities will be encouraged where appropriate. The use of s106 / CIL contributions is appropriate to help create increased community access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEALTH AND WELLBEING

2.2.14 Improving health is an essential element of increasing quality of life (and a crucial part of Birmingham’s Sustainable Community Strategy15).

2.2.15 Factors such as the natural environment, green infrastructure and formal / informal open space, can be as important to the health of the individual and wider community, as some medical interventions. In Moseley, there are aspects of the residents’ quality of life that could be improved through land use proposals. In turn, these would help support community groups, young people, the elderly, as well as leading to high quality residential streets/community spaces that are safe and well-used.

POLICY CONTEXT

Draft BDP policy context: Themed policy TP36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local objectives</th>
<th>Local Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Improve health and wellbeing of local residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Support the implementation of the Birmingham and Solihull NHS Integrated Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Support the priorities set by the Birmingham Cross-City Clinical Commissioning Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Improve life expectancy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Promote healthy lifestyles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH1 Promote the development of health care facilities in the Village centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH2 Encourage the provision of safe walking, cycling routes and play areas across the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Birmingham’s Sustainable Community Strategy was adopted in July 2008.
3. IMPLEMENTATION

3.0.1 Moseley’s civic activism has been one of its key features for many years, and, coupled with its historic legacy, has made it one of Birmingham’s desirable neighbourhoods. In that tradition, residents want to maintain its diversity and vitality for future generations to enjoy.

3.0.2 Local community and business groups will work together to help sustain the desirability of the neighbourhoods responding to the development challenges of the future.

3.0.3 This SPD provides a vision for land use in Moseley over the next few years. However, it recognises that the continued success of the place is dependent upon the development of ideas and proposals only partially related to such a physical, land use focus. The successful implementation of the policies contained within this document, together with the social community and service orientated ideas generated throughout the consultation process, will help ensure that Moseley fulfils its potential to be an attractive place to live, work and visit.

3.0.4 In order to secure and deliver change the following key elements will be important:

- leadership
- working in partnership
- ensuring development quality through the statutory planning process
- funding, planning obligations and delivery
- enforcement of policies

3.1 WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP

3.1.1 The City Council, the business community, Moseley Regeneration Group and others, will use the SPD as a mechanism to stimulate inward investment, attract appropriate developers and in turn promote the neighbourhood. This will be achieved by:

- developing links with the private sector including existing businesses and landowners, as well as potential investors;
- co-ordinating public sector investment to maximise the impact of its limited resources;
- appropriate marketing;
- supporting existing and new businesses looking to locate within the area;
- supporting community development activities;
- utilising the Community Asset Transfer process to enable the community to manage and/or acquire assets that they have identified as being important to the local area;
- supporting the community in Community Right to Build initiatives.

3.2 THE STATUTORY PLANNING PROCESS

3.2.1 The SPD will be a statutory planning document. It will provide guidance for future development (providing clarity and certainty for the market) and will be a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications within the area.

3.2.2 The City Council will therefore apply its development management role, together with its other regulatory powers, to shape, determine and enable development, to help deliver the proposals and policies within the SPD.

3.2.3 The SPD will also provide context and support for the use of the City Council’s compulsory purchase powers (where appropriate) to assist with site assembly and to facilitate development.
3.3 DELIVERY

3.3.1 The policies contained within this document have been developed to respond to the issues, ideas and suggestions that matter to local people. Consultation resulted in an extensive list of potential projects that can be developed by a variety of parties, as and when appropriate. Not all of them are land-based – the tourism and business development strands, for example – and many can be incorporated into other documents such as the Ward/District Development Plan. The Moseley Regeneration Group will lead the delivery of many of these projects and seek to form partnerships in the process.

3.4 REQUIRED ASSESSMENTS AND SURVEYS

3.4.1 Due to the diverse built, green and historic environment in Moseley certain additional information may be required when submitting planning applications; these requirements are outlined below.

3.4.2 The requirement for ecological assessment will not be restricted solely to developments adjacent to wildlife corridors. An ecological assessment may be required for developments which have the potential to affect designated sites, wildlife corridors and important habitats (identified in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan for Birmingham and the Black Country (http://bbcbap.org.uk/images/LBAP/bbcbapfinal2010.pdf), as well as legally protected and notable species. Depending on the results of this assessment, ecological mitigation or compensation measures may be required to address any adverse impacts of development. Schemes that provide habitat enhancements will be welcomed, particularly where they contribute to Nature Improvement Area (NIA) objectives.

3.4.3 Archaeological desk-based assessments and field evaluations may be required when there are proposals to redevelop sites, in order to provide information on the potential reuse of heritage assets, or requirements for their recording, as part of future development.

3.5 FUNDING AND PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

3.5.1 In respect of new development, the City Council will seek to secure a package of planning obligations to ensure the delivery and future maintenance of appropriate elements of this plan, including affordable housing, public open space, low carbon energy, education, public realm enhancements and new community facilities.

3.5.2 In addition, the City Council will seek to secure local employment opportunities through the use of targeted employment strategies. It will seek to link training to employer demand and use the local workforce in the construction phases of development, where possible.

3.5.3 This SPD has been prepared at a time of ongoing financial constraints and a challenging economic climate. Viability is an issue in bringing sites forward for development and it may not be possible in the short term for development to provide a full range of planning obligations.

3.5.4 Where this is the case, appropriate measures will be used, to ‘future proof’ planning obligations, so as to ensure that the value of the package of contributions is maximised throughout the lifetime of the proposed development. The City Council may require developers to submit full viability appraisals to demonstrate the level of obligations that can be afforded/delivered.

