

# Final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Birmingham City Council

Electoral review

September 2016

## **Translations and other formats**

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

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

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2016

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	6
Warding patterns	7
Draft recommendations	8
Further draft recommendations	9
Final recommendations	12
City centre and surrounding area	13
East of city centre	18
North of city centre	21
South-east of city centre	25
South-west of city centre	29
Sutton Coldfield	33
Conclusions	36
Parish electoral arrangements	36
3 What happens next?	38

## Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Birmingham City Council	39
B Submissions received	45
C Glossary and abbreviations	48

# Summary

## Who we are

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

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

## Electoral review

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

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

## Why Birmingham?

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

## Our proposals for Birmingham

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

During consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 2,000 submissions commenting on the warding pattern. In light of the local evidence received we decided to publish further draft recommendations.

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

During consultation on our further draft recommendations we received a further 760 submissions including a number of petitions.

## Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Birmingham City Council's 101 councillors should represent 37 single-member wards and 32 two-member wards across the city. None of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Birmingham by 2021.

**We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Birmingham.**

# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Birmingham City Council's ('the Council's') electoral arrangements to ensure that the wards provide for effective and convenient local government and that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the city.

## What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held three periods of consultation: first on warding patterns for the Council, secondly on our draft recommendations and finally on our further draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

This review was conducted as follows:

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

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

## How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Alison Lowton  
Peter Maddison  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

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

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

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

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of Birmingham	728,730	813,981
Number of Councillors	101	101
Average number of electors per councillor	7,215	8,059

10 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the city by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Birmingham.

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

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Birmingham City Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

### Submissions received

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

### Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period

---

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

five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 11.6% to 2021. The growth will be driven by growth in the electorate across the authority but most notably in the city centre and in Edgbaston.

15 We received concerns during our consultation on the further draft recommendations that the electorate figures for Birmingham did not take account of a development site at Selly Oak Hospital. Having consulted the Council, we have increased the forecast electorate in Birmingham in 2021 from 813,401 to 813,981.

16 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

17 In making our recommendation for a new council size for Birmingham City Council we had regard to the comments on council size contained in Sir Bob Kerslake's (now Lord Kerslake) review of the governance and organisational capabilities of the Council. Whilst the report did not propose a specific new council size, it judged the current council size of 120 as 'not sustainable'. The report also suggests the creation of 100, mainly single-member, wards.

18 Prior to consultation on warding arrangements, Birmingham City Council submitted a proposal to us to proposing a council size of 'no fewer than' 120 councillors. After meeting with the Leadership of the Council to discuss council size the political groups on the Council were given the opportunity to submit further evidence in relation to council size.

19 Subsequently, the Leader and Executive and the Council's Conservative Group each made further submissions. Both submissions provided a vision for the future governance arrangements for the Council. We noted that the Leader and Executive considered that its vision could be achieved with 100 councillors and that the Conservative Group proposed a council size between 110–120.

20 Having considered the evidence, we took the view that a council size of 100 was the most appropriate for Birmingham on the grounds of effective and convenient local government. We considered that this council size marked a change from current arrangements, encouraged the new vision being developed for the Council and provided scope for the new ways of working being envisaged for such an important city.

21 We therefore invited proposals for warding patterns based on Birmingham having a council size of 100 members. We explained to all interested parties from the outset that the council size figure adopted at this stage of the review provided context for local stakeholders to submit their views on the wider electoral arrangements and that this council size figure could be slightly adjusted in order to provide for warding patterns that provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

22 In response to the consultation on warding patterns we received city-wide proposals based on council sizes of 99, 100 and 101. In developing the draft

recommendations, we considered that a council size of 101 would provide for a pattern of wards that provided for good levels of electoral equality, would reflect communities and provide for clear and identifiable boundaries. Therefore, our draft recommendations for Birmingham were based on a council size of 101 members.

23 We received no submissions in response to our further draft recommendations that commented on the council size. We therefore confirm a council size of 101 as final.

## Warding patterns

24 During consultation on warding patterns, we received a total of 115 submissions. This included four detailed city-wide proposals from the Council's Conservative and Labour groups and from two local residents. The Conservative Group submission was based on a council size of 101, while the Labour Group's submission was based on a council size of 99. The two city-wide submissions from local residents were both based on a council size of 100.

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

26 The four city-wide schemes each provided for a mixed pattern of wards for the city. As stated in paragraph 24, not all of the city-wide schemes were based on the same council size. Of the four schemes, two proposed a pattern of wards based on 100 councillors. One of the city-wide schemes proposed a pattern of wards based on a council size of 99 whilst another proposed a pattern of wards based on a council size of 101.

27 Our draft recommendations were based on a combination of the city-wide proposals that we received. In many areas of the city we also took into account the localised evidence that we received which provided further evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas we considered that the proposals did not necessarily provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and we therefore identified alternative warding arrangements in some parts of the city with the assistance of localised evidence and with regard to our statutory criteria.

28 When considering the evidence received during the warding patterns consultation and in formulating our draft recommendations it became apparent that a council size of 101 would provide a better allocation of councillors across the city and allow us to strike a better balance between our statutory criteria in some areas. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 101.

29 Our draft recommendations were for 53 single-member wards and 24 two-member wards. We considered that our draft recommendations provided for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

## Draft recommendations

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

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

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

### **Moseley**

33 We received over 460 submissions in regard to our proposals for the Moseley area. Having considered the evidence received we noted the considerable opposition to our draft recommendations. Having considered the opposition to our draft recommendations and the evidence received during consultation we proposed a significantly different warding pattern for the area as part of our further draft recommendations.

### **Acocks Green**

34 During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 60 submissions in regards to the Acocks Green area. The majority of respondents opposed our draft recommendations on the basis that the northern boundary of our Acocks Green ward divided the Acocks Green community in following the Chiltern Main Line.

35 Under our further draft recommendations our revised ward incorporated the historic core of Acocks Green that lies on both sides of the railway line and is bounded by the A4040 to the west, which we believed was more reflective of community identity in Acocks Green.

### **Hall Green**

36 We received over 330 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations that commented on the Hall Green area. Most of the submissions that we received objected to our draft recommendations.

37 Under our further draft recommendations, we combined our two single-member wards in this area to form a two-member Hall Green North ward. We consider that in doing so we have avoided dividing part of the Hall Green community along the railway line. Based on the evidence received we considered that this revised Hall Green North ward provided an improved balance between our statutory criteria.

### **Edgbaston**

38 During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 170 submissions in regard to Edgbaston. Under our further draft recommendations, we decided to rename our Summerfield ward North Edgbaston to reflect the Edgbaston community. We did not propose any changes to the northern boundary of our Edgbaston ward under our further draft recommendations.

