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To The Review Officer (Birmingham)

We strongly object to the ward Boundary and name changes. You want to change Yardley into Stechford East.

I have lived in Yardley for over 80 years, within the sound of the Bells of Yardley Old Church (St Edburgha's), which has been in the centre of Yardley Village for 1000 years. The whole idea is a waste of rate payers money.

Changing ward Boundaries may favour the Conservative Vote. It will not make any difference as to how The City Council runs Birmingham.

Ivor A. Underhill

RECEIVED
18 JAN 2016
Proposals of the boundary commission

Dear Sir

We write to make a strong protest against proposals for Birmingham, made by the boundary commission.

We have specific concerns for the suburb of Moseley, we are sure similar concerns are being raised in other parts of the city.

The proposed changes will alter the way the people of Moseley will be represented, how our local services are shaped, and how economic development works for local centres.

Moseley, is an historical village, having developed into a suburb between 1850 and 1910.

Birmingham city council have established two conservation areas to help preserve this historic environment. The suggested Moseley ward boundary does not encompass the two areas.

Moseley is a popular local centre with a thriving café culture and attracts festivals of national importance. The proposal that Moseley village would not be in the Moseley ward will be confusing and will also sabotage the thoughtful and consistent approach that residents, businesses and the council have taken to develop the area.

Finally Moseley has a very active community. The people organise themselves around the shared locality of Moseley. This is emphasised by the many organisations flourishing within the area Including the Moseley society, The Moseley forum Award winning Moseley in bloom, Moseley community development trust, Moseley farmers market And the B13 Moseley magazine,
The proposals if accepted will do nothing to enhance the area and will have a negative effect on the situation which at present works very successfully

Yours sincerely

John and Irene Underwood
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

LEAVE THE BOUNDARIES ALONE THIS WILL COST EXTRA FUNDS AND WASTE TIME AND MONEY THAT COULD BE USED ELSEWHERE, SUCH AS THE STOCKLAND GREEN ROAD WHICH Floods AT THE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING OUTSIDE THE POST OFFICE ALSO THE PAVEMENTS BY THE SUBWAY SHOP. MANY THANKS

Yours Sincerely (DO NOT WANT YOU KEEP PHONING AND SERVING LITERATURE, AND INFORMATION PASSED ON TO OTHER CANVASSERS.

Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
www.facebook.com/NorthBrumCommunityTogether

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. 5 of our 8 wards have more equal number of electors per a councillor.

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up.

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

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

Save our local community now by filling in the petition letter overleaf and returning ASAP!
Dear Sir,

Aged 69 and born in Birmingham, I have been a resident of Maldon for 32 years during that time I have witnessed a

awful lot of changes in our city not all for the better,

I have worked in Sydenham for 36 years and although people like these, this is mainly an industrial area.

Maldon itself is mainly a

Suburban area and was higher

rated before Council Tax was

complemented. The Maldon Shaping

area was established in 1972, and

the whole area is rich in history.

Carrying up Maldon for political

reasons is not acceptable to its

residents as a recent meeting showed

a lot of “anger” and therefore
would ask you to re think this situation. We find ourselves in "to the sea" and "Hail Green" is another end to the residents it always will be "B28" regardless of politics.
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Today's date 05/02/2016.

Sir or Madam,

Consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

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

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

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

**Bournbrook**

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

**Selly Park**

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,

Your name
Date:

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

Dear Sir/Madam

Boundary Commission’s Draft Recommendations: Acocks Green

I 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. 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 either introducing a new boundary at Fox Hollies/Stockfield Road placing Yarnfield Estate, the current Tyseley, Hay Mills etc. into a new ward as recommended by Cllr Roger Harmer, and the Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum or to redraw the boundary so as to recreate a separate new Fox Hollies Ward, as recommended by Cllr Stewart Stacey.

Yours faithfully

Your name
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jacqui Ure
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Having read Balsall Heath Forum’s submission regarding the recommended Ward Boundary Changes, I wish to state that I fully endorse their thoughts and proposal. I have lived in Balsall Heath for 37 years. In that time the area has changed from one of neglect and extreme poverty to one in which I am proud to say I live. It is an area which now has hope for the future. Such a transformation has been achieved through the efforts of many local residents and community groups who have forged a strong identity for Balsall Heath. Without the work of the Forum, many improvements to the area would not have happened, many people would have found their lives more difficult. If Balsall Heath is split, I would no longer live in Balsall Heath, this would make me feel very isolated and vulnerable. I worry about the recommended changes to the Ward Boundary, as I feel that splitting up the area in such a fashion would lead to me no longer being confident in my neighbourhood’s direction. Please reconsider.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Anne Vaidya
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Objection to the proposed Moseley ward boundary and other ward boundary changes in Birmingham I wish to object to both the new proposed ward boundary for Moseley ward in Birmingham and also for the other ward boundaries suggested at this stage in Birmingham. I live at Moseley and bring up my family here for nearly 40 years because Moseley is such a strong but diverse community. Very many residents have worked so very hard doing so many different things which have all contributed to making and keeping this community one that is recognised both locally and even in the national press as a special and good place to live. The new suggested ward boundaries seem to have little connection with either which community residents identify with, nor natural geographical boundaries. I understand these issues are both relevant criteria for setting ward boundaries and I think they will have been chosen because they help residents to work together to make a good community for everyone. I also think the new suggested boundaries will make it much more confusing and difficult to access the administrative bodies residents and social groups need to work with. This I think will set back efforts to try to create Big Society issues. Although I believe Moseley is an especially good and special place to be a part of the community of, I do not think my view is nimbyist because Moseley being the community it is may be able to express its concerns perhaps more readily than some other less established communities but that the community that the work and experience that Moseley residents have achieved should be valued and taken account of when setting other ward boundaries as well. I believe good communities take a great deal of effort to build and maintain and can be all too easily broken by inappropriate administrative decisions. As a Birmingham resident I also want the other ward boundary changes suggested for the city to be carefully reconsidered taking all the boundary criteria into account with the local residents. Other neighbouring ward residents have expressed their support for Moseley residents opposition to the new suggested ward boundaries. I very much appreciate that the Boundary Commission has offered this opportunity for residents views to be taken into account and I hope this will be done for such important and long lasting decisions. Anne Vaidya P.S. My husband Kirit Vaidya also of wishes me to state that he equally shares these views and wishes to object to both the proposed Moseley ward boundary changes and also for the other ward boundary changes for the other Birmingham wards at this stage.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
6 February 2016

Dear Sirs

Submission Re: Proposed Birmingham Boundary Changes

As a resident of Edgbaston, my wife, son and myself have been living at this address for the last 30 years. Our Company registered address, Silklink Limited, is 75 Vernon Road, Edgbaston. Our son, now aged 30, attended nursery school, pre-prep, prep school and King Edwards Birmingham, also based in Edgbaston. Our family Doctor was originally based in Edgbaston, we belong to Edgbaston Golf Club and Edgbaston Priory Club. We came to this road in Edgbaston because of the community spirit and being part of Edgbaston. The location being excellent for all amenities. I do not see any necessity to change the boundary from Edgbaston to Summerfield. We had no notification of this from the Birmingham City Council, the first we heard about it was a few weeks ago and our community got together to discuss what would happen to our North Edgbaston area. If this happens, our Registered Address would have to be changed at Companies House and our clients would have to be informed individually. This would be at a great cost and inconvenience. I fully support the comments made by my fellow neighbours and members of the North Edgbaston Residents Association, and we trust that we will remain at the same postal address and more importantly to remain Edgbaston and not Summerfield. Yours sincerely Morteza and Janet Vakil
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jennifer van der Molen
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

1: This area contains 2 schools, a social club and a church but few residents.

2: This looks a very messy line, but I think it's a reasonable one - see below.

Map Features:

Annotation 1: This area contains 2 schools, a social club and a church but few residents.

Annotation 2: This looks a very messy line, but I think it's a reasonable one - see below.

Comment text:

1. As this area contains a number of community buildings important to Erdington, I think it should be in Erdington ward. There are few residents in it (only, I think a sheltered housing complex, some odd flats above shops, and about 4 small houses) so a change might not have much effect on numbers. 2. All the housing to the west of my line comes out onto the road down which my line is drawn, and they are separated from Erdington centre by the disused brickworks behind them. So they look towards the shops etc to the east, and to the other housing and amenities on the other side of the road.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Mia Vannelli  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
Organisation Name:  

**Comment text:**

Me and many of my friends live in Moseley with our families. We are all devastated by the boundary changes. In Moseley are not only proud of our area where we live but have created a strong community that goes back over years. We are a very welcoming area that attracts people from all over Birmingham to our pubs/ restaurants/ events. Changing the boundaries will ruin the unique identity of the place we are so proud to call home.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Susan Vannelli
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I realise that it is challenging to come up with a coherent set of new boundaries for a city as large as Birmingham, but the proposed boundary changes for my locality have caused consternation. Moseley has been an established area for so long with a distinct reputation that extends way beyond Birmingham and with an enormously strong community spirit. It is proposed to split Moseley village down the middle between 3 new wards. This would jeopardise many of the community initiatives that have been painstakingly put in place over the years by groups such as the Moseley Society, the Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom etc.. Moseley has a reputation for innovation and community engagement. It has a city-wide unique identity and should definitely be treated as an organic whole entity. I trust that local opinion will have the effect of reconsideration of this potentially destructive proposal.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
To, The Review Officer (Birmingham)

Local Government Boundary Commission for England

14th Floor Milbank Tower

London SW10 4OP

24.1.16

Re: consultation on draft recommendations for Birmingham City Council

Dear Sir or Madam

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

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

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

**Bournbrook**

- Population: Mainly transient students
- Housing: Mainly smaller terraced with many classed as Houses in Multiple Occupation
• Community and Residents' Groups: Tiverton Area Residents Association only.

• Conservation Areas: None

• Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Bristol Rd (aka Bournbrook High St; Bournbrook's main road) via car and bus routes 61, 63, 64, 144, X64. Additionally extensive network of bus stops and routes on local roads (routes 38 & 76)

Selly Park

• Population: Mainly settled families and couples

• Housing: Mainly detached and larger terraced.

• Community and Residents' Groups: Selly Park Residents' Association, Selly Park Property Owner's Association, Selly Park South Neighbourhood Forum, Selly Wick Residents

• Conservation Areas: Selly Park Conservation Area, Selly Park Avenues Conservation Area.

• Commuting Habits: Travel to City Centre using Pershore Road (Selly Park's main road) via car and bus routes 45, 47, 106. No bus routes or stops on local roads

In terms of defining each ward, we suggest an internal boundary within the proposed two-councillor ward, thus creating two on-councillor wards with no wider impact or additional expense.

In summary the proposal we suggest 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 you will give these proposals serious consideration and we look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Dr Chris Vassilas                    Dr Janet Smith
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Trevor Vass
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I speak as a resident of one particularly badly affected ward - Moseley. This neighbourhood has a very strong and historic sense of identity, of place and of relationship to its neighbouring districts. People in Moseley, and of the areas around Moseley understand the boundaries of this place. The complete upheaval of ward boundaries simply to effect some small savings in the cost of running will have a devastating effect on these senses of identity, place and position.

The proposals will only meet one of the three stated considerations of an electoral review – to improve electoral equality by equalizing the number of electors each councilor represents. They will NOT Reflect community identity They will NOT Provide for effective and convenient local government. The process of reducing the number of councillors should be reconsidered and then these ridiculous new boundary positions need never see the light of day.

Uploaded Documents: None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam

We are opposed to the Draft Proposal for our current area of Hall Green, because it fails to keep to the criteria you say you are working to:

1) Hall Green is an identifiable area with a number of amenities that are enjoyed by a community of diverse people from many ethnic groups. Many have lived in the area for upwards over 20 years. They went to school here and their children are at school here also. Yet the boundaries break these off from many of these people. They ought to be kept with in the area as it is at present described and drawn up on the existing map.

2) The shops, churches and other places of religious observance are also in the neighbourhood which will be outside the area where these people live. The main shopping centre, railway station and library are also to be divided up in this draft proposal.

3) The ward pattern does not reflect the entire community interests and identities and boundaries. If some part of it is called Tyseley which is separated by Acocks Green many miles away.

4) Hall Green, is mainly residential with one or two small manufacturers whereas Tyseley is much more involved in manufacturing than is Hall Green.

5) Owing to the above we cannot see what is to be gained by taking out a large part of the community in terms of effective and convenient local government and the electoral arrangements.

6) We have not had any connection with Tyseley.

We would propose that a scheme involving a renaming of the new “Tyseley” to Hall Green North East. Thus keeping the community together.

Yours Faithfully

Anne and Malcolm
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: ARUN VENUGOPAL
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I OBJECT TO THIS CHANGE WHOLEHEATEDLY. I HAVE LIVED FOR OVER 50 YEARS IN NORTH EDGBASTON. ST AUGUSTINS CHURCH AND PARISH RESIDES IN EDGBASTON. THE BOUNDARY MAP SHOWN ABOVE ARE OBJECTIONABLE.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** ARUN VENUGOPAL  
**E-mail:** [Redacted]  
**Organisation Name:** NONE

**Comment text:**

The change from North Edgbaston to Summerfield is objectionable. I have uploaded my objections.