3.5.5 The City Council is preparing its evidence base to support the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to deliver the infrastructure required to support the planned growth of the city. Once introduced, CIL will replace elements of S106 agreements and will be used to support the delivery of key infrastructure.
3.6 SECTION 106 REQUIREMENTS

3.6.1 Until the CIL is adopted, S106 contributions will be negotiated for the following:

**Village centre**
All new development should improve the environmental quality and support the Village centre by:

- contributing to the improved quality of the public realm and its future maintenance, including traffic management measures;
- contributing to town centre management, eg a Business Improvement District or Village Centre Partnership

**Residential**
- New development will be required to contribute to the level of affordable accommodation in the area, in line with the Affordable Housing policies of the City Council.
- New development may need to provide contributions to improving local school provision.
- Contributions to improving and maintaining open space, play and sports facilities, including where appropriate, recreational amenities for young people, or contributions for off-site open space improvements.
- Contributions to improving and maintaining allotments, the green infrastructure, community health and community facilities.

- Contributions to measures to improve the quality of the residential environment, eg environmental enhancements to residential streets, and traffic management measures

**All types of development**
Contributions will be sought for:
- Transport infrastructure
- Environmental, pedestrian and cycling improvements
- Training and local labour in the construction and operational phases of development

---

**RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

1.4 PLANNING CONTEXT – Key local policies relevant to the Moseley SPD.

**The Birmingham Plan (UDP) 2008**

**Chapter 2 Strategy:**
- Development within a sustainable development framework (2.8, 2.9).

**Chapter 3 Environment:**
Vision for
- a sustainable growth (2.4, 2.5, 2.6);
- a vibrant global city (2.10);
- a high quality of life and a sense of place (2.14 and 2.15);
- and objectives 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9.

**Chapter 7 Shopping centres**
- Maintain a network of local shopping centres (7.21, 7.22, 7.23, 7.23a, 7.24).

**Chapter 17 Sparkbrook and Small Heath**
- Moseley (17.31, 17.32, 17.33, 17.34, 17.35).

**Chapter 20 Selly Oak**
THE DRAFT BIRMINGHAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN: RELEVANT OBJECTIVES

- To develop Birmingham as a City of sustainable neighbourhoods that are safe, diverse and inclusive with locally distinctive character. To create a prosperous successful and enterprising economy with benefits felt by all. To create a more sustainable City that minimises its carbon footprint and waste whilst allowing the City to grow.

- To encourage better health and well-being through the provision of new and existing recreation, sport and leisure facilities linked to good quality public open space.

- To protect and enhance the City’s heritage and historic environments.

- To conserve Birmingham’s natural environments, allowing biodiversity and wildlife to flourish.

Key Objectives:
- The environment and sustainability
- Economy and network of centres
- Homes and neighbourhoods
- Connectivity

Relevant themed policies;
TP1 Reducing the City’s carbon footprint
TP2 Adapting to climate change.
TP3 Sustainable construction.
TP4 Low and zero carbon energy generation.
TP5 A low carbon economy.
TP7 Green infrastructure network.
TP8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity.
TP9 Open space, playing fields and allotments
TP11 Sports facilities.
TP12 Historic environment.
TP19 Protection of employment land.
TP20 The network and hierarchy of centres.
TP21 Convenience retail provision.
TP22 Small shops and independent retailing
TP23 Promotion of biodiversity of uses within centres
TP24 Tourism and tourist facilities
TP25 Local employment
TP26 Sustainable neighbourhoods
TP27 The location of new housing
TP29 The type, size and density of new housing
TP30 Affordable housing
TP34 The existing housing stock
TP36 Health
TP37 A sustainable transport network
TP38 Walking
TP39 Cycling
TP40 Public transport
TP45 Digital communications

In addition to the UDP and draft BDP, a number of other policies are relevant to Moseley:
- Shopping and Local Centres SPD (2012).
- Draft Places for the Future SPD (2012) [to be known as ‘Your Green and Healthy City’ SPD, once adopted.]
- Places for All SPD (2001).
**GLOSSARY**

| MRG: Moseley Regeneration Group; Collection of community organisations, instrumental in preparing this draft SPD. |
|---|---|
| BCC: Birmingham City Council. |
| BDP: Birmingham Development Plan. Currently being consulted upon, but which will be adopted as the city land use planning framework until 2031, following a successful public inquiry. |
| BREEAM: Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment – sustainability guidance for new non-residential buildings |
| CENTRE BOUNDARIES: These show the extent of the ‘Village’ centre and include the shopping areas as well as areas of predominantly leisure, business and other main centre uses. |
| CENTRO: The West Midlands integrated transport authority, promoting and developing public transport across the region. |
| CIL: Community Infrastructure Levy. Levy to be introduced, largely to replace S106 agreements |
| DISTRICT CENTRE: A group of shops often containing at least one supermarket/superstore and a range of non retail services such as banks, building societies and restaurants as well as local public facilities. |
| GP: General Practitioner – local doctor. |
| HMO: Housing in multiple occupation. |
| LIFETIME HOMES STANDARD: Design criteria intended to make homes more easily adaptable for lifetime use. |
| LOCAL CENTRE: A generic term used to refer to Town, District and Neighbourhood Centres in Birmingham’s hierarchy of centres. |
| LOCAL PARADE: A small group of local shops. |
| NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE: Moseley Village is a Neighbourhood Centre. Such centres include a range of small shops of a local nature serving a small catchment. Typically local centres might include amongst other shops a small supermarket, a newsagent, a post office and a pharmacy. Other facilities could include a hot food takeaway and launderette. |
| NHS: National Health Service |
| PRIMARY SHOPPING AREA (PSA): Within the local centre, this is the area where retail development is primarily concentrated. Smaller centres may not have areas of predominantly leisure, business and other centre uses and therefore the PSA may share the same boundary as the Centre Boundary. |
| S106: Agreement under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended), to secure compensatory benefits. |
| SA: Sustainability Appraisal. |
| SHLAA: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment |
| SINC: Site of Importance for Nature Conservation |
| SLINC: Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation |
| SME: Small and medium sized businesses. |
| SPD: Supplementary Planning Document. Local land use policy, supplementary to that contained within the Council’s main policy document (currently the UDP). |
| SPG: Supplementary Planning Guidance. Local land use policy to be superseded by the SPD. The Moseley SPG (1992) has been reviewed as part of the SPD process. |
| UDP: Unitary Development Plan. The current land use policy for Birmingham – to be replaced by the BDP once adopted. |
| USE CLASS: Land uses, as defined in The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2005. |
From: Anne Linnecor
Sent: 07 January 2016 14:14
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Birmingham City Council area boundary changes