**Erdington**

39 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received over 360 submissions that commented on our proposed Erdington ward. Under our draft recommendations we proposed a single-member Erdington ward. It was implicit in many of the submissions that we received that many residents that were included outside our Erdington ward consider themselves to be a part of the Erdington community. As part of our further draft recommendations we included our single-member Short Heath ward in an expanded two-member Erdington ward.

**Sutton Coldfield**

40 We received over 130 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations that commented on the Sutton Coldfield area. Most of these submissions argued that the area was under-represented under our draft recommendations in which 10 councillors were allocated to the area and that Sutton Coldfield should be represented by 11 city councillors. In formulating the draft recommendations, we carried out an allocation exercise to determine how many councillors should be allocated to Sutton Coldfield. Firstly, our allocation was based on the boundary of the new parish council, we considered this important in order to reflect community identity. Secondly, it is important to make it clear that, when considering electoral equality, our calculations are based on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. This is a consistent approach to how we undertake allocations in reviews of county councils. In the case of the Birmingham review, we are therefore using electorate projections to 2021. We do not undertake an allocation based on the current electorate.

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

83,765	
(total electorate of Sutton Coldfield – 2021)	
-----	
8,053	= 10.40 (therefore
(average number of electors for Birmingham	rounded to 10)
City Council by 2021)	

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

**Further draft recommendations**

43 In response to consultation on our further draft recommendations we received 760 submissions. We received submissions on a number of areas we had addressed after our draft recommendations consultation. These included submissions from the Conservative Group and Labour Group on the Council that addressed proposals across the whole city. We received a large number of localised submissions across the city as well.

**Moseley and Balsall Heath**

44 We received 165 submissions relating to these wards. A majority were in favour of the revised proposals in Moseley. A small number, including that of the Moseley Forum, suggested a couple of further amendments to the boundaries of Moseley and a number of others objected to the division of Balsall Heath.

45 We considered the submissions received and have incorporated the suggestion made by Moseley Forum into the final recommendations for Moseley ward. We have also accepted a suggestion made by the Labour Group to extend the boundary of Balsall Heath eastwards to include the centre of Balsall Heath in a single ward. We also propose that the ward of Balsall Heath is renamed Balsall Heath West and that the Sparkbrook ward is renamed Sparkbrook & Balsall Heath East.

**Acocks Green**

46 We received 56 submissions relating to Acocks Green ward. The further draft recommendations were generally well received but 36 of the 56 submissions requested the Ninfield Road was included in Acocks Green rather than Tyseley & Hay Mills. We have made this amendment to the Acocks Green ward.

**North Birmingham**

47 We received a large number of submissions during the further draft recommendations concerning the wards to the north of the city centre (Erdington, Kingstanding, Oscott, Perry Beeches, Perry Common, Perry Hall, Pype Hayes, Stockland Green and Tyburn). We also received a number of petitions numbering around 300 signatures regarding our proposals for Kingstanding and Oscott. The submission we received from the Conservative Group contained a number of proposed amendments to these wards.

48 These proposals were very similar to those received on behalf of North Birmingham Community Together group. These proposals provided a new pattern for Kingstanding and Oscott wards to better reflect the community in the area. The proposals also suggested that Perry Beeches and Perry Hall be combined into a two-member ward called Perry Barr. A substantial redrawing of Erdington and Pype Hayes was suggested to include the area to the north of Chester Road in Erdington. Tyburn ward is suggested to be renamed as Gravelly Hill. Having considered these proposals, we have adopted this pattern with some small modifications to provide more identifiable boundaries.

**Sutton Coldfield**

49 We received 49 further submissions for Sutton Coldfield. The majority of these referred the allocation of councillors in Sutton Coldfield. As discussed in paragraphs 40–42 we explain how we calculated the allocation of councillors across the city. As mentioned in paragraph 15 we have accepted a revised electorate for Birmingham in 2021. This makes no difference to the allocation of councillors in Birmingham as illustrated below:

83,765	
(total electorate of Sutton Coldfield – 2021)	
8,059	= 10.39 (therefore
(average number of electors for Birmingham	rounded to 10)
City Council by 2021)	

50 We also a number of submissions requesting small modifications to the ward boundaries in Sutton Coldfield including a submission from Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group with a number of modifications. We have considered these modifications and accept them all on the basis of providing for convenient and effective local government.

### **Harborne and Quinton**

51 We received 201 submissions relating to these two wards. A number of these submissions were in relation to an incorrect leaflet circulated locally regarding the Beech Lanes and Court Farm Road area. This leaflet informed residents that this area was being moved from Harborne ward to Quinton ward. This area is currently in Quinton ward, and our further draft recommendations had proposed this area be included in Harborne ward.

52 We received a further submission that suggested that the properties to the east of West Boulevard and the west of Harborne Golf Course be included in Harborne ward as they had been until the last review in 2004.

53 To include both areas in Harborne would leave both Harborne and Quinton ward with unacceptably high levels of electoral inequality. We have therefore balanced the submissions received and we propose to retain the Beech Lanes area in Quinton ward and move the area to the east of West Boulevard and the west of Harborne Golf Course into Harborne ward.

## Ward names

54 We received a number of suggestion changes to ward names. We propose the following changes, some of which involve no changes to the boundaries of the ward.

Further draft recommendations	Final recommendations
Balsall Heath	Balsall Heath West
King's Heath	Brandwood & King's Heath
Longbridge & Rubery Rednal	Rubery & Rednal
Monyhull	Druids Heath & Monyhull
Perry Beeches	Perry Barr (two-member ward)
Perry Hall	
Sparkbrook	Sparkbrook & Balsall Heath East
Tyburn	Gravelly Hill
West Heath North	Longbridge & West Heath (two-member ward)
West Heath South	

## Final recommendations

55 The tables on pages 13–35 detail our final recommendations for each area of Birmingham. Where we have moved away from our draft and further draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

## City centre and surrounding area

Ward name	Number of Councillors	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Aston</b>	2	-3%	This ward is bounded by Birchfield Road (A34) to the west, the Aston Expressway (A38) to the south-east and the M6 to the north. The ward includes Aston Hall and Aston Park.	During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received one submission specifically relating to our proposed Aston ward. Having considered the evidence received during consultation, we are content that our proposed Aston ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria. We therefore do not propose any amendments to our Aston ward as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Birchfield</b>	1	-5%	Birchfield ward is bounded by Handsworth Park to the west, Wellington Road (A4040) to the north and Birchfield Road (A34) to the east.	We received two submissions that commented on our proposed Birchfield ward during consultation on our further draft recommendations. As a result of one submission we make a small amendment to the boundary of Birchfield and Handsworth wards to place St Mary's Church in Handsworth ward. This change affects six electors. Having considered the other evidence received we are content that a single-member Birchfield ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria.
<b>Bordesley &amp; Highgate</b>	1	-8%	This ward includes the Bordesley and Highgate communities and is bounded by the Birmingham loop railway line to the north.	During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received no submissions that made comments specifically relating to our proposed Bordesley & Highgate and Bordesley Green wards. Accordingly, we do not propose any amendments to these wards under our final recommendations.
<b>Bordesley Green</b>	1	-7%	Bordesley Green is bounded by the B4128 to	