**Uploaded Documents:**

[Download]
I registering strongly my OBJECTION to the proposal to remove the area currently known as North Edgbaston from Edgbaston and create a new area called Summerfield.

Below are me my comments so you can be sure to capture all individually in your database of responses.

1) I am an Edgbaston resident having lived here for over forty five years. Summerfield park of ill repute, is not within the perview of Edgbaston. The name Summerfield is not one which I associate myself nor my family with.

2) My Children and myself attended local schools and consider ourselves part of Edgbaston.

3) All my friends and the local amenities reside within walking distance of my house and are part of the the Edgbaston area.

3) My local church is St Augustine's. The proposed boundary changes make a pig-ear and cuts through the parish.

4) The proposed changes are supposed to balance up the size of the wards yet the proposed size of the new Summerfield ward is 3,000 people bigger than proposed Edgbaston. An conservative estimate, North Edgbaston has 1,500 people so leaving as part of Edgbaston would achieve better balance.

5) I have independent advice from 2 local estate agents which says that the name change will affect house prices in an adverse manner.

6) Insurance companies for house and car, have indicated that insurance premiums will go up should the name Summerfield be used for North Edgbaston.
This name change is completely unnecessary and smacks of the worst kind of Gerrymandering.

We will take legal action to prevent this from happening, as this is beyond the perview of the boundary commission.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Neena Venugopal
E-mail: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: None

Comment text:

Objection to name change

Uploaded Documents:

Download
I register strongly my OBJECTION to the proposal to remove
the area currently known as North Edgbaston from Edgbaston and
create a new area called Summerfield.

Below are my comments so you can be sure to capture all
individually in your database of responses.

1) I am an Edgbaston resident having lived here for over twenty
years. The name Summerfield is not one which I associate
myself nor my family with.

2) My Children attended local schools and consider ourselves
part of Edgbaston.

3) My local church is St Augustine's. The proposed boundary
changes make a pig-ear and cuts through the parish.

4) The proposed changes are supposed to balance up the size of
the wards yet the proposed size of the new Summerfield ward
is 3,000 people bigger than proposed Edgbaston. An
conservative estimate, North Edgbaston has 1,500 people so
leaving as part of Edgbaston would achieve better balance.

5) I have independent advice from 2 local estate agents which
says that the name change will affect house prices in an
adverse manner.

6) Insurance companies for house and car, have indicated that
insurance premiums will go up should the name Summerfield
be used for North Edgbaston.
This name change is completely unnecessary and smacks of the
worst kind of Gerrymandering.
Dear Sirs,

I have recently been made aware of the proposed reduction in the number of Councillors in Sutton Coldfield and I am writing to ask you to reconsider the changes that have been proposed.

I understand that you have largely adopted the Labour proposals that will disadvantage Sutton Coldfield by leaving us with only 10 Councillors.

You 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. A fairer calculation, taking account of the population of Sutton, would suggest that there should be 11 Councillors in Sutton Coldfield.

Having just 10 Councillors will mean that Sutton Coldfield will be under-represented when opposing the Labour group on Birmingham City Council and Sutton may receive less funding in the future.

In light of this, I would propose that our 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.

Yours Sincerely,

Derek Venus
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Alice Vernall
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live in Acocks Green and under the new proposal would live in Yardley West. I am not in support of the proposed changes. The new ward does not fit with our sense of identity and splits apart a historic area which is joined by its architecture and its community. The aims of the reform - cost saving and creating greater equality by wards representing similar numbers of voters - are good ones. But we do need a more sensible way to do this, without enforcing unpopular and illogical separations.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Gemma Villiers Cundy
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Having lived in Edgbaston for 47 years I was horrified to hear that a proposal has been made for a name change. My children are at Hallfield, I teach their and my family have always lived in edgbaston. Until NERG contacted us by email we had not heard of the changes, this is poor. Something so important should be considered and hopefully rejected after reflection on the many comments from my neighbours and friends. House prices will be affected, claims have been made that postal addresses will not change this is impossible if Summerfield is to replace Edgbaston otherwise what is the point? We are a community and have nothing in common with some of our neighbouring wards, the economic bands differ too much. Our churches especially St Augustines where I married historically are in the ward of Edgbaston, records are there to be maintained. The thought of Edgbaston Cricket Ground not being in Edgbaston defies belief. I urge you to consider this very carefully and leave our ward of Edgbaston exactly as it is, a community that works, lives and supports each other it is thriving with many new businesses, bars and restaurants all benefitting from being in Edgbaston. We have shown how quickly we respond as the call went out from NERG and over 90 people immediately joined forces. Why should we be punished for an idea that we are vehemently against, affording a property is difficult enough if we lose value as a result of this is unfair and unjust through no fault of our own. I would encourage you to vote against this proposal and back the opinions of the actual Edgbaston residents. Thank you Gemma Villiers Cundy [redacted]

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

as lifetime Birmingham residents, we strongly oppose the boundary changes. We live in Erdington, a historic part of Birmingham, to think people who have never even visited our city can tear its history apart is disgusting. Our house alone has sat in Erdington, for 115 years, it makes us very uncomfortable to think our street and neighbouring streets are being torn away from historical Erdington. We have also only just found out about these very important proposed plans by a flyer through our door. Its disgusting we haven't all been made properly aware of what is intended and we hope this doesn't affect the number of people able to voice their concern and dismay at these proposals.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Ben Viney  
**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I'm a resident of the Jewellery Quarter and I am in complete agreement with the The Jewellery Quarter Neighbourhood Forum's calls to create its own council ward in lieu of the current proposals, for a large Winson Green ward with two councillors. The creation of an enlarged ward covering two distinctively different areas would be counter productive for residents and businesses who have very different needs. Focusing on the JQ, a single member ward is required and I agree with the boundary proposal put forward by JQNF. This would not only serve the best interests of the JQ but the City as a whole as outlined in the Big City Plan. The JQ has so much potential and i feel that this would be hampered by placing it in a two member ward covering such a vast area. Please re-consider your proposals.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs and Madams, I live in Edgbaston and object to the proposed changes of the boundaries. My reasons are as below. 1) Consultation Criteria. I have not received any information about this changes from the council. I only new about it through our neighbor's e-mail. This is far from being a public consultation! 2) Criteria 1: Do the proposed electoral wards reflect local communities? Proposed electoral wards do not reflect local communities. Historically South and North Edgbaston wards were always regarded as one - Edgbaston. It has its sense of community and its own identity. The church of St. Augustine of Hippo belongs to Edgbaston Deanery and was build in 1851 to accommodate growing population of Edgbaston. My children all went to schools in Edgbaston. Their classmates, who live in Edgbaston, their families and friends are similar in aspirations, lifestiles and views to ours. There is a community identity there. It is very different from that of Winson Green, Soho or Ladywood. Proposed changes would make it extremely difficult to represent such a diverse ward with almost opposing interests. 3) Criteria 2: How do you think the proposals can be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? Proposals can be improved by not including part of modern Harborne area. 4) Criteria 3: Are the names of the proposed wards right? Summerfield is not suitable for the North Edgbaston area. Geographically it rather make one think of Soho or Cape Hill area as there is a park with such name. It may work there as a name. Please kindly consider my opinion and do not change Edgbaston ward boundaries. Respectfully Yours, Vera Vinokourova
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ann Wackett
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am writing to object to the current proposed Boundary Changes in a personal capacity on the grounds that it will militate against community cohesion in the area rather than assist it. I have lived in Sandwell Ward / Handsworth Wood Ward since 1989. I note that it is proposed that Handsworth Wood Ward will lose a substantial number of roads on its southern flank as follows: • The quadrant North West point- Stockwell Road, Oxhill Road and Rookery Road; North East point - Selborne Road, Church Lane and Hinstock Road; South West point- Rookery Road, Antrobus Road; is proposed to move from Handsworth Wood Ward into Handsworth Ward. • The quadrant North West point -Island Road, Holyhead Road; North East point - Stockwell Road, Oxhill Road, Rookery Road; South East point - Rookery Road, Soho Road is proposed to move from Handsworth Wood Ward to Holyhead Ward. In my view a huge strength of the area, and one which gives it its vibrancy and resilience, has been its social as well as cultural and ethnic diversity. A number of significant community campaign and ongoing voluntary activity have been notable for the wide range of people, culturally, ethnically and socially who are involved. Prominent amongst these has been the Save Handsworth Park Campaign, launched in the late 1990's, and culminating in a successful Millenium bid to restore the Park which drew in people from a wide range of socio economic backgrounds. It was my also privilege to chair the Sandwell Ward Labour Party in the 1990's before the previous Boundary Commission change in 2004. Party members from a very wide range of socio-economic, as well as ethnic and cultural backgrounds met, discussed, and made collective decisions together as respected equals. Not always fully recognised by the Council, this capacity for residents from different social backgrounds to work together in my view made an important contribution to the community cohesion at the time, and since. This was eroded by Sandwell Ward's loss of roads from the least well-off socio economic groups into Lozells and East Handsworth as a result of the 2004 Boundary changes. My key objections to the current boundary changes proposals are that they mean that the population loss to Handsworth Wood Ward will be drawn almost exclusively from the poorer socio economic communities at the southern end of the Handsworth Wood Ward. As such these losses will act to further boost gentrification in the Handsworth Wood Ward. This is particularly the case given that there is no countervailing measures suggested to socially rebalance the ward by, for example, the inclusion into Handsworth Wood Ward of other areas to either the north, or in particular the east. It is true that Councillors can always seek to work across Ward and Constituency boundaries. However it is better in my view not to craft the boundaries in a way which reinforces social divisions and reduces the 'natural' opportunities for collaboration across residents from different social backgrounds in the first place. This whilst I note that one of your declared aims is to 'aim to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities as well as promoting effective local government' I would suggest that any proposals need to be evaluated in the light of their impact on community and social cohesion. I am writing in an entirely personal capacity, but would hope that in the light of my experience in the area you will give due weight to my submission. Yours sincerely, Ann Wackett

Uploaded Documents:
I am writing to object to the current proposed Boundary Changes in a personal capacity on the grounds that it will militate against community cohesion in the area rather than assist it. I have lived in Sandwell Ward / Handsworth Wood Ward since 1989.

I note that it is proposed that Handsworth Wood Ward will lose a substantial number of roads on its southern flank as follows:

- The quadrant North West point - Stockwell Road, Oxhill Road and Rookery Road; North East point - Selborne Road, Church Lane and Hinstock Road; South West point - Rookery Road, Antrobus Road; is proposed to move from Handsworth Wood Ward into Handsworth Ward.

- The quadrant North West point - Island Road, Holyhead Road; North East point - Stockwell Road, Oxhill Road, Rookery Road; South East point - Rookery Road, Soho Road is proposed to move from Handsworth Wood Ward to Holyhead Ward.

In my view a huge strength of the area, and one which gives it its vibrancy and resilience, has been its social as well as cultural and ethnic diversity. A number of significant community campaign and ongoing voluntary activity have been notable for the wide range of people, culturally, ethnically and socially who are involved. Prominent amongst these has been the Save Handsworth Park Campaign, launched in the late 1990’s, and culminating in a successful Millenium bid to restore the Park which drew in people from a wide range of socio economic backgrounds. It was my also privilege to chair the Sandwell Ward Labour Party in the 1990’s before the previous Boundary Commission change in 2004. Party members from a very wide range of socio-economic, as well as ethnic and cultural backgrounds met, discussed, and made collective decisions together as respected equals. Not always fully recognised by the Council, this capacity for residents from different social backgrounds to work together in my view made an important contribution to the community cohesion at the time, and since.

This was eroded by Sandwell Ward's loss of roads from the least well-off socio economic groups into Lozells and East Handsworth as a result of the 2004 Boundary changes.
My key objections to the current boundary changes proposals are that they mean that the population loss to Handsworth Wood Ward will be drawn almost exclusively from the poorer socio economic communities at the southern end of the Handsworth Wood Ward. As such these losses will act to further boost gentrification in the Handsworth Wood Ward. This is particularly the case given that there is no countervailing measures suggested to socially rebalance the ward by, for example, the inclusion into Handsworth Wood Ward of other areas to either the north, or in particular the east. It is true that Councillors can always seek to work across Ward and Constituency boundaries. However it is better in my view not to craft the boundaries in a way which reinforces social divisions and reduces the 'natural' opportunities for collaboration across residents from different social backgrounds in the first place.

This whilst I note that one of your declared aims is to 'aim to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities as well as promoting effective local government' I would suggest that any proposals need to be evaluated in the light of their impact on community and social cohesion.

Although I am writing in an entirely personal capacity, I hope that in the light of my experience in the area you will give due consideration to my submission.

Yours sincerely,

Ann Wackett

BA Hons, and MBA (University of Birmingham)
I see that your draft review proposes that councillors in Sutton Coldfield would each have over 600 more electors than councillors in other wards of the City. This is unfair. Indeed the proposals would mean that the smallest ward in the city might have only 60% of the electors per councillor than would have to be accepted in Sutton Coldfield.