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

Dear Sirs

The current boundary change proposal for 10 councillors for the Sutton Coldfield area is unfair to Sutton Coldfield.

The Sutton Coldfield population justifies 11 councillors based on the communities of Four Oaks, Mere Green, Town Centre, Wylde Green, Roughley, Whitehouse Common, Reddicap, Walmley, Minworth, Boldmere and Banners Gate.

We request that Sutton has 11 rather than 10 councillors on Birmingham City Council in line with the population councillor ratio of other Birmingham council area communities.

Yours faithfully,

Anne Frances Linnecor
From: Adrian Linnecor
Sent: 07 January 2016 14:11
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Birmingham City Council area boundary changes

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

Dear Sirs

The current boundary change proposal for 10 councillors for the Sutton Coldfield area is unfair to Sutton Coldfield.

The Sutton Coldfield population justifies 11 councillors based on the communities of Four Oaks, Mere Green, Town Centre, Wylde Green, Roughley, Whitehouse Common, Reddicap, Walmley, Minworth, Boldmere and Banners Gate.

We request that Sutton has 11 rather than 10 councillors on Birmingham City Council in line with the population councillor ratio of other Birmingham council area communities.

Yours faithfully,

George Adrian Linnecor
Dear Sirs

The current boundary change proposal for 10 councillors for the Sutton Coldfield area is unfair to Sutton Coldfield. The Sutton Coldfield population justifies 11 councillors based on the communities of Four Oaks, Mere Green, Town Centre, Wylde Green, Roughley, Whitehouse Common, Reddicap, Walmley, Minworth, Boldmere and Banners Gate.

We request that Sutton has 11 rather than 10 councillors on Birmingham City Council in line with the population councillor ratio of other Birmingham council area communities.

Yours faithfully,

George Adrian Linnecor
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: John Lish
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: n/a

Comment text:

I like to particularly comment on the proposal for changes to my ward which will see the creation of a Stirchley ward. Unfortunately in order to make up the numbers, the draft proposal nibbles a piece of Selly Park and takes a chunk of Cotteridge within the Stirchley ward boundaries. There is some blurring of Stirchley and Selly Park at the boundary so that small area can be fudged. However the area of Cotteridge proposed within the Stirchley boundaries violates the coherence of Cotteridge's community. If Councillors are to represent communities then this split doesn't work. I would further question the creation of a 2-member Cotteridge and Bournville ward. For me, there is more coherence in a Stirchley/Cotteridge ward using the Pershore Road as the basis since both Cotteridge and Stirchley share common issues around economic activity, housing stock and make-up of the community. Bournville is the more separate community of the three that make up the existing 3-member ward. I appreciate that those in Cotteridge have aspirations to be associated with Bournville whereas Stirchley is more independently minded (bloody-minded?) but the Stirchley community is too small in number to make a single ward unless the commission is willing to allow a wider disparity between wards. As I'm firmly in Stirchley, its not a major issue for me but it doesn't feel right. The other proposed ward changes that I wish to comment on is the proposed Balsall Heath/Cannon Hill ward and Moseley ward. I'm frankly baffled by the Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill connection and cannot see why you want to create a 2-member ward over those communities. No doubt you received a lot of correspondence from Moseleyites complaining about the splitting of their community. It does make sense to join what you called Cannon Hill to Moseley to make a 2-member Moseley ward. Although, it would be entertaining for the rest of the city if you created three 1-member wards: Balsall Heath; Moseley West; Moseley East. Then we could sit and watch the arguments about whether East or West Moseley was the 'proper' Moseley.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Graeme Littlewood
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I object to the proposals for the Moseley area (see attached document)

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Dear LGBC,

Ward Boundaries Consultation Response - Moseley

With regard to the proposed changes to the Moseley Ward boundary, I live at [Redacted] (which under the proposed changes will remain in 'Moseley Ward') and I strongly object to the proposed changes in their current form because they will split Moseley into several different wards, and the village centre will no longer be in 'Moseley'. What sense is there in that?

The community of Moseley has been built up and nurtured over many decades, and these proposals do not in any way follow your own policy guidelines, threatening the destruction of its identity as a 'Village' community. This community has in recent years pulled together successfully to win successive awards for its floral displays (Britain in Bloom) and routinely (monthly) has 'working party' groups who clear litter along Moseley's roads and public spaces, car-parks, woods, fields and parks. These services are no longer provided by the City, and so the community is doing what it can to maintain a standard of tidiness and cleanliness which distinguishes it from many other areas that seem not to have such a strong sense of identity as a community.

Your current proposal would dismantle this well-established community (which has a strong sense of place) and wreck local governance, removing at a stroke the benefits of having three local councillors working together as part of Moseley and King's Heath Ward (the adjacent community which has historically been represented as having similar interests and works closely with Moseley). The current three councillors, elected in the present 'phased' election system, ensures continuity of representation and business, so that when councillors change, through voting process or other factors, knowledge and expertise in current activities and local issues is not lost. The proposal to change to an
election for all councillors every four years will be a serious backward step for democracy, and community interests will no longer be safeguarded.