			the north and comprises the Bordesley Green community.	
<b>Edgbaston</b>	2	-5%	This ward comprises the community of Edgbaston and the University of Birmingham campus.	<p>During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received 32 submissions in regard to the Edgbaston area.</p> <p>The majority of these submissions referred to the inclusion of a small area between Bristol Road and Pershore Road in a neighbouring Balsall Heath ward. We are unable to include this area in Edgbaston due to the unacceptably poor level of electoral equality that would result in Balsall Heath.</p> <p>We also received a number of submissions that continued to refer to the division of the Edgbaston area and the naming of the wards.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence received in this regard, and whilst we note the strength of feeling of local residents in this area, we have not made any amendments to the boundary of this ward. Any amendments would require the creation of a three-member Edgbaston ward, which we consider would not allow for effective and convenient local government.</p>
<b>Handsworth</b>	1	-3%	This ward is bounded by Soho Road to the south, Rookery Road to the west and Church Lane to the north. The eastern boundary extends to the eastern edge of Handsworth Park.	<p>We received five submissions that commented on our proposed Handsworth ward during consultation on our draft recommendations. As mentioned above we have made a small amendment to the boundary with Birchfield ward. Some respondents proposed that our Handsworth and Birchfield wards should be combined to form a two-member ward; however, having considered the evidence received we</p>

				are content that a single-member Handsworth ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria in this area.
<b>Handsworth Wood</b>	2	-2%	Handsworth Wood ward is bounded by the A4040 to the south, by the Birmingham-Walsall railway line to the east and by the authority boundary to the north and west.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received no submissions specifically relating to our proposed Handsworth Wood ward and we have not made any changes as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Harborne</b>	2	7%	This ward incorporates the Harborne area of Birmingham and is bounded by the A440 to the north-west, the authority boundary to the north and Bourn Brook to the south.	<p>During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received over 200 submissions in regard to the Harborne area including both support for and opposition to our proposals. Based on the evidence received we have made two amendments to Harborne ward as part of our final recommendations.</p> <p>We received a number of submissions that referred to a leaflet that had circulated locally regarding the Beech Lanes and Court Farm Road area. This leaflet informed residents that this area was being moved from Harborne ward to Quinton ward. This area is currently in Quinton ward, and our further draft recommendations had proposed this area be included in Harborne ward.</p> <p>We received a further submission that suggested that the properties to the east of West Boulevard and the west of Harborne Golf Course be included in Harborne ward as they had been until the last review in 2004.</p> <p>To include both areas in Harborne would leave both</p>

				Harborne and Quinton wards with unacceptably high levels of electoral inequality. We have therefore balanced the submissions received and we propose to retain the Beech Lanes area in Quinton ward and move the area to the east of West Boulevard and the west of Harborne Golf Course into Harborne ward.
<b>Holyhead</b>	1	-4%	Holyhead ward is bounded by the A4040 to the north, Rookery Road to the east and by the authority boundary to the south and west.	We received no submissions that commented on this part of the city during the consultation on our further draft recommendations. Accordingly, we do not propose any changes to Holyhead ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Ladywood</b>	2	-5%	This ward incorporates much of Birmingham City Centre, running from Edgbaston Reservoir in the west to New Street railway station in the east.	<p>During consultation on our draft recommendations we received one submissions in regard to our proposed Ladywood ward.</p> <p>The Conservative Group suggested that the city centre be removed from Ladywood ward and placed in a ward called Jewellery Quarter. A small area around Rotton Park would be added to the ward to balance the electoral equality.</p> <p>We considered this suggestion and balanced it against the support we had previously received for Ladywood ward. We concluded that this suggestion did not better meet the statutory criteria than our proposed Ladywood ward and we therefore confirm our draft ward as final.</p>
<b>Lozells</b>	1	-2%	This ward comprises the Lozells community and is bounded by Soho Hill in the	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received no submissions that commented specifically on the Lozells, Nechells and Newtown areas. We therefore have

			west and Birchfield Road to the east.	not made any changes to these wards under our final recommendations.
<b>Nechells</b>	1	7%	Nechells ward is bounded by the Aston Expressway (A38) to the west and railway lines to the south and east.	
<b>Newtown</b>	1	-4%	This ward comprises the Newtown community to the north and south of New John Street West, which runs through the middle of the ward.	
<b>North Edgbaston</b>	2	-1%	North Edgbaston ward is bounded by the Birmingham Canal to the north and the authority boundary to the west.	During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received three submissions that commented on our proposed North Edgbaston ward; one supported the name and two opposed it, suggesting a return to the Summerfield name. Given the level of support for the name during the earlier consultation we propose to retain the name of North Edgbaston and confirm this ward as final.
<b>Quinton</b>	2	2%	Quinton ward is bounded by the authority boundary to the north and west and by Woodgate Valley Country Park to the south.	As discussed above in the Harborne section we propose to retain the Beech Lanes area in Quinton ward and move the area to the east of West Boulevard and the west of Harborne Golf Course into Harborne ward. We confirm this ward as final.

<b>Soho &amp; Jewellery Quarter</b>	2	-7%	Soho & Jewellery Quarter ward includes the Jewellery Quarter and the communities of All Saints, Hockley and Winson Green.	<p>In response to our further draft recommendations we received two submissions that commented on this part of the city.</p> <p>The Conservative submission proposed a ward called Soho that included the area of Summerfield and a ward called Jewellery Quarter that included the city centre. As mentioned above, we do not consider that this proposal is a better balance of the statutory criteria than the further draft recommendations and we therefore confirm this ward as final.</p> <p>We received a number of alternative proposals for the name of this ward including Winson Green &amp; Hockley, Hockley &amp; Soho or All Saints. Having considered the names put to us we have retained the name of Soho &amp; Jewellery Quarter.</p>
-------------------------------------	---	-----	---	--

#### East of city centre

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of Councillors</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Alum Rock</b>	2	9%	This ward comprises the community of Alum Rock and is bounded by railway lines to the north, south and west, and by Belchers Lane to the east.	<p>Under our further draft recommendations for this area we proposed a two-member Alum Rock ward. During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received 10 submissions that commented on our proposals for this area, including a mixture of support and opposition.</p> <p>Based on the evidence received we still consider that a two-member ward provides a better reflection of community and identity and uses clearer and more identifiable boundaries.</p>