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

I therefore ask that in order to achieve a more equitable balance of electors per councillor, Sutton Coldfield should have 11 rather than 10 councillors on Birmingham City Council.

Sincerely..............Derek Waddington,
I wish to object to the proposed name of Sutton Maney Ward (no. 63 on your draft plan). I would suggest that the name Trinity be retained.

Under the old Sutton Borough Council, Trinity Ward had been established for many years. It disappeared in 1974 when Sutton Coldfield became part of Birmingham.

It was, however, resurrected in 2005 by the Local Government Boundary Commission Review. Trinity Ward covers the central area of Sutton Coldfield and both the Church of England Trinity Church and the Roman Catholic Trinity Church are within the existing Ward and would also be within the proposed Ward.

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

I have lived all my life in Erdington and wish to remain living in Erdington not to be moved into the Short Heath Ward

PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE THE ERDINGTON BOUNDARIES

David Wadlow
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Gail Wadlow  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I object to the proposed changes to the Erdington Ward. I think the Commission should adopt an Erdington Ward with boundaries of Court Lane in the West, Wood End Road/Kingsbury Road to the South, Pype Hayes Park, rear of Woodcote Road to the East and the Sutton border to the North. This is in line with the North Birmingham Community Together campaign for the Erdington area. The proposed plans split Erdington into too many smaller areas and the area will lose its identity as an historic "village" with a real community feel. Some of the new wards are entirely separated from their services putting the train station, library, main shopping area etc into another ward. Some areas of Erdington are being moved into new wards which is not what the local electorate want or need, this is being done without any thought to the local community and what the local people need. I strongly object to the proposals.

**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:-

They are separating people's residence from their main amenities.

The plans are disjointed.

The plans have no connection with the area's history and sense of community. I am Erdington born and bred! Erdington is a historic area of Birmingham with a great sense of community which the new proposals would rip apart - what a waste of time and money for no gain to the electorate.

Yours Sincerely

[Name Redacted]

[Address Redacted]

[Postcode Redacted]

[Email Redacted]

[Phone number Redacted]
I live in the new proposed Perry Hall Ward. It is important for you to note that between the back of a row of houses in Rowdale Road and the back fences of houses in Ipswich Crescent, is a vehicular drive, which exists onto Ipswich Crescent. This drive is jointly owned by the residents in Rowdale Road who rear gates and garages are accessed via this drive. The residents/houses of Ipswich Crescent have no legal right to this drive. Please ensure that this drive is officially in Perry Beeches and NOT in Perry Hall.
Dear Sirs

I am writing to you to object to the breaking up of the Hall Green ward.

Under the new proposals I will be living within the Tyseley ward. This will mean the value of my property will be reduced.

Please reconsider breaking up the Hall Green ward or alternatively include my property in within a Hall Green ward.

Regards

Ramiz Wahid
Richard and Sarah Wainwright

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

To whom it may concern,

We have been very concerned to hear about the proposed new boundaries for wards in the Moseley area. The changes proposed will change how we are represented, how our local services are shaped and how economic development works for our local center.

Up until 2001, our road, [redacted], was in Moseley Ward. We were moved into Springfield Ward and would now like to see ourselves return to Moseley Ward in line with the plans submitted by Moseley Community Groups.

We identify very strongly with the Moseley ward and have many links with the cultural activities that go on there. Swanshurst Lane and Swanshurst Park are important parts of Moseley's identity.

Please do consider our views in the making of the boundaries. If there is to be a move towards moving Swanshurst Lane to the Sparkbrook South ward, please do let us know as soon as possible and let us also know what we can do to formalise a complaint.

Thank you very much for your time,

Yours faithfully

Richard, Sarah, Olivia and Albany Wainwright
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Michael Wakelam

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

These boundaries are absurd in that they fail to recognise the importance of communities and their identity. It is a key aspect of government that elected representatives must represent their constituents, in order for this to be sensible and workable the representative must represent a viable community. The proposals made make this unviable in many parts of Birmingham, but for my community, Moseley, the fragmentation into five separate wards with the heart of the village not even being in Moseley, the proposal reverses progress made at the last boundary review and puts at risk the fantastic community structure of Moseley. This inclusive and coherent community characteristic is demonstrated by its active and effective neighbourhood forum, the local and widely supported Moseley Society, the highly successful Moseley in Bloom and nationally recognised farmers' market. The community produces its own local magazine (Birmingham 13) and Moseley was also identified by the Sunday Times as one of the best places to live in the country. Whilst my focus is unsurprisingly upon Moseley, I can see from the plans that many other communities in Birmingham have been similarly fragmented, this will be to the clear detriment of many long-standing and active communities in the city. Thus I ask you to reconsider these proposals and devise boundaries that recognise communities and the people who live there and thereby maintain the basic tenet of local democracy.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
We ask you to amend your proposals for the North Birmingham area between the M6 Motorway and Sutton Coldfield in line with the proposals put forward by the North Birmingham Community Together group for our area. We object to the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals as they stand because they would segregate local communities that have forged a strong bond over many years.

We feel a Gravelly Hill Ward bordered by the A4040 and the M6 and a Stockland Green Ward bordered by Short Heath Road, Reservoir Road, Marsh Hill, encompassing the area around Witton Lakes/Bleak Hill Recreation Ground, would best represent the Local communities.

Mrs & Mr M Wakeman
25th January 2016.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to ask you to please think again about your proposed boundary changes concerning Edgbaston in Birmingham.

I am the Chair of Edgbaston Housing Liaison Board, which is a community group of volunteers. For the past 11 years we have worked with Birmingham City Council, including all of their departments, the Council’s contractors, the local police, the fire service, other community groups and many more too numerous to add.

Apart from myself, every member of this group lives in the area where you propose to change the Edgbaston boundary to Balsall Heath, these areas being Priory Estate B5, Barsham Close B5, Cley Close B5, Spey Close B5, to name a few.

So in effect this boundary change would completely wipe out Edgbaston Housing Liaison Board. The members have made it clear that they would not start again under Balsall Heath Ward, and I would not remain as Chair of a Housing Liaison Board that includes part of Harborne, an area I know little about. Harborne has a postal address as Harborne, and is not part of the Edgbaston community in any way, shape or form.

Birmingham City Council will be losing a lot of hardworking volunteers, with a wealth of knowledge of
The Edgbaston area. The Boundary Commission states that their intention is to keep communities together, but this boundary change would most definitely split a whole community.

2. My second objection is about Edgbaston Cricket Ground, which everyone knows is an internationally renowned ground and is an integral part of Edgbaston. To put this wonderful institution under any other ward but Edgbaston, would be a travesty, not only for Edgbaston but for Birmingham as a whole.

One of the members of our Housing Liaison Board acts a representative for the area, with Edgbaston Cricket Ground, and keeps in regular contact with one of their management team to resolve any issues, especially on match days. This communication would be lost to us under Balsall Heath Ward, or any other ward but Edgbaston for that matter.

A solution that has been discussed among residents is to keep the areas that I have mentioned as 'Edgbaston Ward', and the areas north of Hagley Road could be renamed 'Edgbaston Reservoir Ward' instead of Summerfield Ward, which is far more suitable for where their position is.

I hope you will take note of my objections, and please think about how the above solution could work.

Thankyou.

Yours Sincerely

Kathleen Wale
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Charlotte Walford
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I don't understand why this needs to change. You want to move Moseley Village out of Moseley, you're changing Jewellery Quarter to Winson Green. All seems pointless

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:- typically it shows a total disregard for the areas' history and also what the public would prefer. The phrase "cobbled together" comes to mind!!
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: Garry Walker
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Who ever came up with this doesn't know Erdington, you can not take Erdington railway station out of Erdington. The same as Erdington Police station. Please use your brain and look again. Most of it seems ok but there are a lot of mistakes. It needs a big review by sensible people.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Melanie walker
Email: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I have lived in Hall Green since 1977, and the area is one of the most urban areas. Lush Green trees and verges line the majority of the roads and I feel give the area its name Hall GREEN. I am completely flabbergasted that anyone would want to move the borders to take away this well known and loved area name. How can we have Hall Green train station, Hall Green Schools and Hall Green Parade NOT in Hall Green? How would visitors to the area understand why they are looking for Hall Green train station NOT in Hall Green? The community within Hall Green are a great group of people who pull together, we have our Hall Green Residents Association and community groups. I believe it would be a very sad time if the decision to eradicate Hall Green from Birmingham goes ahead, for all residents of Hall Green and for the area that is affected. When this happened to my parents after the Tyseley border was extended along Reddings Lane some years ago, no-one understood the changes it would bring, the council did not spare any thought for those residents affected, and I do not think that there was any positive outcome from the changes, only disruption for everyone involved. I believe that there would be mass exodus from the area if the decision is agreed and goes ahead, we are all very proud to tell our friends and family that we live in Hall Green, Birmingham, and there are not many people who are so proud of the borough.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Neil Walker
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Private resident

Comment text:

As someone who has lived in Hall Green since 2006 ([redacted]) and before that Springfield/Sparkhill since 2001 I know the roads and the area from Camp Hill Circus to Solihull and the Statford Road and Warwick Road corridors I find the above council ward boundaries bizarre. To label the historic heart of Hall Green including Sarehol Mill (dating back to the 16th Century as Tyseley beggars belief. The LGBC are playing with lines on a map without understanding the population characteristics that make Tylesley different to Hall Green. I am not a local politician but I have had people who I have never known before lower down in Southam Road knocking on my door (I jest not) totally confused, perplexed and very angry at the above boundary proposals. B28 is NOT Tyseley and never has been. There are two local community meetings scheduled between now and 31 January and expect some very strong views to be expressed. This issue surmounts any local party political considerations. I strongly advise the LGBC to review the above map for the dividing line between Tylesley and Hall Green North.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Neil Walker
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Private resident

Comment text:

Regarding Birmingham Hall Green and proposals to take part of historic Hall Green and transfer into a Tyseley constituency I have talked to many neighbours this week and we are all solidly against a proposal which would create an electoral boundary that geographically and socially disenfranchises thousands of Hall Green voters. This is not a party political matter. I have no political axe to grind as a private resident and therefore I would request that the boundary commission seriously consider the proposal to create a Hall Green East and Hall Green West set of wards that maintain the geographical identity of this long established Birmingham district. I plan to attend the second scheduled public meeting on 29th January. The first public meeting a few days ago was extremely well attended and according to my neighbour was universally hostile to the existing proposals unsurprisingly. If these ward boundary changes were designed to promote local democracy they perversely have had the desired effect but not for the reason intended perhaps. Local Hall Green residents will fight these proposals vigorously and will demonstrate strongly on the streets and at the ballot box their opposition to the proposal to bring the historic heart of Hall Green (including the 16th century Sarehole Mill) into a Tysley boundary that no one locally recognises or accepts.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
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:-

Would it not be a good idea to consult the Erdington Community before making any changes. I am part of an "Erdington Family" we have been in this area for 65 years just leave us alone please.

Yours Sincerely

Name:- MR. P. WALKER

Address:-

Postcode:-
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. 3 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!
Pascoe, Mark

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 08 February 2016 14:26
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Electoral review of Birmingham City Council

From: ROGER WALKER
Sent: 07 February 2016 23:03
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Electoral review of Birmingham City Council

For the attention of Mr Mark Pascoe
Re New Oscott/Sutton Coldfield area Birmingham - New Parklands Ward

Dear Mr Pascoe

I am writing to you on my own behalf as owner of a house in Sutton Coldfield which is occupied by my daughter and her family. In addition I am also including the comments of her neighbour Mrs M Bason who is in her nineties and partially sighted and is unable to write on her own behalf.

We have both discussed the proposals at length and would comment as follows:
1) We see the proposed area for the new ward as not being a cohesive area to be designated as a ward. It is just a strip of buildings mainly running along the path of Chester Road North.

2) We feel that a better solution would be to keep the ward in its present form as part of the Sutton Vesey Ward but with two Councillors.

3) Another point that concerns us is that at a future date this thin slice of a Ward could be absorbed into the nearby Kingstanding Ward with a resulting reduction in house values.

4) We are also concerned about the proposed name of Sutton Parkside and feel that the well regarded Vesey Ward should remain.

Yours faithfully

R D Walker
2nd February 2016

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

Dear Sir

REF: Proposed Boundary Changes to wards in Moseley Area

I wish to lodge my very deep concern over the proposed Boundary Changes to wards in the Moseley Area which are ill thought through and actually do not comply with two out of the three of the Commission’s main areas for consideration, namely:

- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

I have lived in Birmingham and specifically Moseley since 1969 and over that period have seen and experienced many changes to both City and suburb. However what has remained constant is Moseley’s wonderfully diverse culture and thriving economy. In these troubled times there is a strong multi-faith Society which works extremely hard to pull together all faiths across Moseley and the surrounding wards.

The residents of Moseley have always cared deeply about their ‘home’ whether this is supporting local schools, businesses, festivals, Moseley Forum, Moseley Community Development Trust, The Moseley Society, Moseley in Bloom, Moseley in Lights, Moseley Park & Pool, Moseley Festival, Sustainable Moseley, Moseley Arts Market, Moseley Farmers Market or the Moseley B13 Magazine.