Representing a community of people is not a numbers game – it must always be for the benefit of that community, not to its detriment. The LGBC appears to be drawing these new boundary proposals from the map of the current local polling districts, and it bears no relation to the reality of the geography of Moseley. It will break the partnership between the Moseley Society and the Moseley councillors, which created two Moseley conservation areas. It will cause the loss of many years’ work creating the ‘Moseley Big Plan’, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, which has resulted in a Supplementary Planning Document – surely this is a massive potential impact on something which exemplifies the identity and cohesion of the community that is Moseley? All the efforts of local volunteers and council officers, made to improve economic development in this part of Birmingham, will be lost if these proposals go ahead.

Further, several significant establishments and amenities absolutely must remain within the boundary of what everyone knows to be Moseley: the village centre is the most obvious of these, but both Moseley Parish Church and St Columba’s Church must also remain in ‘Moseley’, as must the Moseley Exchange and the Moseley Park.; It would be a nonsense to designate any other area boundary for any of them, and any area boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is a nonsense also.

Fragmenting the community of Moseley across so many proposed wards will make consultation with and between local councillors so much more difficult: lobbying, campaigning and fighting for grants will become much harder and more time-consuming. The integrity of most of the Moseley local groups, such as Moseley in Bloom, Moseley Forum, Moseley Society, Moseley Park & Pool, Moseley Festival, Moseley Farmers’ and Arts Markets, etc., will all be severely compromised – needlessly. There seems to be no benefit for Moseley in these proposals – it seems to be just a bureaucratic exercise which has not been properly thought through.

The people who live in the community of Moseley need structures that keep us all together and help us work together and build a stronger sense of community and involvement and belonging – not this piecemeal destruction of something vibrant and strong that exists already. Please don’t destroy what we have. Any ward called ‘Moseley’
simply MUST have the centre of Moseley in it. It seems that the LGBC has not considered community identity at all in these proposals.

Please reconsider these proposals and recommend a Moseley ward that properly reflects the community of Moseley, respecting and reflecting the submissions in this regard from the Moseley Community Groups.

Yours sincerely,

Graeme Littlewood
Dear Sir, I am writing to object strongly to the proposed boundary changes to Moseley. Although I will still be in ‘the new Moseley’ I strongly oppose the idea of splitting Moseley into different wards and destroying the current unity of Moseley as it now is and has been for many years. Boundary change will see the separation of the two conservation areas that have over 150 years of history and partnership. The link between the Moseley Society and Moseley Councillors will be broken. Key places such as Centre of Moseley (Moseley Village) Moseley Parish Church, (St Mary’s) and Moseley Park, MUST be in Moseley. The many volunteers who work tirelessly for the present Moseley community will have to liaise with different ward councillors and officers and this will be more time consuming and often unwieldy. Moseley, as it is at the present time, is a unique area that people from many parts of the country know of either from having lived here, or had/ have family members or friends living here and it is held in great regard; indeed many people want to come to live here because of Moseley’s ‘village community’. If these proposals go ahead and Moseley is split, then all this will be lost. I sincerely hope that my objections and those of others will be looked at sympathetically and Moseley will be left intact for future generations to enjoy living in this individual area of Birmingham. Yours faithfully, Julia Littlewood (Mrs)
Dear Sir or Madam

We have just been to a meeting about the proposed moving of the Hall Green boundaries. We have lived here for 37 years and are very unhappy about the proposal. We want Status Quo.

Thank you for considering our request

John and Birgitta Livemore
Pascoe, Mark

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 13 January 2016 09:35
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Boundary changes involving the removal of historic Yardley in Birmingham and calling it Stechford East

-----Original Message-----
From: Carol
Sent: 12 January 2016 22:42
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary changes involving the removal of historic Yardley in Birmingham and calling it Stechford East

I write to lodge my objection to rename the Yardley area of Birmingham Stechford East in your proposed amendments to reduce the size of the wards.

Yardley has no association with Stechford other than it happens to be the ward next door. Stechford has no historical significance whereas Yardley has and your proposals will wipe out an area that goes back to the Domesday book and our Church is 1,000 years old. We live in Yardley, worship in Yardley and our children play in Old Yardley Park.

I urge you to reconsider your proposal and allow our great heritage to continue.

Regards

Carol Lloyd
Oakfield rd which currently comes under Stockland green ward comes under a different ward every time their is a boundary change. Prior to being placed in Stockland green Oakfield rd was in the Erdington ward. The new proposals is for Oakfield rd to be in the tyburn ward. I feel that since Oakfield ld rd was in the Erdington ward it has been neglected with planned Road resurfacing and new street lighting planned for 2012 being shelved. I believe this is due to planned boundary changes and another ward will be picking up the bill. I believe that Oakfield road has not been represented since it was moved out of the Erdington ward, i believe this is due to its location on the edge of a boundary, if it was moved back into the Erdington ward it would be in a more suitable ward following on from Trafalgar road. My proposal is to draw the boundary for Tyburn along Wood End lane from 6 ways Erdington down Oakfield rd (as drawn on the proposal) instead of Wood End rd. This change would only affect a few resident on Wood End rd and Oakfield rd.
To: The Review Officer  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14th floor Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir or Madam  
Ref: Consultation on Draft Recommendations for Birmingham City Council

I wish to comment on the proposed 2-councillor ward of Bournbrook & Selly Park.

In my firm opinion, separate 1-councillor wards for respectively Bournbrook & Selly Park would serve the interests of both communities better.

These are completely different areas in terms of population types, conservation areas and public transport routes:

**Bournbrook** is composed largely of rented smaller terraced properties, occupied by students who live in the area for 1 to 3 years. It has only 1 small Residents' Association and no Conservation Area. Its Public Transport and commuting route is based on Bristol Road, the main artery of Bournbrook.