<b>Bromford &amp; Hodge Hill</b>	2	-6%	This ward is bounded by Bromford Lane to the west, the M6 to the north and the River Cole to the south. It contains the communities of Bromford and Hodge Hill.	We received one submission that commented on our proposed Bromford & Hodge Hill ward during the consultation on our further draft recommendations. The submission was in favour of our recommendations. We therefore do not propose any amendments to our further draft recommendations for Bromford & Hodge Hill.
<b>Garrett's Green</b>	1	-8%	Garrett's Green ward includes the communities of Lea Hall and Garrett's Green and is bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received no submissions that commented on the Garrett's Green area. We therefore do not propose any amendments to our further draft recommendations for Garrett's Green.
<b>Glebe Farm &amp; Tile Cross</b>	2	6%	This ward includes the communities of Glebe Farm, Kitt's Green and Tile Cross, bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the south and the River Cole to the north.	We received two submissions that commented on this area of Birmingham. Both submissions contained petitions signed by a large number of residents. Both petitions argued that the area to the west of the River Cole should not be included in Glebe Farm & Tile Cross as it had no community ties to the area. It was argued that this area should be included in either Alum Rock or Ward End wards. To include this area in either ward would result in poor electoral equality in both areas. In light of this and the lack of other alternatives, we consider that this area should remain in Glebe Farm & Tile Cross ward and we confirm this ward as final.
<b>Heartlands</b>	1	0%	Heartlands ward is bounded by Hob Moor Road to the south, the River Cole to the east and the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north.	In response to the consultation on our draft recommendations we received one submission that commented on our proposed Heartlands ward. This proposed that the ward be called Little Bromwich but did not provide compelling evidence to support this assertion. We

				have therefore not made any changes to Heartlands ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Shard End</b>	1	7%	This ward comprises the community of Shard End and is bounded by the River Cole to the south and the authority boundary to the north and east.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received one submission relating to our proposed Shard End ward. This was strongly in favour of the further draft recommendation and we therefore do not propose any amendments to our Shard End ward at this stage.
<b>Sheldon</b>	2	-3%	Sheldon ward includes the areas of Sheldon, Gilbertstone and Lyndon Green and is bounded by the authority boundary to the south and east.	We received no submissions that commented on this part of the city during the consultation on our further draft recommendations. We therefore do not propose any amendments to Sheldon ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Small Heath</b>	2	-8%	This ward is bounded by Muntz Street, Coventry Road and Wordsworth Road to the west and the River Cole to the east.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received no submissions specifically relating to our proposed Small Heath ward and we have therefore not made any amendments to it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>South Yardley</b>	1	-3%	South Yardley ward includes the South Yardley area and is bounded by the authority boundary to the east, Hob Moor Road to the north and by Holder Road, Wash Lane and the Grand Union Canal to the west.	In regards to our further draft recommendations for this part of the city we received 17 submissions for Yardley. These submissions were overwhelmingly in favour of the further draft recommendations in Yardley. We therefore confirm the recommendations for these wards as final.

<b>Ward End</b>	1	7%	This ward is bounded by the railway line to the north and west and by Bromford Lane to the east.	We received one submission that commented on this ward, as mentioned above under Glebe Farm & Tile Cross. Having considered the evidence received we are content that our Ward End ward provides a good balance between our statutory criteria and we do not propose any amendments under our final recommendations.
<b>Yardley East</b>	1	5%	This ward includes much of the historic core of Yardley and is bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north and by Station Road and Stoney Lane to the west.	In regards to our further draft recommendations for this part of the city we received 17 submissions for Yardley. These submissions were overwhelmingly in favour of the further draft recommendations in Yardley. We therefore confirm the recommendations for these wards as final.
<b>Yardley West &amp; Stechford</b>	1	0%	This ward incorporates parts of both Yardley and Stechford and is bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the north, by Station Road and Stoney Lane to the east, the River Cole to the west and by Hob Moor Road to the south.	

#### North of city centre

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of Councillors</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Castle Vale</b>	1	-8%	This ward includes the Castle Vale community and	During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received no submissions that

			is bounded by Sutton Coldfield to the east, the A38 to the north and the River Tame to the south.	commented on our proposals for the Castle Vale area. We do not propose any amendments to this ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Erdington</b>	2	-1%	Erdington ward is bounded by Sutton Coldfield to the north, Perry Common to the west and Kingsbury Road to the south.	<p>We received over 40 submissions that commented on our proposed Erdington ward.</p> <p>As part of our further draft recommendations we included our proposed single-member Short Heath ward in an expanded two-member Erdington ward. We also amended the boundary between Erdington and Stockland Green to include Erdington Abbey and Erdington railway station in Erdington ward. These changes incorporated the historic core of Erdington into the ward of that name.</p> <p>We received alternative proposals in this area from the Conservative Group and North Birmingham Community Together. The schemes propose a revised pattern of wards across North Birmingham and are substantially similar to each other. The submissions proposed the area to the north of Chester Road be included in an Erdington ward, and that the area of Short Heath that we had proposed be included in a two-member Erdington ward instead be included in Perry Common.</p> <p>As a result, our two-member Erdington ward now includes properties to the north of Chester Road as well as a further small area around Erdington station.</p> <p>Subject to these changes we confirm our Erdington ward as final.</p>

<b>Gravelly Hill</b>	1	-9%	Gravelly Hill ward is bounded by the M6 to the south, the A4040 to the east and the Birmingham to Sutton Coldfield railway line to the west.	Our final recommendation for Gravelly Hill ward is similar to that proposed by the Conservative group and North Birmingham Community Together. As we propose to include Birches Green in a Pype Hayes ward, we agree with the suggestion to rename the Tyburn ward to Gravelly Hill. We propose that the boundary between Gravelly Hill and Stockland Green wards be the Birmingham to Sutton Coldfield railway line rather than the A5127 to provide better electoral equality in both areas.
<b>Kingstanding</b>	2	-6%	This ward is bounded by Sutton Coldfield to the north-east, the A453 to the South and the M6 to the West.	During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received a large number of submissions that commented on our proposals for the Kingstanding area. These submissions suggested that our Kingstanding ward contained an area considered to be Oscott and our Oscott ward contained an area considered to be Kingstanding and that these two area should be swapped. This also formed the basis of the submission from the Conservative Group and North Birmingham Community Together.
<b>Oscott</b>	2	-2%	This ward includes the community of Oscott, bounded by the M6 to the west and by Kingstanding Road to the east.	<p>The area considered to be Oscott within our proposed Kingstanding ward was the area mostly to the north of the B4149 up to the Sutton Coldfield boundary. The area considered to be Kingstanding within our proposed Oscott ward comprises the properties at the southern end of the B4138 Kingstanding Road.</p> <p>We have made these modifications as we consider that they are a better reflection of the community in the area than our further draft recommendations. Subject to these changes we confirm these wards as final.</p>