Moseley Village is a popular local centre, with a thriving café culture, nightlife and award-winning Farmers’ Market. It attracts festivals of national significance to Moseley Park & Pool, and contains venues that are recognised across the city, notably the Prince of Wales and Tipu Sultan. Moseley also boasts a Michelin Star restaurant.

The Moseley economy is recognised in two supplementary planning documents:
- Shopping and Local Centres SPD: [http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/spdlocalcentres](http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/spdlocalcentres)

There is also a ‘living’ Moseley regeneration strategy, ‘Making Moseley’:
Moseley also has a significant historical heritage. Birmingham City Council has established two Conservation Areas in Moseley to help preserve this historic environment:

- Moseley Conservation Area: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/moseleyca
- St. Agnes Moseley Conservation Area: http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/stagonesca

Both of the links above include maps that indicate the boundaries of the conservation areas.

Considering all of the above it is no surprise that the Times voted Moseley the best place to live in Britain.

The current proposals pay absolutely no heed to any of the above breaking apart a community, pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance, and virtually ensuring that getting any agreement or coherent plan for Moseley's future will be impossible. How can Moseley Park, Moseley Parish Church and a large percentage of the businesses not actually be in Moseley - a ludicrous and unsustainable position.

At a recent community meeting attended by over 500 people (Sat 16th January, Queensbridge School) not one person supported the current proposals and this included all major political representatives. Overwhelming support was given to the alternative proposals presented by the Moseley Society and supported by local Forum's, Businesses and Faith Groups. Indeed a vote also had almost 100% support to halt the whole Boundary Change process for Birmingham.

The current proposals for Boundary Changes for Birmingham and specifically Moseley need to be halted, reviewed and altered. I look forward to your response.

Yours Faithfully,

Cc Roger Godsiff, MP House of Commons
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Simon Wallace  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

Moseley is a small village area of Birmingham. People here identify as Moseley the area around the central cross roads and so do people who visit. How in your right minds be considering having us as Balsall and cannon hill. An utter nonsense and you have people who live here confused and angry. You simply have to arrange things to include the village back in Moseley.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam

We are absolutely appalled that the name Yardley will disappear when the boundaries are changed. We want the ward to be called Yardley not Stechford East!

Whoever is responsible for this suggestion obviously does not know the history of this ancient parish and area. St Edurgha’s Church has been known far and wide as Yardley "old" church as there has been a church on that site for over a thousand years and has connections with Henry VIII. Stechford East Church is just laughable. Please do not commit this terrible act! We want to remain in Yardley.

Yours sincerely

Joan and Robert Wall
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Isabella Walshe
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: member of the public

Comment text:

I wish to register my opposition to the proposed boundary changes in Birmingham. I was born and raised in Birmingham and have lived most of my 63 years here in this proud old city whose history can be traced back to the Domesday Book. Public concerns must be listened to and acted upon. It is not your right to ride roughshod over the wishes of the local electorate.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Faith Walsh  
**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** [REDACTED]

**Comment text:**

I am writing to express my disapproval of the proposed boundary changes for Moseley. Moseley has a unique identity and long history and this shouldn't be destroyed for mere administrative and bureaucratic convenience. Moseley village must stay in Moseley! Moseley was recognised by the Sunday Times as best place for urban living, has associations with some of the great industrialists of Birmingham's past as well as being a creative hub. I have not read anything that convinces me that the proposed changes are a good idea. Don't tear up Birmingham's history.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Joseph Walsh
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Revised Edgbaston boundary

Comment text:
I understand the simplicity of having the Pershore Road as the Edgbaston and Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill boundary, but it would be good to have Edgbaston cricket ground remain within the ward. The river Rea provides a non-moveable boundary, which used to be the boundary between Warwickshire and Worcestershire.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Joseph Walsh
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 2: Moseley Village

Comment text:

"Moseley" should be renamed "Moseley East" or "Moseley East and Wake Green" and "Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill" should be "Balsall West & Balsall Heath". Moseley village follows the Acocks Green and its epicentre is at the junction of Salford Road and Wake Green Road - it would be illogical to have the centre of Moseley, which is a major local destination within Birmingham, not in a ward with its name.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Joseph Walsh
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Birmingham City Centre
Comment text:
The city centre is no longer contained within the old inner ring road or "Queensway", as most of it has been removed - Ladywood ward did make sense following the road before all of this occurred. Therefore, if it is possible, I think there should be a ward containing the whole of the city centre - that which is inside the "Middleway". If this is not achievable then it should be split into a maximum of two, such as along the A38, so that it is easier to coordinate activities. To have five wards within the city centre that also incorporate poor inner city areas, I can see a conflict of interest occurring for the councillors, as even now areas outside the Middleway don't get the attention that they deserve. It would also create difficulties for policing, as the three wards currently in the city centre are within the same Local Policing Unit - this is highly unlikely with five. With the growing city centre population, it should be taken into account how many people will be in those wards in 15-20 years time.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Joseph Walsh
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 4: Add to Hall Green North

Comment text:

Area marked should be included within Hall Green North, as it has nothing in common with the rest of the proposed Tyseley ward and people have always seen the area as part of Hall Green - the shopping parade named after the area and the railway station run along the Stratford Road, but they are included within Tyseley.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Joseph Walsh
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Add to Bournbrook & Selly Park

Comment text:
The area to the east of this line is distinctly Selly Oak, which has been split between the Weoley and Bournbrook & Selly Park wards. As Selly Oak, with its high street along the Bristol Road (A38), has such an identity, especially with the student population, I would also include the name Selly Oak within the ward. Since this map was made, the Selly Oak by-pass has been created and the A38 as shown on the map is now just a 'D' road - using the current A38 as a boundary would include the areas such as the Selly Oak retail park within a more suitable ward.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

I am writing to object to you changing the Ward boundaries.

I live in Yardley by St. Edgburgha's Church
& Yardley Old Park. This has been the Yardley Ward and Parish for hundreds of years.

I think it is a really bad idea to move Yardley and call it Stafford East. We should be in Yardley.

Yours faithfully

13.01.2016
Mrs A. Ward

15 JAN 2018
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Gemma Ward
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Annotation 1: The original village of Erdington
Annotation 2: The Gravelly Hill Community
Annotation 3: Gravelly Hill Station
Annotation 4: Erdington Train Station

Comment text:

Erdington and Gravelly Hill are two historic communities, which while existing for hundreds of years, rapidly expanded from the train stations built in Victorian times. The communities are clearly identified. The draft proposals for this area make no sense and are clearly rigged to help one political party since they are so obviously not the local communities.

Uploaded Documents:
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Amalia Wardle
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I have heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from friends who attended the Jan 16th meeting 'Your Moseley – fight for it NOW'. I live at [Redacted] and, as a teenager, have been looking forward to be able to contribute to the activities of a lively community. I have already been able to appreciate the efforts of those who live here to make it an exciting place to be growing up – the flowers, the festival and the friendly atmosphere. I do not understand why you have proposed to divide up the district and join different areas to other communities and think this is a big mistake. Please think again.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Kenneth Wardle
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I have heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from friends who attended the Jan 16th meeting 'Your Moseley – fight for it NOW'. I have now lived at [REDACTED] for nearly 40 years and benefitted from the moment of our first arrival from the sense and the reality of the Moseley community. I strongly object to the split of Moseley into different Wards which will at a stroke negate the efforts over so many years of so many residents of diverse origins and interests to create and maintain a real, vigorous community. The Moseley Festival, the Moseley Farmers and Craft Market and the Moseley Big Plan all illustrate the success of our community in creating a vision for the future of all our residents, many of who have and continue to contribute their time and energy on a purely voluntary basis. The established guidelines for the Boundary Commission include, explicitly, respect for local communities. Removing the village centre and the parish church from the proposed new Moseley Ward suggests that you are not respecting these, your own, guidelines to the slightest degree. The success of local government in maintaining the respect of local residents and empowering them to contribute to the development and future of their local district, depends on local representation. Your proposals will quite literally tear the heart out of our community.

Uploaded Documents:
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**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Nicola Wardle

E-mail: [HIDDEN]

Postcode: [HIDDEN]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I have heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from friends who attended the Jan 16th meeting 'Your Moseley – fight for it NOW'. I live at [HIDDEN] and strongly object to the split of Moseley into different Wards. The proposed boundaries would vitiate so much that the Moseley community has built up over many decades. The proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines which are explicit about respecting the identity and coherence of local communities. Your current proposal would dismantle a very well established community of place and will wreck local governance (local decisions by local people). As the mother of two young children the losses that would affect me most include the work of many years on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in a Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. It is the long term future of our children in this community which is at stake. All the effort by volunteers and council officers, made to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening of Moseley mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package; It is logical that the centre of Moseley and its parish church should be in Moseley Ward: any other configuration is simply insane. I feel most strongly about unnecessary problems caused for such community initiatives as Moseley in Bloom and Sustainable Moseley.

**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:-

leave well alone
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Wal & Jane Warmington
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

We feel that any boundary change should reflect a finite sense of community in terms of location and geography. Whilst some areas will lie close to borders, it is difficult to appreciate what the name 'Summerfield' actually refers to. Such a name change is likely to lead to considerable confusion and could also lead to less involvement in the democratic process as those with a particular mindset feel unable to relate to a place that has a meaningless name. Being part of Edgbaston is reflected historically in our everyday language and behaviour through constant references to where we live and shop, etc. Specifically this is also reflected in the work and travel activities of the community around this area which has its economic and social focus within Edgbaston and Harborne. Given this, if a ward name change is necessary, it could simply be called 'Edgbaston West' as this would encompass important aspects of our identity.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
THE Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government.
14th Floor Millbank Tower.
London SW1P 4DF.


Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to register my objections to the proposed boundary changes for Birmingham, and in particular "Yardley"—where I live and have lived for 50+ years—and would like to keep this same address.

I am a 79-year-old lady, and the thought of having to change all my administrative details, even down to my pre-paid "funeral plans," are daunting; some points to consider.
Yardley dates back before the Doomsday Book.

St Edbergh's Church (Yardley Old Church) is almost 1000 years old.

The Yardley Conservation Area was Birmingham's first.

Yardley was independent until 1911.

Can you really alter history at the stroke of a "pencil", pen? I live in Yardley and would like to stay in Yardley. I don't want to be known as Stitchford East.

Please think again, scrap the whole plan for Birmingham, listen to the people, take note of what we say, and please start again.

Yours sincerely,

[Name Redacted]

Mrs.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stuart Warner
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I think these new boundaries do not make any sense. We will lose some important community identities and that would be a real shame. Longbridge should still exist and Edgbaston should include the areas around Cannon Hill Park (Cannon Hill Park lies on the southern part of the new proposed Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Ward when few people live in the park!) I would suggest that Cannon Hill is still part of Edgbaston and that Edgbaston Cricket Ground remains in Edgbaston - it would not impact severely on the size of the ward (by population). This is a rather silly boundary change and should not be adopted.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jocelyn Warren
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I strongly oppose the proposal for the Jewellery Quarter to be moved into the Winson Green boundaries and agree with the JQNFs opinions that changing the boundaries so that The Jewellery Quarter comes under the Winson Green ward is not suitable. The Jewellery Quarter and Winson Green are two very different areas and communities with very different needs. I do not believe that the needs of the Jewellery Quarter will be met by the Winson Green 2 member ward. Having lived in the jewellery quarter for some 15 years and having a business that has been based in the jewellery quarter for some 25 years, I have witnessed the jewellery quarter community grow and flourish over the last 10-15 years. Much needed redevelopment has resulted in a growing community with increasing numbers of residents and businesses. Numbers of residents are still increasing thanks to further planned development and the area is continuously improving thanks to the local communities of residents and businesses. It would be devastating to see the recent improvements take a decline due to poor council representation. The jewellery quarter is a city centre community with close links with the city centre. It’s needs are very different to that of Winson Green. There is a requirement to be represented by a ward that understand the needs of the community. I do not think that the Jewellery Quarter would adequately represented by the Winson Green ward, I support the JQNF counter-proposal for a Jewellery Quarter and St Mark’s single member Ward and feel this ward would better represent the needs of the jewellery Quarter.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I am against the proposed changes to the Erdington Ward boundaries, particularly with regard to Somerton Drive, which I would like to remain in the Erdington Ward. I also particularly think The Abbey should remain in Erdington.