**Selly Park** on the other hand consists mostly of families and couples who are resident for many years, occupying mostly detached or a few larger terraced properties. There are 4 Residents' Groups and most properties are in the Selly Park Conservation Area. The main Public Transport and commuting route is A441 Pershore Rd.

I suggest that although the proposed external boundary of Bournbrook/Selly Park could be kept, this ward should be split into 2 wards, each with 1 councillor, which I believe would better serve the very different needs of each group.

Please consider this proposal seriously.

Yours truly  
Philip Lloyd
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name:  
E-mail:  
Postcode:  
Organisation Name:  

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1:  Should be Sheldon or Yardley

Comment text:

Houses around Cockshut Hill (Gleneagles, Duncroft should be at least recognised as Sheldon or Yardley, never in the area of Garrets Green.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Barbara Lomas
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I wish to strongly oppose the change of name from Yardley to Stechford East. Yardley is an historic village/area, it has been known as YARDLEY for over a thousand years, it is seped in history. So much of British history is being eroded away n Please let us keep our lively ancient name YARDLEY give us YARDLEY not Stechford East Barbara Lomas Philip Aldridge [REDACTED]

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir

I wish to notify you of my very strong objection to the renaming of my historic village/area Yardley has been Yardley for over a thousand years please let it remain Yardley til the end of time! We want Yardley not Stechford East

Regards
Barbara Lomas
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

I don't think that it makes sense for the Boldmere gate area of Sutton Park to be taken out of the Boldmere councillor's area. The proposal puts it in to Four Oaks. However the Boldmere Partnership work links to Boldmere Gate area in Sutton Park and so this needs to be in the boldmere ward area.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
AFTER BEING A RESIDENT OF OVER 45 YEARS IN HALL GREEN WE ARE DISGUSTED THAT YOU ARE TO DOWNGRADE US TO TYSLEY HALL GREEN HAS ALWAYS BEEN REGARDED AS A LOVELY AREA KNOWN FOR ITS TREE LINED ROADS AND GREEN SPACES THATS WHY ITS CALLED HALL GREEN NOT AN INDUSTRIAL AREA LIKE TYSLEY AS A RESULT OF THIS HAPPENING OUR HOUSE PRICES WILL DROP AND HOME AND CAR INSURANCE WILL INCREASE THIS IS NOT WHAT WE WANT AND WILL FIGHT FOR OUR RESIDENTIAL RIGHTS
Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Ward Boundary Changes

We most strongly disagree to the changes of our boundary.

We have lived here in Hall Green B38 for thirty seven years. We moved from Tulseley in 1979.

Over the years we have lost our local shops, all our banks, Moor Green Football Ground and now we are expected to loose our name.

Obviously though being part of Tulseley Ward our rates and property prices would drop.

We hope that you reconsider this proposed plan.
as we would like Hall Green Birmingham to stay the same.
Tree lined and grass verges like our roads
Hall Green Railway Station and our parade,
Church and School.

We are extremely proud of our Suburb
Hall Green.

Thank you for reading this letter.

Yours Sincerely
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Paul Long
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I am a resident in the current Sutton Vesey Ward. I am happy with the name Sutton Boldmere as proposed by LGBCE. The Boldmere community is a strong one which many community events and community involvement. It is essential however, that access to Boldmere Gate and the facilities at Boldmere Gate up to the Jamboree Stone in the centre of the park are part of the Boldmere ward as these are facilities used by the Boldmere community. It is wholly wrong that these facilities should be part of the Four Oaks ward where residents don't even use our gate but have access to two gates of their own. I support the submissions made by community organisations that reflect residents' views including Boldmere Neighbourhood Forum, Boldmere Futures Partnership and Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir

I have considerable concerns over the new proposed council structures that have been suggested by the Local Government Boundary Commission and hope very much that you will reconsider the plan.

I have lived in Moseley for most of my student and adult life and have a real passion for the village that has adapted to every economic and other types of change that has been thrown at it since my time here in 1969.

In spite of being less than three miles away from the large city of Birmingham it has kept the village feel which is evident the moment you arrive into the centre.

The diverse population of Moseley have become a large family and are fiercely loyal and protective of its status recently regarded as the best in Britain in the Daily telegraph, and is a wonderful place in which to live.

It has a thriving arts population, is noted for the Moseley Farmers’ Market, has a Moseley in Bloom group which annually wins a gold award for its efforts in providing beautiful displays of flowers from the end of spring, whilst also looking after many communal areas such as the car park to ensure that it always looks good, and the Moseley Exchange which encourages the development of businesses.

There is also the Moseley Society which is knowledgeable about the History of Moseley, ensures that planning issues do not change the Conservation areas, which will no longer be in Moseley in spite of their historical significance, and work actively to protect the nature of Moseley. There is also a thriving Moseley regeneration group and the Moseley Faith groups.

There is a famous Moseley Bog, Moseley Hall, the Moseley Dovecote, Moseley Park and pool where music and folk festivals are held and of course Moseley village itself.

Moseley has a special identity but many of these groups will no longer be able to use the term Moseley in their title as the basis of the groups will cease to be united and exist as one.

It is totally bewildering that Moseley is being split into five wards with six councillors and where a great deal of the village centre and central roads that identify Moseley will no longer be in the ward of Moseley.
One can’t help but wonder about the logic that might have been used to justify this by those in the commission who drew the boundaries. It almost seems vindictive as if someone wishes to destroy something precious and that works well.

A stated main consideration in conducting an electoral review is to provide for effective and convenient local government. I would suggest that the present plan makes this far more difficult. How will six councillors with so many other considerations know who should be seen to deal with a particular constituent concern. It may well be that suddenly all six councillors are working on one concern, wasting valuable time and effort which could be more effectively used in other ways.