<b>Perry Barr</b>	2	-3%	Perry Barr ward is bounded by the M6 to the east and by the Birmingham to Walsall railway line to the west.	During the consultation on our draft and further draft recommendations we received submissions that commented on our proposals for the Perry Beeches and Perry Hall area. A number of respondents suggested combining our proposed Perry Beeches and Perry Hall wards into a two-member ward. The Conservative Group also suggested that the two single-member wards of Perry Beeches and Perry Hall be combined as the current single-member wards artificially divided the community. Having revisited the submissions in this area we agree that the two single-member wards of Perry Beeches and Perry Hall should be combined into a two-member Perry Barr ward. We have adopted the boundaries proposed by the Conservative Group that also include a small area around the Tame Valley Canal. This area was previously in our Oscott ward.
<b>Perry Common</b>	1	7%	This ward includes the Perry Common area and is bounded by College Road (A453) to the north.	We have revised our ward in this area based on the submissions of the Conservative Group and North Birmingham Community Together as well as a number of localised comments. This ward now includes the area of Short Heath that was included in Erdington ward under our further draft recommendations. The properties between Witton Cemetery and Witton Lakes are included in our Stockland Green ward to reflect their community ties.
<b>Pype Hayes</b>	1	-4%	This ward includes the Pype Hayes area and is bounded by Sutton Coldfield to the north, and the M6 to the south.	As in Erdington, we received around 40 submissions that related to Pype Hayes, mainly objections to our inclusion of the area to the north of Chester Road in the ward. As mentioned above, we have adopted the scheme submitted by the Conservative Group and the North Birmingham Community Together Group. This proposal includes the area of Birches Green in a Pype Hayes ward. We received a

				number of more localised submissions that also suggested this.
<b>Stockland Green</b>	2	-3%	Stockland Green ward is bounded by the M6 to the west, the Birmingham to Sutton Coldfield railway line to the east and by Short Heath Road to the north.	Our final recommendations for Stockland Green are based on the submissions from the Conservative Group and North Birmingham Community Together. As mentioned above it includes the properties between Witton Cemetery and Witton Lakes. We also propose that the boundary between Stockland Green and Gravelly Hill wards be the Birmingham to Sutton Coldfield railway line rather than the A5127. This provides for better electoral equality in both areas.

#### South-east of city centre

Ward name	Number of Councillors	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Acocks Green</b>	2	10%	Acocks Green ward is bounded by Grand Union Canal to the north, the A4040 to the west and Lakey Lane to the south.	<p>Under our further draft recommendations our revised ward incorporates the historic core of Acocks Green that lies on both sides of the railway line and is bounded by the A4040 to the west. During the further draft recommendations consultation, we received strong support for our revised Acocks Green ward.</p> <p>We also received a number of submissions from residents on Ninfield Road who stated that they identify with the Acocks Green community. We have therefore made a minor modification to our Acocks Green boundary to include Ninfield Road in our Acocks Green ward. Subject to this minor amendment we confirm our Acocks Green ward as final.</p>

<b>Balsall Heath West</b>	1	-3%	This ward includes the community of Balsall Heath and is bounded by the A4540 to the north, Cromer Road to the south and the Birmingham to Worcester railway line to the east.	<p>We received around 30 comments on our proposed Balsall Heath ward. The main issue remained our division of the Balsall Heath community and our inclusion of Balsall Heath Park in our Moseley ward. We also received a number of template letters objecting to the inclusion of an area between Pershore Road and Balsall Heath in this ward, proposing instead that it be included in Edgbaston. We considered this but have decided not to include this area in Edgbaston due to the poor electoral equality it would provide in both wards.</p> <p>With regards to Balsall Heath Park, as discussed below under Moseley, we accepted a proposal from the Moseley Society that removes Balsall Heath Park from Moseley ward. We also accept a proposal from the Labour Group on Birmingham City Council to move the eastern boundary of this ward from the A435 Alcester Road eastwards to the Birmingham to Worcester railway line.</p> <p>Finally, have renamed this ward Balsall Heath West and have renamed Sparkbrook ward as Sparkbrook &amp; Balsall Heath East to reflect the fact that the Balsall Heath community straddles both wards.</p>
<b>Billesley</b>	2	-5%	This ward is bounded by Alcester Road South to the west and by the Dingles to the east.	In response to our further draft recommendations we received no submission directly relating to Billesley ward. Subject to a minor amendment mentioned below under the discussion of Moseley ward we confirm this ward as final.
<b>Brandwood &amp; King's Heath</b>	2	-2%	This ward contains the community of King's Heath and the park of that name	Our further draft recommendations for this area combined the two single-member wards of King's Heath and Brandwood. We have adopted a proposal from the local MP to name this ward Brandwood & King's Heath.

			and is bounded by Alcester Road South to the east.	<p>We have modified this ward from that proposed in our further draft recommendations. We have amended the boundary between the ward and Stirchley ward to follow the Birmingham to Worcester railway line and to include the 'Priory Road Triangle' in Brandwood &amp; King's Heath where its community lies.</p> <p>We have also made two more minor amendments to include Birches Close in Moseley ward and to reflect the access for a number of properties on Lifford Lane into King's Norton North ward. Subject to these amendments we confirm the ward as final.</p>
<b>Druids Heath &amp; Monyhull</b>	1	1%	This ward is bounded by Alcester Road South to the east and by Broad Meadow Lane to the west, with the authority boundary to the south.	During the consultation on our further draft recommendations, we received no submissions that commented on the boundaries of our proposed Monyhull ward but a number that commented on its name. They centred on the exclusion of Druids Heath from the name. We have therefore renamed this ward Druids Heath & Monyhull.
<b>Hall Green North</b>	2	6%	Hall Green North ward is bounded by the authority boundary to the east and the River Cole to the west.	During the consultation on further draft recommendations we received some support for our revised Hall Green wards. We also received a number of submissions that suggested that Hall Green be made up of three single-member wards. Only the submission received from the Conservative Group suggested where the boundaries should be. We considered the submissions submitted at this stage but concluded that we had not received persuasive evidence to divide the two-member Hall Green North ward into two single-member wards. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendations as final.
<b>Hall Green South</b>	1	6%	Hall Green South ward is bounded by the authority boundary to the south and east and the River Cole to the west.	

<b>Highter's Heath</b>	1	5%	This ward contains the community of Highter's Heath, bounded by the Stratford-upon-Avon Canal to the north and Alcester Road South to the west, with the authority boundary to the east and south.	We received no submissions that commented on our Highter's Heath ward during the consultation on our further draft recommendations. Accordingly, we do not propose any amendments to Highter's Heath ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Moseley</b>	2	5%	This ward is bounded by River Rea to the west, Balsall Heath to the north and the B4146 to the south.	We based our further draft recommendations in Moseley on submissions we received during our consultation on draft recommendations. This ward was widely supported during the consultation on further draft recommendations. We received a submission from the Moseley Society that suggested further small amendments. It was proposed that a number of properties on Wake Green Road, Keel Drive and Burke Avenue be included in Moseley ward. It was also suggested by a number of residents that Birches Close and all of Swanshurst Lane be included in Moseley ward. Finally, an amendment to the boundary between Moseley and Sparkbrook was proposed to ensure that Balsall Heath Park was not in a Moseley ward. We accept all these proposals and our final recommendations for Moseley reflect this.
<b>Sparkbrook &amp; Balsall Heath East</b>	2	3%	This ward includes the community of Sparkbrook and is bounded by the Birmingham to Stratford railway line in the north and east and by the Birmingham to Worcester railway line and the A4540 to the west.	As discussed above under Moseley and Balsall Heath West, we made a small amendment to this ward to ensure that it includes Balsall Heath Park. We also propose that the ward be renamed Sparkbrook & Balsall Heath East to reflect that the Balsall Heath community straddles this ward and Balsall Heath West.