Please change your proposals 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 end 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.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards

Jackie Warren
Pascoe, Mark

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 08 February 2016 14:19
To: Pascoe, Mark
Subject: FW: Please will you review the boundary changes to the Erdington ward

From: Kevin Warrington
Sent: 08 February 2016 11:51
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Please will you review the boundary changes to the Erdington ward

"I am asking the commission to amend their plans for North Birmingham to represent a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a two member Gravelly Hill Ward, two member Kingstanding Ward, two member Oscott Ward, a Perry Common Ward, Pype Hayes Ward and a Stockland Green Ward. With the Erdington Ward borders running from Court Lane in the West, Sutton in the North, Pype Hayes and Holly Lane in the East and Kingsbury Road/Wood End Road in the South" Regards Kevin Warrington vicar of Bethany Church Erdington.
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Susan Wasmuth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Name:***

**Comment text:**

Boundaries should be left alone. Names of places are centuries old and part of our identity as communities and as individuals associated with famous people in history and important events. I am in agreement with alternative proposals made by Hall Green Labour Councillors.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: john wassell
E-mail: *********
Postcode: *********
Organisation Name: *********

Comment text:

I councillor for this ward seems inadequate what happens at holiday times or in cases of the councillor being ill

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Anthony Wass
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Moseley is one of Birmingham’s greatest assets, you mess with it at your peril. It is no coincidence that the Sunday Times voted Moseley the best place to live in the UK, the list of it’s assets are many but one of it’s main assets is the sense of community which has been its greatest strength over 150 years and the reason I moved here almost 40 years ago. When I saw these proposals, quite frankly, I thought they were a joke, has Mr Kerslake and his advisers just landed from Mars? Do they have any concept of Birmingham, let alone Moseley? The additional proposals to get rid of Longbridge altogether and move the Jewellery Quarter to Winson Green are simply unbelievable. How would the residents of Mayfair or Knightsbridge feel if they were simply erased or that Hampstead Village suddenly found itself in Haringey? These boundary changes are ill thought out by bureaucrats who have no understanding or empathy for the area. I fully support the Moseley Community Groups proposal for the ward boundaries which is the reply to the LGBCC proposals and is a sensitive and pragmatic approach made from common sense and by the people who actually live here. However, more seriously, this is part of the bigger picture of emasculating the City Council by reducing the number of councillors from 120 to 100, putting even more pressure on the existing overstretched councillors and officers to deliver services and support to communities in what is the largest council in Europe, this is fundamental and must be opposed at the highest level of government. Tony Wass

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
26 Jan. 16

Review Officer (Birmingham)
LGBCE
14th Floor, Millbank Tower
LONDON
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir,

I am writing in regard of the proposed boundary changes in Birmingham. Specifically those of Edgbaston Ward.

I am a member of the Edgbaston HLB (Housing Liaison Board), which acts as a kind of bridge between the council and local residents enabling the council to deal with problems in the area efficiently, conveniently and effectively. The majority of our members (all volunteers) live on the Priory Estate, between Pershore Road and Bristol Road, and they have stated, myself included, that if we were to come under Balsall Heath we would no longer continue. Many of the members are elderly and the prospect of starting again with a group of strangers, who probably would not want us there is abhorrent. The Chair of our HLB would have to work with members of the Harbourne HLB (if they wanted to transfer) and she is not willing to take that on. This would mean that many, many years of local knowledge and experience will be lost to the council.

Another casualty of the southern border of Edgbaston Ward being moved is that EDGBASTON County Cricket Ground would then be in Balsall Heath instead of Edgbaston. Simply a ridiculous situation.

All my neighbours want to retain their Edgbaston postal address and their Edgbaston identity. The part of Harbourne it is proposed to change to Edgbaston has always been Harbourne, has nothing to do with the Edgbaston community and should remain Harbourne. It seems to me that the only logical way to proceed is to keep the southern, eastern and western borders of Edgbaston as they are. To make the numbers right simply remove the northern areas (north of Hagley Road) from Edgbaston. Their main complaint is they want to retain Edgbaston as part of their address so if they were allowed to be Edgbaston Reservoir instead of Summerfield this would probably be acceptable.

I do not want to see the Edgbaston community ripped apart and the loss of the HLB so I hope you will view these suggestions favourably.

Yours Sincerely

[Signature]

Linda Waterhouse (Miss)
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Malanie Waththegedara
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

We brought a property in the [REDACTED] and recently came to know that council will be changing the wards for this housing scheme. This is raised concern for our mortgage value of the property and also why the builders advertised the scheme highlighted as B17. This action let the people down who brought property that not knowing the what is the real value or which ward in belongs. If we knew this before hand we would not be proceed to buy a home in this area.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Emma Watkins
Email: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: 
Feature Annotations

11: Moseley village is not in the Moseley ward. This does not reflect community interests and identities and fails to observe clear and defined community links.

Map Features:
Annotation 3: Historic JQ centre with local shops and amenities.
Annotation 4: Residential centre with residents who rely on local transport hubs and shops within the inner ring road
Annotation 5: Broadway Plaza community - a new urban centre in keeping with the character of the residential hub by the canals.
Annotation 7: Local transport hub
Annotation 8: Local transport hub providing intercity travel for JQ residents
Annotation 10: Ladywood/Jewellery Quarter Ward
Annotation 11: Moseley village is not in the Moseley ward. This does not reflect community interests and identities and fails to observe clear and defined community links.
Annotation 12: Erdington is not in Erdington Ward. The abbey is the historic centre of the community. Again this does not reflect community interests or the historic character of the community
Annotation 13: All wards in Sutton Coldfield are significantly underrepresented. Future housing developments would leave local people worse off and significantly without the correct level of representation when compared to wards like Edgbaston.
Annotation 16: Edgbaston Reservoir
Annotation 17: Summerfield
Comment text:

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7466 08/02/2016
The presence of the inner ring road (Queensway) acts as a physical boundary between Ladywood and Edgbaston. I believe that this should be utilised as a boundary between Edgbaston reservoir and the City centre as well as the JQ and Winston Green there is a distinct community identity here which is not observed in these plans. Residents in the Jewellery Quarter do not associate themselves with living in the Winston green community. They are separated by a natural boundary with their own local shops and amenities. They benefit from good access to public transport, all of which can be reached on foot and is available within the city centre. By combining the two communities this would allow for a good level of local representation of a one member ward with c.8500 residents.
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**Birmingham District**

Personal Details:

Name: Emma Watkins
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organization Name:

Feature Annotations:

**Map Features:**

Annotation 3: Historic JQ centre with local shops and amenities.
Annotation 4: Residential centre with residents who rely on local transport hubs and shops within the inner ring road.
Annotation 5: Broadway Plaza community - a new urban centre in keeping with the character of the residential hub by the canals.
Annotation 7: Local transport hub
Annotation 8: Local transport hub providing inter city travel for JQ residents
Annotation 10: Ladywood/Jewellery Quarter Ward
Annotation 11: Moseley village is not in the Moseley ward. This does not reflect community interests and identities and fails to observe clear and defined community links.
Annotation 12: Erdington is not in Erdington Ward. The Ward is the historic centre of the community. Again this does not reflect community interests or the historic character of the community.
Annotation 13: All wards in Sutton Coldfield are significantly under represented. Future housing developments would leave local people worse off and significantly without the correct level of representation when compared to wards like Edgbaston.
Annotation 14: Local amenities and schools serve the Low Brook community which lies within the city centre inner ring road.
Annotation 16: Edgbaston Reservoir
Annotation 17: Summerfield

Comment Text:
The presence of the inner ring road (Queensway) acts as a physical boundary between Ladywood and Edgbaston. I believe that this should be utilised as a boundary between Edgbaston reservoir and the City centre as well as the JQ and Winston Green there is a distinct community identity here which is not observed in these plans. Residents in the Jewellery Quarter do not associate themselves with living in the Winston green community. They are separated by a natural boundary with their own local shops and amenities. They benefit from good access to public transport, all of which can be reached on foot and is available within the city centre. By combining the two communities this would allow for a good level of local representation of a one member ward with c.8500 residents.
Annotation 3: Historic JQ centre with local shops and amenities.

Annotation 4: Residential centre with residents who rely on local transport hubs and shops within the inner ring road.

Annotation 5: Broadway Plaza community - a new urban centre in keeping with the character of the residential hub by the canals.

Annotation 7: Local transport hub providing inter city travel for JQ residents.

Annotation 10: Ladywood/Jewellery Quarter Ward

Annotation 11: Moseley village is not in the Moseley ward. This does not reflect community interests and identities and fails to observe clear and defined community links.

Annotation 12: Erdington is not in Erdington Ward. The abbey is the historic centre of the community. Again this does not reflect community interests or the historic character of the community.

Annotation 13: All wards in Sutton Coldfield are significantly under represented. Future housing developments would leave local people worse off and significantly without the correct level of representation when compared to wards like Edgbaston.

Annotation 14: Local amenities and schools serve the Low Brook community which lies within the city centre inner ring road.

Annotation 16: Edgbaston Reservoir

Annotation 17: Summerfield

Comment text:
The presence of the inner ring road (Queensway) acts as a physical boundary between Ladywood and Edgbaston. I believe that this should be utilised as a boundary between Edgbaston reservoir and the City centre as well as the JQ and Winston Green there is a distinct community identity here which is not observed in these plans. Residents in the Jewellery Quarter do not associate themselves with living in the Winston green community. They are separated by a natural boundary with their own local shops and amenities. They benefit from good access to public transport, all of which can be reached on foot and is available within the city centre. By combining the two communities this would allow for a good level of local representation of a one member ward with c.8500 residents.
Annotation 1: Historic JQ centre with local shops and amenities.

Annotation 2: Residential centre with residents who rely on local transport hubs and shops within the inner ring road.

Annotation 3: Broadway Plaza community - a new urban centre in keeping with the character of the residential hub by the canals.

Annotation 4: Local transport hub

Annotation 5: Local transport hub providing inter city travel for JQ residents

Annotation 6: Ladywood/Jewellery Quarter Ward

Annotation 7: Moseley village is not in the Moseley ward. This does not reflect community interests and identities and fails to observe clear and defined community links.

Annotation 8: Erdington is not in Erdington Ward. The abbey is the historic centre of the community. Again this does not reflect community interests or the historic character of the community.

Annotation 9: All wards in Sutton Coldfield are significantly under represented. Future housing developments would leave local people worse off and significantly without the correct level of representation when compared to wards like Edgbaston.

Annotation 10: Local amenities and schools serve the Low Brook community which lies within the city centre inner ring road.

Annotation 11: Edgbaston Reservoir

Annotation 12: Summerfield

Comment text:
The presence of the inner ring road (Queensway) acts as a physical boundary between Ladywood and Edgbaston. I believe that this should be utilised as a boundary between Edgbaston reservoir and the City centre as well as the JQ and Winston Green there is a distinct community identity here which is not observed in these plans. Residents in the Jewellery Quarter do not associate themselves with living in the Winston green community. They are separated by a natural boundary with their own local shops and amenities. They benefit from good access to public transport, all of which can be reached on foot and is available within the city centre. By combining the two communities this would allow for a good level of local representation of a one member ward with c.8500 residents.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Emma Watkins
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Feature Annotations

12: Erdington is not in Erdington Ward. The abbey is the historic centre of the community. Again, this does not reflect community interests or the historic character of the community.

13: All wards in Sutton Coldfield are significantly under represented. Future housing developments would leave local people worse off and significantly without the correct level of representation when compared to wards like Edgbaston.

Map Features:

Annotation 3: Historic JQ centre with local shops and amenities.

Annotation 4: Residential centre with residents who rely on local transport hubs and shops within the inner ring road.

Annotation 5: Broadway Plaza community - a new urban centre in keeping with the character of the residential hub by the canals.

Annotation 7: Local transport hub.

Annotation 8: Local transport hub providing inter city travel for JQ residents.

Annotation 9: Ladywood/Jewellery Quarter Ward.

Annotation 11: Moseley Village is not in the Moseley ward. This does not reflect community interests and identities and fails to observe clear and defined community links.

Annotation 12: Erdington is not in Erdington Ward. The abbey is the historic centre of the community. Again this does not reflect community interests or the historic character of the community.

Annotation 13: All wards in Sutton Coldfield are significantly under represented. Future housing developments would leave local people worse off and significantly without the correct level of representation when compared to wards like Edgbaston.

Annotation 14: Local amenities and schools serve the Low Brook community which lies within the city centre inner ring road.

Annotation 16: Edgbaston Resvoir.

Annotation 17: Summerfield.

Comment text:
The presence of the inner ring road (Queensway) acts as a physical boundary between Ladywood and Edgbaston. I believe that this should be utilised as a boundary between Edgbaston reservoir and the City centre as well as the JQ and Winston Green. There is a distinct community identity here which is not observed in these plans. Residents in the Jewellery Quarter do not associate themselves with living in the Winston Green community. They are separated by a natural boundary with their own local shops and amenities. They benefit from good access to public transport, all of which can be reached on foot and is available within the city centre. By combining the two communities this would allow for a good level of local representation of a one member ward with c.8500 residents.

Uploaded Documents:
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From: James Watkins
Sent: 03 February 2016 12:38
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Birmingham Electoral Review - Erdington/Wylde Green/Pype Hayes

Having viewed your proposed ward changes, my address would be moved into Pype Hayes. The proposed Pype Hayes ward is of a peculiar dog leg shape and incorporates properties with no community connection or any access other than via an unlit gulley at the junction of Berwood Farm Road and Welwyndale Road.

I would like to propose change in relation to Harman Road (south side), Berwood Farm Road, Welwyndale Road and Barnsbury Avenue which incorporates aprox 150 properties.

The only logical proposed wards to be in would be Erdington or Sutton Wylde Green. The closest community connection is to Wylde Green which is 2 min walk to the central Wylde Green shopping and community area, located at the far south west point of the proposed ward. The closest primary schools with easy walking access are Wylde Green and Penns.