I am also concerned that equalising the number of electors each councillor represents can be achieved just by counting numbers of people living within the boundary. It is often the case that one or two electors can create work which is the equivalent of 20 electors so this may not be such an obvious method to improve electoral equality. If a one member councillor has several multi occupancy properties and many awkward electors within their ward they will find it impossible to provide equality, which would suggest that it would be better to have less wards and reintroduce at the very least two councillor wards. Even better would to stop wasting time, money and other precious resources and leave things as they are which I suspect would be the preference of everyone living in Birmingham.

In addition there are many Residents associations which not only look after their immediate areas but support other groups and keep in contact with police groups and local councillors when appropriate but how will all of these groups be able to communicate successfully with six councillors? How will the police be able to identify who they should be working with? Local governance will be difficult and divided.

Another stated electoral review consideration is to reflect community identity. The proposal has not only failed to do this but in fact is very much in danger of splitting a successful multi ethnic community. What a tragedy this would be.

On the Sunday Politic Show this week Professor Colin Mellors new chair of the Boundary Commission made many interesting statements. One being that there had been an intensively conducted tour. I would be interested to know what constituted this intensive tour as, had it been conducted I doubt that many of the boundary lines drawn so far would be in place.

It would be interesting to hear from the Boundary Commission the reasons why other Cities have a smaller ratio of electors per councillor too.

Professor Mellors also stated that he was “keen to learn what places should be called,” and “we will listen very hard to what the name should be,” I do hope that this is a genuine offer and that he will keep Moseley whole and united.

Yours Faithfully
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Matthew Lovell
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

The Jewellery Quarter and Winson Green are very different communities with differing needs. The JQ is a city-centre community, inextricably linked with the city core, and is it likely we will be poorly served by a 2 member ward that covers an area with such diverse needs. The Quarter is also home to a Business Improvement District - should these boundaries change then the BID will no longer be included with city centre BIDs which will negatively impact the work they carry out in the Jewellery Quarter and equally be a loss for Birmingham City Council and the city centre.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Linda Lovenbury
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Having lived in YARDLEY for nearly 72 years I feel I must express my dismay at people who have no knowledge of this area trying to make changes to the boundaries and inventing names which have no Meaning or historical significance to it. Yardley is a village which is over 1000 years old ,and has great significance in the development of Birmingham. Ivy seems as though yet again decisions are being made for financial reasons with no thoughts of the emotions of the people who actually live there Yardley is a pleasant well run area with a community spirit that is strong and valuable to society. It would be very sad if people who do not understand this are taking on the responsibility of changing this. Most of the people who live here are actually not in favour of these insensitive ideas of renaming areas with names of no significance. I would therefore ask you to re-consider these proposals. The ward should remain as it is-the desire of the people who actually live there.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Michael Lovenbury  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]  
Organisation Name: [redacted]

**Comment text:**

It seems to me rather ridiculous that the ancient parish of Yardley should be renamed "Stechford East ". Yardley has a focal centre both at Yardley church and at the Yew Tree. Stechford has no such focus and lacks the historical heritage. Why should Stecford not be renamed Yardley West? I strongly oppose the proposed renaming of Yardley.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Christopher Lowe
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I live within the proposed Ladywood ward, and agree with the proposals for the Ladywood ward. I agree with creating a ward with two councillors - this ward has a lot of businesses within it, and it is important that there are two councillors in the ward, as although those businesses do not have any votes, they do have significant need for representation by councillors. It would be too much for 1 councillor to cover the city centre area. The boundaries of the proposed ward are natural boundaries for the ward, as the main roads along which the boundaries lie create natural boundaries between the communities. The proposals for Ladywood Ward have my full support. In general, however, I disagree with the move to wards with only 1 councillor, and to the reduction of councillors from 120 to 100. Birmingham City Council has the largest population for a council in the UK, and there are very significant numbers of EU citizens here who are under-represented in the electoral roll. The number of electors per councillor in Birmingham is already very high compared with other councils, and reducing the number of councillors will increase that even further. In addition, when wards with only 1 councillor are created, those wards lose out if their councillor becomes a cabinet member. In wards where there are 2 councillors, the other councillors can help take over some of the local casework that cabinet members may find difficult to cover. I think that wards with 2 councillors is ideal - giving a good balance between having a ward that is too large to properly get to know, and having wards lose out if their only councillor has a heavy workload from being a cabinet member. I am very happy that Ladywood ward will have 2 councillors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: SJ Lowe
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

1. Moseley Village and the main streets associated with Moseley are not located within Moseley Ward.

2. Moseley school and streets surrounding with Moseley addresses are not within Moseley ward.

3. This area containing Hall Green station and streets within Hall Green. They have been located in the new Tyseley Ward even though they are not near the area commonly associated with Tyseley.

4. This is Tyseley station and the area I associate with being Tyseley - it is not near the ward given the name Tyseley.

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Moseley Village and the main streets associated with Moseley are not located within Moseley Ward

Annotation 2: Moseley school and streets surrounding with Moseley addresses are not within Moseley ward.

Annotation 3: This area containing Hall Green station and streets within Hall Green. They have been located in the new Tyseley Ward even though they are not near the area commonly associated with Tyseley.

Annotation 4: This is Tyseley station and the area I associate with being Tyseley - it is not near the ward given the name Tyseley.