<b>Sparkhill</b>	2	-8%	This ward is bounded by Yardley Wood Road to the west, by the River Cole to the east and by Wake Green Road to the south.	During the consultation on further draft recommendations we received no submissions directly relating to this ward. As discussed in the Moseley section above, we propose a minor amendment to this ward to include a number of properties in Moseley ward. Subject to that amendment we confirm this ward as final.
<b>Tyseley &amp; Hay Mills</b>	1	-3%	This ward runs from York Road in the south to Hob Moor Road in the north and comprises the communities of Tyseley and Hay Mills.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we no submissions that directly related to Tyseley & Hay Mills and subject to the amendment to the boundary with Acocks Green ward mentioned above we confirm this ward as final.

#### South-west of city centre

Ward name	Number of Councillors	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Allens Cross</b>	1	0%	Allens Cross ward is bounded by the A38 to the east and by Long Mynd Road to the north.	During our further draft consultation in Birmingham we received one submission that directly referred to our proposals for Allens Cross. This submission did not support the proposal to include the properties to the north of Merritts Brook in this ward but did not provide a suitable alternative to the poor electoral equality that would result as a consequence. Accordingly, we do not propose any amendments to Allens Cross ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Bartley Green</b>	2	5%	This ward contains the Bartley Green community and is bounded by Bourn	During our further draft consultation in Birmingham we received one submission that directly referred to our proposals for Bartley Green. This submission from Bartley

			Brook to the north and by Shenley Lane and Barnes Hill to the east. The authority boundary lies to the south and east.	Green Ward Committee supported the further draft recommendations. Accordingly, we do not propose any amendments to Bartley Green ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Bournbrook &amp; Selly Park</b>	2	3%	Bournbrook & Selly Park is bounded by Bourn Brook to the north, by the Cross-City railway line to the west and by the River Rea to the east.	<p>During our draft recommendations consultation, we received 60 submissions that commented on our Bournbrook &amp; Selly Park ward including both support for and opposition to our proposals. In formulating our further draft recommendations, we did examine the possibility of two single-member wards; however, we were unable to identify a boundary that didn't result in the division of the Bournbrook community between wards.</p> <p>During our further draft recommendations consultation, we received six further submissions that supported two single-member wards in Birmingham. We also received a submission from the Conservative Group that proposed where to place the boundary between Bournbrook and Selly Park. We considered this boundary but concluded that it still provided an artificial division of the Bournbrook community. Accordingly, we continue to consider that our two-member Bournbrook &amp; Selly Park ward provides the best balance between our statutory criteria and we do not propose any amendments to this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Bournville &amp; Cotteridge</b>	2	-4%	This ward contains the communities of Bournville and Cotteridge and is bounded by the A38 to the west and by the Cross-City	During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received around 25 submissions that commented on our proposed Bournville & Cotteridge ward and neighbouring Northfield ward. The issue related to Victoria Common, and our decision to not include all of the

			<p>railway line to the east and south.</p>	<p>common in Northfield ward. We received a suggested alternative from the Conservative Group that included the whole of the Victoria Common and surrounding properties in Northfield ward. As discussed below under Northfield ward, this boundary is now part of our final recommendation.</p> <p>We also received a handful of submissions suggesting the area around Cotteridge School be included in this ward as opposed to Stirchley. We considered this but we are unable to do so as a result of the poor electoral equality it would provide.</p> <p>Finally, as mentioned in paragraph 15, we have accepted a revised electorate forecast for the Selly Oak Hospital development site in this ward. Subject to the above mentioned amendment we confirm this ward as final.</p>
<b>Frankley Great Park</b>	1	7%	<p>This ward includes the entirety of the parish of New Frankley in Birmingham and some additional residential areas to the south and east of the parish.</p>	<p>In response to our further draft recommendations we received no submissions that commented on our proposed Frankley ward. We do not propose any amendments to the boundaries of the ward.</p>
<b>King's Norton North</b>	1	3%	<p>This ward includes the community of King's Norton and is bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the north.</p>	<p>During the consultation on our further draft recommendations we received three submissions that commented on two King's Norton wards including some support for our proposals. Having considered the evidence received, we have made one minor amendment to the north-eastern boundary of the ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>King's Norton South</b>	1	0%	<p>King's Norton South ward includes the southern part of King's Norton and is</p>	

			bounded by the authority boundary to the south and east with Parson's Hill to the north.	As mentioned above we include a small number of electors on Lifford Lane in this ward, from Brandwood & King's Heath. Subject to that amendment we confirm this ward as final
<b>Longbridge &amp; West Heath</b>	2	-2%	This ward is at the southern edge of the authority, bounded by the Birmingham to Worcester railway line to the north.	In this area we received a submission from the Conservative Group who argued that our two single-member wards of West Heath North and West Heath South arbitrarily divided the West Heath community. We therefore propose that the two single-member wards should be merged into a two-member ward. We also received a submission from a local councillor that suggested that the centre of Longbridge around the station and the former Longbridge car works be included with West Heath rather than Rubery & Rednal as this was a better reflection on community in the area. As we have already merged the two West Heath wards we proposed a two-member Longbridge & West Heath ward that included a number of properties to the north of Longbridge station to provide for better electoral equality in the area. We consider that this provides the best balance of our statutory criteria in this area.
<b>Northfield</b>	1	9%	This ward is bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the east and Callow Brook to the south.	As discussed above we have included all of Victoria Common in this ward as well as a number of surrounding properties. We also propose that an area at the southern end of the ward be included in Longbridge & West Heath. Both of these proposed boundaries are based on a submission received from the Conservative Group and we agree that they use easily identifiable boundaries.
<b>Rubery &amp; Rednal</b>	1	2%	Rubery and Rednal consists of the two communities of	Subject to the changes mentioned above in Longbridge & West Heath we confirm this ward as final.

			Rubery and Rednal in the south-west of Birmingham.	
<b>Stirchley</b>	1	-4%	Stirchley ward is bounded by Dad's Lane to the north with the Cross-City railway line to the west.	As discussed under Brandwood & King's Heath, subject to the modification around the 'Priory Road Triangle', we propose this ward as final.
<b>Weoley &amp; Selly Oak</b>	2	4%	This ward is bounded by Shenley Lane and Barnes Hill to the west, by Bourn Brook to the north and by the A38 to the east.	We received a number of submissions for the Selly Oak area with some suggested changes to the ward. We did not consider we have received persuasive evidence to move away from our proposed ward in this area.