With regard to the Sutton Coldfield town council boundary, this does not reflect the traditional Sutton Coldfield boundary. The north side of Berwood Farm Road was moved from Sutton Coldfield to Erdington as part of the Electoral Review 2001.

Erdington, the traditional ward, is the next closest area with direct community access and would be another alternative option to Pype Hayes.

Regards,

James Watkins
To whom it may concern,

About Boundary Changes to our address plans to change it to Tyssley ward we have lived in our house nearly 50 years it has always been Hall Green we are not in favour of it changing like all the other people. It affects we will fight this to the end.

Res. P.R.S.

Mrs J. Watkins
The decision to decimate Mosely further by splitting it into 3 is a travesty. Whilst I truly welcome the proposal to bring the tiny part of Anderton Park Road, Cadbury Road and the section of Yardley Wood Road that runs between them, disenfranchised from Moseley into Sparkhill some years ago, back into Moseley where they belong, I am appalled at the proposal to remove a significant part of Moseley, namely the centre of the Village itself, into another area. Moseley Cross and the section of Alcester Road that runs past it, to say nothing of all the roads running down to Queensbridge Road and the bottom of Salisbury Road, are significant parts of Moseley. Just like we found ourselves disenfranchised from the area in which we live, work, socialise and go to school and church and thrown into an area that we still have no connection to, so the residents from the very heart of Moseley are going to be disenfranchised from the area that they are the centre of. Unlike many areas in Birmingham, this is a very close-knit community. People live here because they want to live in Moseley, not in Balsall heath or Cannon Hill or Arkhill. They want to live in this ‘village’ and play their part in the community and the proposed boundary changes are going to rip this village apart. We found that when we were forced into the Sparkhill ward with no consultation that we no longer had access to our neighbourhood Forum or any say in things that affected us. Moreover, we were thrust into an area where there was no-one to represent the small group of us in the triangle as Sparkhill residents, community organisations & neighbourhood Forum have a completely different demographic and issues that are irrelevant to us. We remain in this disenfranchised and I represented state so welcome the proposal to bring us back into Moseley ward and I would hope that would go through but to split the village in two through its centre is abhorrent.
To the Review Officer I’ve heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from the Moseley Forum and in the press. I live at [redacted] and I strongly object to being in the proposed Sparkbrook South Ward because this would remove me from the current Springfield ward and alienate me even further from the Moseley Ward. I would like [redacted] to return to the Moseley Ward. Sparkbrook South has little or no connection with [redacted] which has been part of Springfield (for good reason) for a considerable period. [redacted] has been part of Moseley for years and years. When I moved to [redacted] I wanted to be part of Moseley. I participate at St Mary’s Church, my children attend Moseley C of E School and we regularly walk around Moseley Bog. I have no personal connection with Sparkbrook, the notion of being part of the Sparkbrook ward makes me feel alienated from the community to which I belong and understand. The proposed boundary would damage and even destroy so much that the Moseley community has built up over many decades. The proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines. Moseley community groups have rightly included Swanshurst Lane in a new proposed Moseley Ward. Your current proposal would dismantle a very well established community of place and will wreck local governance (local decisions by local people). The loss/losses that would affect me most is/are: · A Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance; · The partnership between the Moseley Society and Moseley councillors which created two Moseley conservation areas would be broken, and the volunteers who monitor planning applications would have a totally unnecessary increase in their workload; · The work of many years on the Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in a Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the effort by volunteers and council officers, made to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening of Moseley mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package; · Moseley Bog must be in Moseley Ward; · Sarehole Mill must be in the Moseley Ward. For many years Moseley has been celebrated for the fame of JRR Tolkien · The centre of Moseley must be in Moseley Ward; · Moseley Parish Church must be in Moseley Ward; · Moseley Park must be in Moseley Ward; · The Moseley Exchange must be in Moseley Ward; · The incredible number of Moseley volunteers who work for the Moseley community to nurture and develop the place they live in and love must not have their workload increased by the need to liaise with different ward councillors and officers. The volunteers may well give up. I feel most strongly about unnecessary problems caused for: Moseley Forum / the Moseley Exchange / The Moseley Society / Moseley in Bloom / Moseley Park & Pool / Moseley Interfaith Group / Moseley Festival / Sustainable Moseley / Moseley Arts Market / Moseley Farmers Market / Moseley B13 Magazine. Regards Amy Watson

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Angus Watson  8th February 2016 To the
Review Officer I've heard about your proposals to alter the boundary of Moseley Ward from the
Moseley Forum and in the press. I live at and I strongly object to being
in the proposed Sparkbrook South Ward because this would remove me from the current
Springfield ward and alienate me even further from the Moseley Ward. I would like Swanshurst
Lane to return to the Mosley Ward. Sparkbrook South has little or no connection with
which has been part of Springfield (for good reason) for a considerable period. has been part of Moseley for years and years. When I moved to

I wanted to be part of Moseley. I participate at St Mary's Church, my children attend
Moseley C of E School and we regularly walk around Moseley Bog. I have no personal
connection with Sparkbrook, the notion of being part of the Sparkbrook ward makes me feel
alienated from the community to which I belong and understand. The proposed boundary would
damage and even destroy so much that the Moseley community has built up over many
decades. The proposed changes fly in the face of your own policy guidelines. Moseley
community groups have rightly included Swanshurst Lane in a new proposed Moseley Ward.
Your current proposal would dismantle a very well established community of place and will
wreck local governance (local decisions by local people). he loss/losses that would affect me
most is/are: • A Moseley ward boundary that does not encompass the two Moseley conservation
areas is pulling apart an area with over 150 years of historical cohesion and resonance; • The
partnership between the Moseley Society and Moseley councillors which created two Moseley
conservation areas would be broken, and the volunteers who monitor planning applications
would have a totally unnecessary increase in their workload; • The work of many years on the
Moseley Big Plan, by Moseley residents, businesses and the Council, resulting in a
Supplementary Planning Document, would be lost. All the effort by volunteers and council
officers, made to improve economic development in this part of the city, would be wasted, at a
time when we have real opportunities to accelerate this, particularly in line with the reopening
of Moseley mooted element of the HS2 connectivity package; • Moseley Bog must be in Moseley
Ward; • Sarehole Mill must be in the Moseley Ward. For many years Moseley has been
celebrated for the fame of JRR Tolkien • The centre of Moseley must be in Moseley Ward; •
Moseley Parish Church must be in Moseley Ward; • Moseley Park must be in Moseley Ward; •
The Moseley Exchange must be in Moseley Ward; • The incredible number of Moseley volunteers
who work for the Moseley community to nurture and develop the place they live in and love
must not have their workload increased by the need to liaise with different ward councillors and
officers. The volunteers may well give up. I feel most strongly about unnecessary problems
caused for: Myself St Marys Church Moseley C of E Moseley Forum The Moseley Exchange The
Moseley Society Moseley in Bloom Moseley Park & Pool Moseley Interfaith Group Moseley
Festival Sustainable Moseley Moseley Arts Market Moseley Farmers Market Moseley B13
Magazine. I do hope that you will reconsider the proposals and create a new Moseley Ward
which encompasses Yours faithfully Angus Watson Angus Watson

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/print/informed-representation/7740 11/02/2016
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

1. I have not been made aware until now what the proposals are.
2. What criteria is used?
3. How were consultation details published?
4. Why change something which isn't broken?
5. No case has been made out to me that these proposals are needed, wanted or even if it will improve what is currently in place.
6. Is this another case of being directed by people who do not live in the area, but are arrogant to know better than those who do?

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Name:
Address:
Postcode:
Email:
Phone:
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 voice heard—take action now!

**Save our local community now by signing the petition letter overleaf and return**
Contrary to your proposal for our Vesey Ward to be renamed "Parkside" which I am at a loss to understand. I would suggest that the name Vesey should remain. The historical identity for the residents of Royal Sutton Coldfield with Bishop Vesey has always been very strong, despite population changes and I have been a resident for 50 years. Why choose Parkside when the entire 2,400 acres of Sutton Park NNR is "Parkside"? I would also suggest that the residents of Monmouth Drive are more closely associated with Boldmere for services, shops, the Golf Course, Sailing Club, Fishing, and Boldmere Gate entrance to Sutton Park National Nature Reserve. The National status is not mentioned in your Review! but it is of extreme importance. I do not see that electoral equality would be achieved by your proposals as geographically and electorally Vesey appears perfectly balanced.
I feel very strongly that to cut Sycamore Road into two different boundary is ludicrous. When we brought our property it was after very careful consideration. We brought it on the basis that this was still a very desirable road as it is on the verge of Sutton Coldfield. Short Heath is not such a desirable area and consequently it would devalue our property and also increase our house insurance. When we brought the property I was still able to manage full time work and I certainly cannot afford an increase in insurance as a result of a boundary change that only includes half of the road I live in. So people living two doors away will be in a better area - how insane does this sound?
I feel it completely unnecessary a) to change the boundary, b) to devalue our property as a result. I have worked very hard all of my life and I still strive to continue working and not sit back and claim benefits - why? I could have claimed benefits and had housing benefit to pay rent instead I worked to buy my own home for a government to decide that they were changing the area I live in.
I am absolutely appalled and disgusted with this proposal but even more appalled that you would take one road and in effect make it a road of two halves.
I would like to know how you can make such decisions with no thought to what it means long term to people financially long term.
Please leave things as they are and if not DO NOT SPLIT ONE ROAD IN TWO.
Jo Watts
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Samantha Webb

**E-mail:** [Redacted]

**Postcode:** [Redacted]

**Organisation Name:** [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

The boundaries for Kings Heath, Moseley, Stirchley, Billesley and Balsall Heath should be left as they are currently. The areas all have their own unique identities and changing the boundary to these new proposals would ruin this. For example the divide between the present communities of Balsall Heath and Moseley is on the Edgbaston Road/Salisbury Road - the two communities either side of this boundary rarely mix and the whole feel of the two areas is completely different. It would not be right to then group Balsall Heath and this part of Moseley together as one ward due to vastly different communities that live in these areas. Classifying areas that are currently Moseley and Kings Heath as other wards would also cause people in the affected areas to lose money as their house prices would decrease. People have paid a premium on their houses as they are currently classed as being in Kings Heath or Moseley, a premium that someone would not pay if buying a house that was now classed as being in Stirchley, Billesley or Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill. It is clear that whoever has come up with these boundaries has no idea about Birmingham's culture, communities or history and I cannot believe so little regard for this has been taken when these proposed boundaries have been drawn up.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: J E Webley
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:
I object to the proposed boundaries of Erdington. The historical and geographical heart of 'Erdington Village' will be lost in this boundary proposal. Erdington railway station, Erdington Abbey, Erdington cottages and Erdington sorting office are just a few of the omissions from the proposed Erdington boundary. There are natural road boundaries that should be considered i.e. Court Lane, Short Heath Road, Summer Lane, Gravelly Hill North, Kingsbury Road, Tyburn Road and Chester Road.

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:-

The historical and geographical area recognised as Erdington would be separated into illogical areas.

The natural boundaries of "Erdington Village" is Court Lane, Summer Lane, Gravelly Hill, Kingsbury Road, Tyburn Road and Aston Road and all roads inside this area. This whole proposal must be revisited.

Yours sincerely,

[Address Redacted]

Name: [Redacted]

Postcode: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]
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 consultation survey and returning ASAP!**
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: P Webster
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Have not succeeded in drawing on the interactive map! Basically, the existing south and west area of the Selly Oak ward should be incorporated in the proposed Bournbrook and Selly Park Ward and the south-west boundary retained. This is because you have failed to take into account that the Selly Oak shopping area that includes the Selly Oak railway station is the shopping and transport centre of both areas east and west of Bristol Road and Oak Tree Lane. Furthermore, most wards should have at least two councillors for two main reasons: - able to understudy each other for representing and communicating with their ward constituents - able to collaborate with neighbouring ward councillors to ensure co-operation between areas rather than competition

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Linda Weetman

E-mail: [Redacted]

Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

I would like to know why parts of Hall Green, including Hall Green Health Centre, Hall Green Parade, Hall Green railway station, Hall Green secondary school and college, and Sarehole Mill have been paced in Tyseley

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Clifton Welch
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Dear Sir I cannot understand how the Boundary Commission can possibly propose an Erdington Ward which would no longer have the following within its boundaries - Erdington Abbey - Erdington Police Station - Erdington Royal Mail Delivery Office Instead its proposed that these facilities which are at the heart of Erdington Community will be placed into Stockland Green. I also cannot understand how the area around the Yenton Pub could be taken out of Erdington and put into a new Pype Hayes ward No serious consultation with local people would ever had made such a recommendation. Can you please listen to the local people of Erdington and produce a more realistic boundary for Erdington and its residents Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

We ask you to amend your proposals for North Birmingham, the area between the M5 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 Ward will not have Erdington Alley, Erdington Police Station and Erdington Mail Delivery Office contained within its boundary. Instead they will be contained within a Staklewood Green ward. How can this possibly be correct? This current proposal tears the heart out of Erdington community and needs to be changed as a matter of urgency.
- Why has the area around Xerxes Park taken out of Erdington and moved to Pype Hayes?
- Why has Pype Hayes Golf Club not been added to a new Pype Hayes Ward?