Comment text:

How do they new wards fit with lower level geographies ie LSOAs, CCG boundaries etc - are they contained within the new wards or do boundaries cross. Impact on providing data which is available at these levels or for organisations such as CCGs. Has the impact on historical ward level data from ONS will impact on calculating trend data used for planning etc. Several of the ward names chosen are very long e.g. “Globe Farm and Tile Cross” - not very practical for mapping, charts or any kind of data visualisation. The new ward names do not reflect the geographical/ postal areas that they represent - see the map above - this is the case for the area I am familiar with - Hall Green and Moseley. Suggests to me that those producing the boundaries and names are not familiar with these areas. More thought required on the choice of names.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jane Lownes
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I oppose the proposed changes to the Ward boundaries of Moseley. There is a clear change in the architecture, size and amount of land at the front of domestic properties on either side of Valentine Road and Springfield Road. Properties to the right/east of these roads should continue to be classed as Moseley Ward to ensure that a consistent approach to road and lighting maintenance and improvements is made throughout the Ward. It also strikes me as ridiculous that a proposal to exclude the commercial and social centre of Moseley, being the area to the left and right of the A435, from the Ward boundary. Moseley is a cohesive local community, and should be allowed to exercise our right to elect local councillors who will work for the benefit of our whole community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ewart Lucas
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

As a resident of Hall Green for 30 years, I have to say that the proposal to put my road into the proposed new extended ward of Tyseley leaves me flabbergasted, and asking why? A feeling I share with all my friends and neighbours. The changing of a name may seem trivial to a distant body, but just imagine your residential area being given the name of an adjacent, heavily industrialised area - not much fun is it? I ask you, before that unfeeling, irreversible stroke of a pen to think again and leave Hall Green as it is. There are many alternatives out there, at least look into them because your present proposal hurts.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
-----Original Message-----
From: Graham Luck
Sent: 08 January 2016 12:45
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Councillors for Sutton Coldfield

Sirs,
I must emphasise the necessity of at least one (preferably two) more Councillors in addition to the ten offered. Sutton Coldfield and its surrounding areas have need of more qualified representatives to service efficiently, without the need to be obliged to request further help from the West Midlands Authority.
Yours faithfully,
Graham H. Luck.

Sent from my iPad
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I live in the suburb of Kings Heath in Birmingham. I have lived in several places in Kings Heath. I think the proposed boundaries for Kings Heath ward should be slightly different to those proposed and should include a few more roads. Although the boundaries of Kings Heath are a little hazy, I think more of the main road (Alcester Road South) just a little south of the proposed boundary of Howard Road would also be considered to be in Kings Heath. People there can easily walk to the shops in Kings Heath and the bus on the main road there goes to the centre of Kings Heath. Also roads a little bit to the east and west of Alcester Road South would also be considered to be in Kings Heath and people there easily get to Kings Heath shops. Therefore I would suggest that the proposed boundary be changed so it detours from the proposed boundary of Howard Road and turns right to include Hazelhurst Road to the south of Howard Road, continues on to include Livingstone Road, turns left where Livingstone Road turns left, crosses Alcester Road South, goes straight ahead down the driveway to the cricket ground, crosses the cricket ground, then includes Peacock Road and then turns left and goes back down to Wheelers Lane. The boundary lines should go along the backs of the back gardens of these roads. I think the Boundaries Committee should consider almost always having the lines of the ward boundaries go along the backs of people’s back gardens rather than up the middle of roads as if the boundary goes up the middle of a road one is always left with a situation where one side of the road is in one ward/constituency and the other side of the road is in another. A situation of this nature does nothing to help community cohesion.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

- Erdington was a village before Samuel Johns and over two centuries the area around what is known as Erdington Village has extended embracing various enclaves which it is new proposed should be excluded from the Erdington Ward. For example the church on Satchel Road consecrated in 1851 took the name Erdington Hovery and until the advent of the railway we have Erdington Station run to the 19th century. Erdington and its population grew and became a suburb of Birmingham in the early part of the last century.

- If the local government boundary commission's proposals are adopted Erdington Hovery and its historic college in Satchel Road, Erdington Road, Erdington Road Station, Erdington Police Station, Erdington Police Station's advert to Erdington will be longer be in the Erdington Ward.

- I do hope that common sense will prevail and that we can retain our historic Erdington Community.

Yours Sincerely  
2 February 2016

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

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

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

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

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

Personal Details:

Name: Jane Lutz  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

My comments relate to the proposed boundaries for a new Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. I have lived in Moseley for over 30 years. In this time I have seen and experienced tremendous positive changes. It is now a wonderful place to live, work, and bring children up in. Most of the positive changes have been driven by local people, who have a great attachment to the place. Within Birmingham Moseley as it is currently constituted, stands out as having a strong positive identity and an enviable sense of community and well-being. The proposed boundary changes threaten to undermine this well-being and diminish the dynamism and community cohesion there is here. I object to the proposed boundary changes and support the alternative as set out by the Moseley Forum.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I am outraged by the proposed changes to our boundaries. I have lived in Hall Green all my life and feel we have a strong identity here. How can you seriously consider putting Hall Green parade, Hall Green school, and Hall Green church into Tyseley. Also being unceremoniously moved into Tyseley is Hall Green station, when Tyseley has its own station.

Isn’t it going to be confusing, having places named for the place that they’ve been since they were built, sitting in a different ward? How will visitors to Birmingham find Hall Green library if they’re told it’s in Tyseley?

I’m also concerned that this may affect insurance premiums. Hall Green is a good area, whereas Tyseley is more industrial, and therefore more risky in the eyes of insurance companies. Will our home and car insurance go up with the new naming?

I urge you to reconsider this. I’m a resident of Hall Green and wish to remain one.

Thank you

Carole Lydall
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission

I support the idea that Birmingham needs smaller single member wards, and that includes in what is currently Hall Green.

I did not see any major problems with the 3 wards originally proposed, although there could always be some tidying up around the edges.