#### Sutton Coldfield

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of Councillors</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Sutton Four Oaks</b>	1	1%	This ward includes the Four Oaks area of Sutton Coldfield as well as the northern part of Sutton Park Nature Reserve.	<p>We received around 50 submissions in regard to the Sutton Coldfield area during the consultation on our draft recommendations, around half of these referred to the number of councillors for the area. We have discussed this in paragraphs 41 and 49.</p> <p>The other half of the submissions were either in support of our proposals or made a number of small localised suggestions to the proposed boundaries. We also received a submission from the Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group that suggested a number of amendments across Sutton Coldfield.</p>

				No submissions suggested any changes to Sutton Four Oaks ward. Accordingly, we have not made any amendments to this ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Sutton Mere Green</b>	1	6%	This ward comprises the Mere Green area of Sutton Coldfield.	No submissions suggested any changes in this ward. Accordingly, we have not made any amendments to Sutton Mere Green ward under our final recommendations.
<b>Sutton Reddicap</b>	1	4%	This ward comprises the Reddicap area of Sutton Coldfield.	The submission received from the Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group proposed a number of small amendments to this ward. A small number of properties on the north of Rectory Road are included in this ward as opposed to Sutton Roughley ward to reflect their access. It is also proposed that the whole of Reddicap Heath Road and Old Langley Hall are included in this ward to avoid splitting the community. Subject to these modifications we confirm this ward as final.
<b>Sutton Roughley</b>	1	8%	This ward contains the Roughley area of Sutton Coldfield as well as the residential area of Whitehouse Common.	As mentioned above, we have adopted the submission from Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group which suggested a small change to properties on the north of Rectory Road. No other changes were suggested.
<b>Sutton Trinity</b>	1	7%	This ward comprises Sutton Coldfield town centre as well as the Maney area of the town.	The submission from Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group suggested the entirety of Somerville Road be included in Sutton Trinity ward to avoid splitting the community. It was also proposed that Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls be included in Sutton Wylde Green ward to reflect its access and that Monmouth Drive Playing Field be included in Sutton Vesey to reflect its

				community usage. Our final recommendations include these changes.
<b>Sutton Vesey</b>	2	3%	This ward comprises the Boldmere and Banners Gate communities, bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the east and the authority boundary to the west.	We received strong support for our proposed Sutton Vesey ward and subject to the minor amendments mentioned above we confirm this ward as final.
<b>Sutton Walmley &amp; Minworth</b>	2	4%	This ward comprises the Sutton Coldfield communities of Walmley and Minworth.	Our proposals for these wards take account of a number of suggestions from Sutton Coldfield Independent Residents' Group. Aside from the proposal for Reddicap Heath Road as discussed above, these do not affect any electors and reflect community access to certain open spaces. Subject to those amendments we confirm these wards as final.
<b>Sutton Wylde Green</b>	1	0%	This ward contains the Wylde Green area of Sutton Coldfield, bounded by the Cross-City railway line to the west and Maney Hill Road to the north.	

## Conclusions

56 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	101	101
Number of electoral wards	69	69
Average number of electors per councillor	7,215	8,059
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	14	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

### **Final recommendation**

Birmingham City Council should comprise 101 councillors serving 69 wards representing 37 single-member wards, 32 two-member wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

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

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

arrangements.

59 On the basis of Birmingham City Council making a Reorganisation of Community Governance Order in December 2015 establishing a Town Council in Sutton Coldfield and as a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Sutton Coldfield. We have given consideration to our proposed ward boundaries and the existing ward boundaries, but have not taken into account the existing parish ward boundaries.

60 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for the new Sutton Coldfield parish. Please note that these arrangements are slightly different to the arrangements set out in our draft recommendations.

**Further draft recommendation**

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

### 3 What happens next?

61 We have now completed our review of Birmingham City Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2018.

#### Equalities

62 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Birmingham City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Acocks Green	2	16,197	8,099	12%	17,796	8,898	10%
2	Allens Cross	1	7,685	7,685	7%	8,039	8,039	0%
3	Alum Rock	2	15,496	7,748	7%	17,529	8,764	9%
4	Aston	2	14,133	7,067	-2%	15,576	7,788	-3%
5	Balsall Heath West	1	6,912	6,912	-4%	7,818	7,818	-3%
6	Bartley Green	2	15,723	7,862	9%	16,909	8,454	5%
7	Billesley	2	14,440	7,220	0%	15,306	7,653	-5%
8	Birchfield	1	6,473	6,473	-10%	7,670	7,670	-5%
9	Bordesley & Highgate	1	6,785	6,785	-6%	7,375	7,375	-8%
10	Bordesley Green	1	6,918	6,918	-4%	7,490	7,490	-7%
11	Bournbrook & Selly Park	2	12,950	6,475	-10%	16,599	8,299	3%
12	Bournville & Cotteridge	2	13,541	6,771	-6%	15,547	7,773	-4%

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

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
13	Brandwood & King's Heath	2	14,194	7,097	-2%	15,855	7,927	-2%
14	Bromford & Hodge Hill	2	14,025	7,013	-3%	15,179	7,590	-6%
15	Castle Vale	1	6,740	6,740	-7%	7,408	7,408	-8%
16	Druids Heath & Monyhull	1	7,925	7,925	10%	8,180	8,180	1%
17	Edgbaston	2	9,816	4,908	-32%	15,334	7,667	-5%
18	Erdington	2	13,886	6,943	-4%	15,932	7,966	-1%
19	Frankley Great Park	1	7,813	7,813	8%	8,657	8,657	7%
20	Garrett's Green	1	6,690	6,690	-7%	7,384	7,384	-8%
21	Glebe Farm & Tile Cross	2	15,230	7,615	6%	17,044	8,522	6%
22	Gravelly Hill	1	6,566	6,566	-9%	7,335	7,335	-9%
23	Hall Green North	2	15,280	7,640	6%	17,047	8,524	6%
24	Hall Green South	1	7,907	7,907	10%	8,519	8,519	6%
25	Handsworth	1	7,149	7,149	-1%	7,855	7,855	-3%

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

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
26	Handsworth Wood	2	13,829	6,915	-4%	15,747	7,874	-2%
27	Harborne	2	15,820	7,910	10%	17,184	8,592	7%
28	Heartlands	1	7,033	7,033	-3%	8,076	8,076	0%
29	Highter's Heath	1	8,142	8,142	13%	8,493	8,493	5%
30	Holyhead	1	7,012	7,012	-3%	7,751	7,751	-4%
31	King's Norton North	1	7,824	7,824	8%	8,293	8,293	3%
32	King's Norton South	1	8,023	8,023	11%	8,069	8,069	0%
33	Kingstanding	2	14,261	7,131	-1%	15,150	7,575	-6%
34	Ladywood	2	12,308	6,154	-15%	15,387	7,694	-5%
35	Longbridge & West Heath	2	14,860	7,430	3%	15,759	7,880	-2%
36	Lozells	1	6,384	6,384	-12%	7,923	7,923	-2%
37	Moseley	2	15,460	7,730	7%	16,923	8,461	5%