Yours Sincerely

Name: Chifton Welch
New Pype Hayes Ward
Please amend your proposals to protect long established local communities.
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!
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Iris Welch
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Hello Although I live in Cornwall I regularly visit my son who lives in Erdington and I have just learnt that new boundary proposals have suggested that - Erdington ward will no longer have the Police station, Abbey or Royal Mail Delivery Office within its borders. At the same time Birches Green and Pype Hayes will be split despite the fact that they share the same shopping centre. This does not suggest to me as some one who admires the strength of the local community in Erdington every time I visit as very sensible proposals given they will tear historic communities apart. I would urge the commission to have a rethink and bring forward new proposals that respect historical community ties Thank You

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:-

It appears the boundary changes are in order to reduce the number of councillors and thus make a financial saving. However the scheme is a complete waste of time, effort and money when one considers the amount of money WASTED by Birmingham City Council ‘across the board’ - without listing individual spending.

How could Erdington Abbey be taken out of Erdington as one example of this idiotic scheme by the Local Government Boundary Commission.

Yours Sincerely

Name:- LAURENCE WES18.
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-

RECEIVED
29 JAN 2016
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!
I cannot believe the proposed changes to the Moseley boundaries. Surely the people who drew them up know nothing about Moseley: the topographical area, the history and most of all the people who live there. It's a disgrace.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Ruth Weston  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]  
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

Absolutely not. This is complete rubbish. Stop wasting our money. Who's ridiculous idea was it? Sack them. Just stop messing about with our city, I am fed up with the wards changing. So far since I have lived here I have been Selly Oak, Harborne, weoley castle & edgebaston without even moving. Police we have been covered by Harborne, bournville lane twice & Belgrade twice. We never seem to know where we are. Just leave us alone.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you regarding the recently published draft recommendations for new ward boundaries for Moseley in Birmingham. I am a Moseley resident and have been for some time and I am strongly against the new draft recommendations. The new proposal would mean that the much loved Moseley village will be sliced up and parts of it will no longer be classed as Moseley. The village has a strong and close community with a number of historical sites that all make Moseley so interesting and loved by both its residents and many others throughout Birmingham. The new proposal will have no benefit to the community, it needs to remain whole and I really hope you seriously take into consideration the Moseley Community Groups' Ward Proposal, or leave it as it is.

Regards

Vicki Westwood
I largely support the commission’s proposals for the Kings Norton area but would like to raise an issue. My road (a Kings Norton postcode) although it does not appear on the map above yet, is being moved into a proposed ward called West Heath. This road and a number of houses on the Rednal Road also built by Persimmon in 2011, I feel should remain in Kings Norton. The current proposals place a boundary in line with the alleyway along Kings Park West, which is a source of crime and anti-social behaviour for us in Kings Park West and residents in Nearhill Road and Heathleigh Road. We have a Neighbourhood Watch group in Kings Park West. We work with the police and our local councillor to tackle the issues and I fear that if the source of the problem is split into two wards, it will be more difficult to tackle. My worry is that due to access difficulties, the proposal could create a forgotten road if Kings Park West were to move from Kings Norton into West Heath. There is a long gap between houses to the west of West Heath Hospital to the Rednal Road, part of the Kings Park West development. The only other access is from the alleyway to Nearhill Road (which would be in a different ward). It would make common sense to keep Kings Norton with the nearest group of houses - Nearhill Road and Heathleigh Road. We look towards Kings Norton and not West Heath. When houses were sold by Persimmon, it was made clear that Kings Park West was in Kings Norton and I feel that should not change. Thank you Phillip Wevill

Resident of Kings Park West
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:-
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: mark whoever
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Northfield West not Allens Cross

Comment text:
I have lived in [redacted] for many years and this has always been known as Northfield even though it was weoley ward. Its about time it was given the name it has always been know as.

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:— I want the areas to stay the same. I lived here in Erdington all my life the areas are as they are and best leave them alone. Let’s of History in Erdington and we do not want it lost or broken up.

Yours,

Name
Address
Postcode
Email
Phone
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!
From: The Right Reverend Michael Dickens Whinney

The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP
31 January 2015

Dear Sir

Proposed Boundary Changes to Moseley Ward in Birmingham

I write as President of the Moor Green Lane (East) Residents Association, Moseley, and as a resident at this address for the past thirty years, to object in the strongest terms to the proposed boundary changes for the Moseley Ward.

The proposals cut the historic village of Mosley into two, ignoring the two conservation areas in Moseley and consequently destroys the long standing efforts to create a vibrant Moseley Community, its culture and economy. It will discourage the extremely active community involvement which includes an award-winning monthly Farmers Market, the Moseley Society, the Moseley Forum and the Moseley Community Development Trust.

This appears to be a purely paper exercise by people far away just looking at maps rather than a considered response to local consultations. I have not met anyone in Moseley who is in favour of these proposals. Therefore I ask for an assurance that you and your colleagues from London will visit this area, meet with the genuine community leaders and listen carefully to what they say before any final decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

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

14th January 2016

Boundary Commission Ward Proposals for Moseley

I write as one who has lived and worked in Special Education in this historic ward of Moseley since January 1988. My appreciation of Moseley is supplied by the inspiring leadership in Moseley that has established a vibrant ethnic mix, well supported societies seeing to neighbourhood issues and schools that work well together to provide a service that extends far over the boundaries of the ward. The present ward of Moseley is an area from which many people go out to serve in a paid or voluntary capacity in the nearby communities of Balsall Heath, Stirchley, Kings Heath and Sparkhill. Each of these other areas has its own proud historic past and present identity. Moseley itself has built up community relationships with the Moseley Development Trust, Moseley Society, Moseley Interfaith Group, Sustainable Moseley and the Moseley Festival as well as others. It is small surprise that The Times Newspaper named Moseley as one of the best place to live in an urban environment in the UK recently.

I fear that your proposal to divide Moseley Ward from Moseley Village (clustered around the Roman road that runs through it) by using the line of the railway (which we cannot see as it runs through tunnels and there are houses which are built close to it) will ruin the historic nature of the place so well known to JRRTolkien. Add to this Moseley Hall Hospital formerly the home of the Cadbury family in Moseley which together with Moseley Park, and the 600 year old Moseley Parish Church will no longer be in Moseley Ward. I foresee an administrative nightmare for us residents since the small area designated Moseley will have none of the services formerly making up the ward of Moseley and all these services with the name of Moseley will be in Balsall Heath/Cannon Hill Ward.

With great differnce, as I have never written such a letter before. I ask if you are able to reconsider the boundaries for the proposed Moseley Ward. I enclose an attached map for your consideration. By enlarging the boundaries to include Moseley Village, Moseley Hall Hospital and the top end of Moor Green Lane (where Helen Cadbury lived and a retirement home was built) you would be helping to preserve a great deal of commitment to a community that is really thriving in these days of community needs everywhere. I do ask though, as one who is fully committed to voluntary service in retirement. I have taught English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) in Balsall Heath, Ladywood, and at present in the St George’s Newtown ESOL classes. I support the Local Foodbank while serving on Churches Together in the Birmingham 30 area.

Yours faithfully,

V. Whinney (Mrs)
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Alfred White
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

We understand that the proposed boundary changes for Moseley will drastically affect the Moseley area. As boundary changes are meant to strengthen community spirit we should like to point out that this part of Birmingham has an extremely strong and vibrant identity and a change like this which removes a major part of Moseley including Moseley village will have an extremely deleterious effect. Michele and Alfred White

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Local Government
The Review Officer
Birmingham
Boundary Commission
For England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

To Whom it May Concern
Regarding the proposed boundary change for Yardley, I strongly object to this proposal in light of the fact that the conservation area around St Edburgha’s church is not only the a conservation area but has been known as Yardley Old Village for centuries, and is signposted as such. Also the effect on our house prices would be a consideration we paid a premium to be in this quiet village and this would be effected by the boundary name change.
I suggest a visit to our village and the Stechford area before such a decision is made. I sincerely hope this would be a consideration before a final decision is made.

Sincerely
E.J. Whitehall
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** SUSAN WHITEHEAD  
**E-mail:** [Redacted]  
**Postcode:** [Redacted]  
**Organisation Name:** Glebe Farm Residents Group

**Comment text:**

I am a resident of Glebe Farm and a member of the Glebe Farm Residents Group. The proposed Boundary change for Glebe Farm and Tile Cross has now got parts of Stechford & Yardley North, Ward End and Alum Rock Wards included in the proposed changes. These areas have never been part of Glebe Farm or Tile Cross and I am very surprised that it is being proposed by the Commission. I feel these areas would be better shared by the Saltley, Ward End and Alum Rock Wards; these are very small wards especially Alum Rock and I am surprised at how small these wards are in contrast to the proposed Glebe Farm and Tile Cross Ward. The natural Boundary is the River Cole/Kingfisher Project; realistically it should be Stechford Retail Park that would include some part of the Stechford & Yardley North Ward and the Railway Line up to Lea Hall Train Station. In your Proposing New Wards Guidance 2015-08-04 PDF Document; How to propose a pattern of Wards; part 3 Promoting effective and convenient local government and reflecting electoral cycles page 11 Size of Ward or Division – You state "We will look at the geographic size of the ward or division and try to ensure that it is not so large that it would be difficult for a Councillor to represent. Similarly, in urban areas, a ward might be so small in area that its Councillor might not be able to contribute effectively to the wider business of the council." and page 12 'Detached Ward' – you state that "We are sometimes presented with proposals to include two geographically separate areas in the same ward or division. We will not usually accept a proposal of this kind as it is unlikely to meet our criteria for promoting community identity and interests or delivering effective and convenient local government." I think that this proposal falls into these categories and my views are shared by others within this Community. If you realistically think about it you are proposing to split residents from Stechford & Yardley North, Ward End and Alum Rock Wards (Which the above statement is also relevant) and putting them into Glebe Farm and Tile Cross; actually you’re splitting 3 Wards and putting them all into another Ward. This is clearly completely contradictory to what your statements above are stating in your criteria. I hope you will consider my views has valid points and take note of your own set criteria as mentioned above; when making your decisions on the proposed Boundary changes. There are also plans to build 250 – 300 Homes on the old Sewage Farm Site; which could potentially see 1,000 – 1,500 new residents added to the Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Ward. Has this been taken into account when assessing the number of residents for each ward? Will the new people moving in have any connections with the local Community? In the 'Birmingham Ward Draft recommendations 2015' Summary under Analysis and Draft Recommendations on page 14 it states: Ward Name: Glebe Farm & Tile Cross Number of Councillors: 2 Variance 2021: 6% Description: This ward includes the communities of Glebe Farm, Kitt’s Green and Tile Cross, bounded by the Birmingham Loop railway line to the south and the River Cole to the north. Detail: We received five submissions that commented on this area of Birmingham, including four detailed proposals for warding arrangements. The proposals that we received for this area differed quite significantly. In considering our draft recommendations for this we visited this part of the city in order to observe the evidence received. As part of our deliberations we examined whether we could identify two single-member wards of Glebe Farm and Tile Cross. However, we could not identify a sufficiently clear boundary between the two areas that would provide an acceptable level of electoral equality. Accordingly, we propose a two-member Glebe Farm & Tile Cross ward based on one of the submissions that we received. We consider that this ward provides the best balance between...
our statutory criteria in terms of both reflecting community identity and providing a good level of electoral equality, while also allowing for effective and convenient local government. There is no mention in these statements regarding including parts of the Stechford & Yardley North, Alum Rock and Ward End Wards in this proposed Ward. This is very misleading to residents and interested parties and I would like to know why this information has been omitted. I am also concerned of the lack of literature through residents’ doors from the Boundary Commission explaining these proposed changes and the lack of consultation via Ward Councillors with their electorate. Please see the uploaded Map of the proposed Glebe Farm and Tile Cross Ward with the highlighted areas shaded in. Thanks

Uploaded Documents:

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

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

Consultation Map

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database rights 2013.
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

I have lived in [Redacted] for over 45 years and I wish to remain within my Doctor's Boundary area. How can these people make these changes without consulting the residents. Another stupid plan which no doubt will cost thousands of pounds. Can we spend this money on something more sensible! I am very angry about this. I am using some common sense.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Name:
Address:
Postcode:
Email:
Phone number:
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** DAVID WHITEHOUSE

**E-mail:**

**Postcode:**

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

The 'consultation' appears to be red lines on a map. There is NO explanation as to why these proposals are being made, and for what purpose. Birmingham council should be 'transparent' as to their motives for re-drawing boundaries, and who it is supposed to benefit. Perhaps the council could publish their reasons so people can understand why this is being done so they can consider a more appropriate response.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
My wife and I are gravely concerned regarding the change in boundaries that are being proposed. We have lived in Yardley for 35 years, proud of all its connections, dating back to before the Domesday book and St Edburgha’s church a centre point of Yardley.

We are strongly opposed to the changes, proposed by people who do not even know or live in the area.