However, the idiot who thought that they could call one of them Tyesley, could not have thrown a bigger spanner in the works if he/she had done so deliberately. They have played right into the hands of the crappy forces that dominate the old Birmingham politics. There are people who fear they are almost being deported from Hall Green, and/or that their house prices will be effected. And there fears are being deliberately stoked.

I do hope such acts of idiocy, and there are suggestions that there have been others elsewhere, do not derail the whole scheme for smaller wards for Birmingham.

disapointed

Andrew Lydon
Dear Commission

I live in Ladywood Ward on the Kilby and Lighthorne Estate which is part of the Central Ladywood council estates with:

Chamberlain Gardens, Middleway View, Gilby Rd, Guild and Rodney, St Marks and the Five Streets.

Where I live is next to the NIA and City Centre. Residents use our shop and send their children to Nelson School on the St Marks estate just across the bridge from us.

We all come under the Ladywood Housing Office and we use the Ladywood Community Centre on St Vincent St West. I attend the Ladywood Housing Liaison Board to help check up on repairs and maintenance, allocations, grounds maintenance. Also to decide how to spend Housing Capital money on improvements to our estates fairly. Residents from the above Central Ladywood estates and from the Civic Centre estate near Broad St. in the city centre attend the HLB.

A group of residents were in Dhillons newsagents on Kilby Ave the other day. We looked at an article in the Birmingham Mail about the boundary changes. We are happy to see that you are keeping all of the Central Ladywood estates together in Ladywood Ward. We understand that you have to make the areas where we vote smaller. We think that you have made a good job of it. I’ve always thought that the Dudley Rd and Sand Pits was a barrier within the Ladywood Ward that we have now. The people from the Jewellery Quarter have their own forum and organisations. I don’t know of any city council houses or flats there. They have little in common with Central Ladywood and show no interest in us.

This is why I was intrigued to read that the Jewellery Quarter is trying to set up a ward of its own by taking people from Ladywood Ward. This doesn’t make sense.

The boundaries that you are proposing for Ladywood are spot on. Please keep them.

Yours faithfully

Gordon Lyew, Resident of Kilby and Lighthorne estate
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

Firstly the idea that the centre of Moseley is no longer in "Moseley" is quite clearly ridiculous and difficult to imagine quite how it got this far! I have acquired a B13 property very much within Moseley and very much at a B13 value! The proposal puts said property into "Kings Heath" by a slither. I cannot therefore work out why the boundary and definition of Kings Heath and Moseley requires change. Why the two are merged at Council wards they are clearly defined by postcode and cant therefor work out why the proposed split of the ward would not follow the well established postcode definition. the streets off School Road are clearly defined and long established at Moseley and Kings Heath by postcode and this clear definition should be respected and upheld. Note no submission is suggested above as my proposal is based on a pre-established postcode split, to be clear, I am proposing following postcode current definitions to split Moseley and Kings Heath (if it needs splitting, which I dispute).

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Commission

I write to object to your proposal to break up our existing Erdington Community. We associate with our community and take pride in being part of Erdington, when you move our boundaries you are not only affecting our property prices, you are taking away our feelings of community values, our choice, our wellbeing of belonging, our feelings of safety and familiarity that such an old community provides to its residents. There is quite an older residents voting population and although I am sure this is a financially driven proposal by the running government it makes little sense to the existing people within this community. You want to move community funds around but you are making us victims of your policies. We are voting people and these are our homes you are playing with, you are very remiss to believe that changing our boundaries will not have an impact on our everyday lives.

Instead of your proposals, I would like to ask the commission to adopt an Erdington Ward with boundaries of Court Lane to the West, Wood End Rd/ Kingsbury Rd to the South, Pype Hayes Park, rear of Woodcote Rd to the East and the Sutton border to the North. This would keep the Erdington Community together, and is the same Erdington Community as the North Birmingham Community Together campaign is proposing for the Erdington Area.

Yours sincerely

D. Lyn,
I am writing to express my absolute horror and fury at the proposed changes where part of Hall Green will become Tyseley.

Hall Green is a community. It is the Hall Green Community. If I had wanted to live in Tysley I would have bought a house there. I have lived in Hall Green for over 40 years and I am proud to say that it’s where I live. Tyseley is a completely different area with an entirely different make up.

As soon as I tell my insurance company that I live in Tyseley my insurance premiums will escalate for both my home and my car, regardless of what you say. If I want to sell my home and move so I continue to live in Hall Green, I will lose money as house prices in Tyseley are lower, regardless of what you say.

How can you possibly say that Hall Green School, Hall Green railway station, Hall Green Parade, Hall Green Health, Hall Green Library and Hall Green Community Church should be in Tyseley? Should they be renamed - problem there - there is already a Tyseley station. Sarehole Mill of Tolkien fame is also in Hall Green and always will be. The Stratford Road goes through Hall Green, the Warwick Road goes through Tyseley. That’s a known fact but of course you don’t know about that as you know nothing about us in south Birmingham.

I cannot believe that you can sit in London in your ivory tower and carve up our community without any thought of how it will affect the residents.

I urge you to rethink these boundary changes and leave us where we belong - in Hall Green.

Yours faithfully

Margaret Lyne
I am writing to you today to raise the object of the plan. Yardley has been ruled out and Yardley Hall would have been acted on by the planning. Please consider our request for re-development of the site. Yardley has been ruled out and Yardley Hall would have been acted on by the planning. Please consider our request for re-development of the site.
You are trying to change the boundaries of Birmingham to suit politics and saying it is because of the Council isn't it to catch votes for our Party or the expense of another. Someone who has never been to Yardley in their life can sit in London and change the lives of people living a hundred miles away because we don't count except for our vote. I was born in Selly Oak years ago but I live in Yardley and Yardley is what it will always be. You can't change history and who ever thought this up, must be some sort of nut.

Yours

D. Lyncock