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

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
38	Nechells	1	5,945	5,945	-18%	8,617	8,617	7%
39	Newtown	1	5,845	5,845	-19%	7,764	7,764	-4%
40	North Edgbaston	2	13,291	6,646	-8%	15,905	7,952	-1%
41	Northfield	1	8,218	8,218	14%	8,758	8,758	9%
42	Oscott	2	14,708	7,354	2%	15,858	7,929	-2%
43	Perry Barr	2	14,452	7,226	0%	15,637	7,819	-3%
44	Perry Common	1	7,673	7,673	6%	8,639	8,639	7%
45	Pype Hayes	1	7,545	7,545	5%	7,772	7,772	-4%
46	Quinton	2	15,019	7,510	4%	16,399	8,199	2%
47	Rubery & Rednal	1	7,543	7,543	5%	8,229	8,229	2%
48	Shard End	1	8,426	8,426	17%	8,646	8,646	7%
49	Sheldon	2	14,187	7,094	-2%	15,637	7,818	-3%
50	Small Heath	2	12,794	6,397	-11%	14,774	7,387	-8%

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

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
51	Soho & Jewellery Quarter	2	13,097	6,549	-9%	14,991	7,495	-7%
52	South Yardley	1	7,237	7,237	0%	7,792	7,792	-3%
53	Sparkbrook & Balsall Heath East	2	15,046	7,523	4%	16,530	8,265	3%
54	Sparkhill	2	13,007	6,504	-10%	14,903	7,452	-8%
55	Stirchley	1	7,056	7,056	-2%	7,752	7,752	-4%
56	Stockland Green	2	14,623	7,312	1%	15,678	7,839	-3%
57	Sutton Four Oaks	1	7,648	7,648	6%	8,117	8,117	1%
58	Sutton Mere Green	1	8,188	8,188	13%	8,526	8,526	6%
59	Sutton Reddicap	1	7,712	7,712	7%	8,365	8,365	4%
60	Sutton Roughley	1	8,585	8,585	19%	8,735	8,735	8%
61	Sutton Trinity	1	7,692	7,692	7%	8,631	8,631	7%
62	Sutton Vesey	2	15,669	7,835	9%	16,605	8,302	3%
63	Sutton Walmley & Minworth	2	13,001	6,501	-10%	16,705	8,352	4%

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

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
64	Sutton Wylde Green	1	7,512	7,512	4%	8,080	8,080	0%
65	Tyseley & Hay Mills	1	7,238	7,238	0%	7,854	7,854	-3%
66	Ward End	1	7,529	7,529	4%	8,607	8,607	7%
67	Weoley & Selly Oak	2	15,455	7,728	7%	16,800	8,400	4%
68	Yardley East	1	8,041	8,041	11%	8,467	8,467	5%
69	Yardley West & Stechford	1	7,318	7,318	1%	8,070	8,070	0%
	<b>Totals</b>	101	728,730	-	-	813,981	-	-
	<b>Averages</b>	-	-	7,215	-	-	8,059	-

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

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

# Appendix B

## Submissions received

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

### Local authority

- Birmingham City Council Conservative Group
- Birmingham City Council Labour Group

### Political Parties

- Acocks Green Conservative Association
- Birmingham Liberal Democrats
- Brandwood Labour Party
- Edgbaston Labour Party

### Councillors

- Councillor D. Alden
- Councillor J. Alden
- Councillor R. Alden
- Councillor D. Barrie
- Councillor R. Beauchamp
- Councillor M. Bennett
- Councillor R. Brew
- Councillor L. Collin
- Councillors Cotton, Bridle & Khan
- Councillor I. Cruise
- Councillor N. Eustace
- Councillor P. Griffiths
- Councillor A. Hardie
- Councillor S. Hussain
- Councillors Hussain, Quinnen & Zaffar
- Councillor T. Huxtable
- Councillor M. Jenkins
- Councillor E. Mackey
- Councillor M. Mahmood
- Councillor P. McDonald (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor G. Moore
- Councillor D. Pears
- Councillors Phillips, Henley & Leddy
- Councillor R. Pocock
- Councillor V. Quinn

- Councillor G. Sambrook
- Councillor R. Storer
- Councillor K. Wood
- Councillor A. Yip

### **Members of Parliament**

- R. Burden MP
- Lord Whitby of Harborne
- Rt Hon A. Mitchell MP
- G. Stuart MP
- S. McCabe MP
- J. Dromey MP

### **Local organisations**

- Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum
- Alum Rock Youth Project
- Anderton Park Residents' Group
- Balsall Heath & Edgbaston Churches
- Balsall Heath Forum
- Balsall Heath is our Planet
- Balsall Heath Local History Society
- Banners Gate Neighbourhood Forum
- Bartley Green Ward Committee
- Beech Lanes Neighbourhood Forum
- Boldmere Neighbourhood Forum
- Brandwood Forum
- Cannon Hill Neighbourhood Watch
- Community Partnership for Selly Oak
- Fallows Road Residents' Association
- Hands On Handsworth Residents' Association
- Hawthorn Road Petition
- Hodge Hill Community Centre
- Hodge Hill Elders
- Jamia't Us-Salem
- Keep Bandywood in Oscott
- Keep Perry Common Whole
- Kings Heath Residents' Forum
- Kingstanding (Police Station) Neighbourhood Police Initiative
- Larches Park Residents' Group
- Lyndhurst (now Abbey Fields) Neighbourhood Forum
- Moor Green Residents' Association West
- Moseley Community Development Trust
- Moseley Forum

- Moseley Tennis Club
- Naseby Youth Centre
- North Birmingham Community Together
- Northfield BID
- Oscott Elderly Residents' Group
- Residents of Washwood Heath
- Russell Road Residents' Association
- Sarehole Residents' Association
- Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum
- Sparkbrook CIC
- Sparkbrook Neighbourhood Forum
- St Andrews Close, Wentworth Way, Vale Close Residents' Association
- St Paul's Community Development Trust
- Standing up Together for our Community Identities in Erdington
- Still Waters Community in Harborne
- The Chamberlain Highbury Trust
- The Harborne Society
- The Moseley Society
- Tower Block Action Group
- True Harborne Group
- Walmley Residents' Association
- Washwood Heath Housing Liaison Board
- Wentworth Way Residents' Association
- West Midlands Fire Service
- Westley Vale Millennium Green Trust
- Woodbridge Cornerstone Residents' Association
- Wylde Green Neighbourhood Forum

## **Residents**

- 669 local residents

# Appendix C

## Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council