We are also very concerned that house prices will fall if these proposed changes take places.

In these 'cash strapped' times how can money be wasted by even discussing these changes and we can see no benefits whatsoever for the people of Yardley.

LEAVE YARDLEY IN YARDLEY!

Regards
Ray and Pauline White
Further to e-mail of 27 January, we felt we needed to add to our comments following our attendance at the public meeting held at Yardley Library on Thursday, 28 January 2016.

There was representation from all parties who gave an overview of the proposed boundary and name. It seemed to us that this is a proposal by people in Westminster who have no links or understanding of the area and the feelings of the Yardley people. It seems to be just a 'numbers' exercise to accommodate the required number of 'voters' for each area. We do not want our boundaries changed, nor do we want them re-named, eg; east, west, etc. Road signage already exists, and as we are in and in economic climate, I do not want to see my council tax spent on re-naming signage. Another worrying comment raised during the meeting was that we were informed that all but 2 of the wards would only have one Councillor representing the whole ward, what happens if this Councillor is ill, etc. We are proud to belong to Yardley "we, the people of Yardley, Birmingham object to the renaming of our area as 'Stechford East' and want the ward to be called 'Yardley' thus ensuring "that the pattern of wards reflect the interest and identities of local communities as well as promoting effective local government" - this passage as stated as your aim on your website.

KEEP YARDLEY IN YARDLEY

Ray and Pauline White

SAVE HISTORIC YARDLEY

My wife and I are gravely concerned regarding the change in boundaries that are being proposed. We have lived in Yardley for 35 years, proud of all its connections, dating back to before the Domesday book and St Edburgha’s church a centre point of Yardley.

We are strongly opposed to the changes, proposed by people who do not even know or live in the area.

We are also very concerned that house prices will fall if these proposed changes take places.
In these 'cash strapped' times how can money be wasted by even discussing these changes and we can see no benefits whatsoever for the people of Yardley.

LEAVE YARDLEY IN YARDLEY!

Regards
Ray and Pauline White
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Richard White  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

Hi - I strongly appose the boundary wards for Moseley. Moseley appears to have been split up and spat out into multiple ward areas. Moseley is a very unique place within Birmingham, and probably no other area exists that is like it. Part of the reason for this would be why it won best place to live in Britain 2015 from the Sunday Times and has previous awards for Moseley in Bloom. this is something that the council should retain and enable the ease of continuing success for this ward. By splitting areas that are in Moseley, it will create unnecessary bureaucracy and restrictions to allow people who actually live in Moseley to have their say and representation. It is like a community that exists in Birmingham that is so unique compared to others, with the farmers markets and numerous arts events that take place. The line goes right through the 'Moseley triangle' which is one of the most desirable areas to live in Moseley and Birmingham itself. This needs to be re-configured so that the Moseley ward consists of all areas within Moseley. Any local can show where those boundaries must exist.

**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:-

We as residents of Erdington, may lose the councillors who currently represent us, and therefore have representation by councillors of political parties, and who do not work as hard for us, that we do not want.

Yours Sincerely

[Signature]

[Name]

[Address]

[Postcode]

[Email]

[Phone]
Could I submit the following suggestion:

A Pype Hayes Ward including Birches Green, a Castle Vale Ward, a two member Erdington Ward, a Perry Common Wars, 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 East, to the South the traditional border with Gravelly Hill/Birched Green of Wood End/Kingsbury Road is used. To the East the border is the border of Pype Hayes, enabling Hooe Park Drive to remain in Erdington.

I hope this submission is useful.

A.R.Wiggall.
Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Moseley Boundary Changes

I refer to the above and the meeting I attended on 16.1.16.

I wish to strongly object to the proposed and would like the current boundaries to remain unchanged. I cannot see why you have to 'fix what is not broken'.

The proposal that has not been outlined is not what the local Moseley residents want.

I trust you will consider all objections when making your final decision.

Yours faithfully

(Moseley Resident)
I am a resident of the Jewellery Quarter, having lived here since moving to Birmingham six years ago. Your proposal for the new Ward that includes the JQ seems to be driven primarily by the numbers, rather than taking into account the natural boundaries of our community. The JQ is very much a city-centre based community, which is why it naturally fits within the current Ladywood Ward. The identity of the area is rapidly developing, given the boom in the residential population over the recent years, and with approximately 7,000 residents we need to ensure we are effectively represented on the City Council. As such, I object to your current proposal and I support the Jewellery Quarter Neighbourhood Forum’s counter-proposal for a 1 member Jewellery Quarter and St Mark’s Ward. Further details can be found in the map I have uploaded and on the JQNF website: http://jqnf.net/2016/01/09/jewellery-quarter-to-move-to-winson-green-part-2-of-2/. The area proposed by the JQNF better reflects the natural community boundaries of the Jewellery Quarter. If you choose to keep the current proposals for the boundaries of the Ward, Jewellery Quarter should feature in the title. Soho is the historic name for the area to the north of the Jewellery Quarter, and as such Jewellery Quarter and Soho would be a suitable name for this ward. Best wishes Thomas Wildish
From: Robert Wild
Sent: 16 December 2015 17:17
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: ELECTORAL REVIEW OF BIRMINGHAM: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS - Oscott Ward

Comments,

Recently, I commented on the proposals for ward boundary changes.

Yesterday I received details of the draft recommendations from Heather Fuller and was asked for my comments.

I have looked at the proposals and am in general agreement to the proposals in so far as they appear to effect Oscott Ward.

Yours sincerely

Robert Wild
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:-

TAKING RAILWAY STATION
POLICE STATION
AND ABBEY OUT OF ERDINGTON

Yours Sincerely

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

RECEIVED
29 JAN 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!**
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:

1. I CANNOT see what benefit there is in moving a boundary other than to help labour, would cause total confusion for residents & visitors, I.E. ERDINGTON ABBEY TO BE TAKEN OUT OF ERDINGTON - LUDICROUS. COST WOULD BE HORENDOUS for new signage resulting in unnecessary cost for the very people that don't want or need the changes.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Vivienne Wilkes
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Splitting Hall Green up will take the heart out of the area. The community spirit in Hall Green has taken many, many years to build up by volunteers, churches and local organisations and the dedicated Councillors it has had in the past. People identify with an area not a north or west. Hall Green being torn apart does not comply with the idea of communities sharing interests and facilities etc as the Councillors will not be sharing the same concerns in the same way they do at present. There appears to have been no imagination or empathy used in the decision to shred the wards into meaningless pieces as far as residents are concerned. Arguments about the same number of voters and like for like interests just confirms what many people think about politics at present. It does not relate to them as a community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam

We are writing to express our objections to the proposed changes to the Hall Green boundaries. We believe very strongly that the proposed changes would completely break up the community of Hall Green. We have lived in Hall Green for 27 years using our local amenities, such as the shops on Hall Green parade, Hall Green station and Hall Green Health and enjoying the historic Sarehole Mill. All of which would become part of Tyseley under the proposed changes. Not only does this seem impractical but it would destroy the strong sense of community this area has always enjoyed and which benefits all who live here.

We urge you to reconsider.

Yours faithfully

Anthony and Sarah Wilkey

Sent from my iPad
Birmingham District

Personal Details:
Name: Jayne Wilkinson
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Feature Annotations

Annotation 1: This area should also be part of Sutton Coldfield.

Comment text:
The people of Boldmere want to have a say in what happens to their part of the park. The park is so large that the people of Four Oaks will not be bothered about what happens at the other side of it.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: michael wilkinson
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

the proposed changes to Erdington do not take into account the historical background of Erdington nor the wishes of the vast majority of its residents. Proposed division splits the village High street in half. on one side they will be in Stockland Green on the other Erdington. The centre of Stockland Green is where it has been for hundereds of years the same as for Erdington itself, the proposals are a mismatch. Erdington Station will be in Short Heath, is this to be renamed as well?. Likewise Erdington Abbey and the police station will be in Stocland green, will these have to be renamed as well. House prices will fall as those in Erdington are higher than in Stockland Green and Short Heath , will owners receive recompense for there losses? In addition car and house insurance premiums will rise in the changed areas so will people be able to gain recompense for these additional costs. All signage will have to be replaced. who pays for this, the council tax payers, additionally why should local businesses have to pay for the changes to signage, stationary ect. Would it be to much to ask for a vote on this or will it be just passed through by faceless people in an office in London to show that they are earning their keep by disturbing and upsetting people hundreds of miles away who would rather keep things the way they are.

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: The Proposals would split a historic village in two, one side of a busy high street in a different community to the other. The Abbey and Police Station moved without thought to their significance to the communities they serve. No thought has been given to the additional costs for local businesses, council tax payers or house holders. House prices will fall as the area changes whereas care and horse insurance prices will rise. New signage will have to be paid for, who will pay for business's additional costs in re-branding etc etc.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stuart Wilkinson
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Disgraceful, most of Moseley will now not be in moseley. I would love to know the reasoning but regardless, leave moseley as it is, particularly the high street and kings heath border

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
The Review Officer (Birmingham)  
Local Govt Boundary Commission for England  
14 1st Floor William Gee  
London SW1P 4OP  

Dear Mr/ Madam,  

Proposed Moseley Ward Boundary Changes  

I object to the current proposals because you have failed to address two of your three main considerations namely:  

(a) To reflect community identity  
(b) Provide for effective and convenient local govt.  

Your proposals for Moseley Ward do not include the whole of Moseley Village.  
Its centre, surely the shops, pub, restaurant, businesses and church, should all have the same councillors.  
Instead, they would have to deal also with councillors from the proposed Balsall Heath ward.  

I support the Moseley community groups' boundary proposal which was endorsed by a large meeting of electors on 16/12/16.  

Yours faithfully,  

(Gordon Will)
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Antony Williams
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live on I have never considered this road as Kingstanding as it boarders on New Oscott and our kids are more likely to go to Sutton coldfeild schools, this should be changed as it does not make no sense for us to be Kingstanding, we shop in Sutton, school in Sutton, our transport links are Sutton coldfeild. Common sense applies in our case, I think the ones objective would be renting or council tenents Please view this as a necessary change of boundary and postcode to amend what should of been put in place already.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
18th January 2016

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

Dear Sirs,

I understand that all Birmingham ward boundaries are being reviewed and that Yardley could be amalgamated with Stechford to become “Stechford East”. This would mean that St. Edburgha’s Church and the conservation area of Yardley would no longer be in Yardley.

Yardley conservation area has been a centre of worship for over 1,000 years. It was dedicated to King Alfred’s granddaughter, Edburgha, hence the church being named after her. Yardley was mentioned as being the property of Pershore Abbey in King Edgar of England’s Charter of 972. It is recorded in the Domesday Book as a detached part of Booley, a Worcestershire manor belonging to Pershore Abbey. It was also part of the divorce settlement by Henry VIII to his wife Catherine of Aragon. Yardley is older than Birmingham and remained independent until 1911. This is just an example of the special history of Yardley.

We are always being told by historians etc., that it is vital that we do not lose our heritage. By losing the name of Yardley we would be doing just that.

Also on a practical note; becoming part of “Stechford” could mean that our property prices decrease and insurance premiums etc., could possibly rise.

I have lived in Yardley for over 40 years and have always been proud to live in this area. My daughter was married at St. Edburgha’s church. Although both my children have moved out of Birmingham (one up north and one in America) Yardley still holds a special place in their hearts.

I therefore, totally oppose this suggestion.

Yours sincerely,

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have studied the proposed boundary changes and am dismayed at what this will mean for my community. The proposal fails entirely to achieve two out of three of the stated aims of the Electoral Review.

Moseley has a unique identity and atmosphere and these proposals will split our community in half. Moseley Parks (including all the music festivals), the Parish Church and Moseley Farmers' Market to name just a few will no longer be in Moseley.

It will also have an adverse effect on the many charitable and
Community/voluntary groups that take place around the village area. The Mosley Society would have to deal with several Councillors and since the work carried out by these wonderful people is already arduous and entirely voluntary (this could be too much and may spell the end).

I urge you to respect this wonderful community, the citizens, its voluntary work and the history of our village and stop these proposals.

Yours
Mrs. E. Williams
Dear Sir/Madam

Boundary Commission’s Draft Recommendations: Acocks Green

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 recognize 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. 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 either introducing a new boundary at Fox Hollies/Stockfield Road placing Yarnfield Estate, the current Tyseley, Hay Mills etc. into a new ward as recommended by Cllr Roger Harmer, and the Acocks Green Neighbourhood Forum or to redraw the boundary so as to recreate a separate new Fox Hollies Ward, as recommended by Cllr Stewart Stacey.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Date: 2/2/16

Review Officer (Birmingham)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
LONDON
SW1P 4QP
I strongly feel Sutton Coldfield should have 11 councillors to represent the borough not 10 as you would propose
GWilliams Sent from my iPhone
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Geoff Williams
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Please see the attached document

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Dear Sir/Madam

PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES 2016

I have studied the proposed boundary changes and am shocked at the lack of thought that has gone into them.

The stated aims of the electoral review are:

a) to recommend ward boundaries that give each councillor approximately the same number of voters
b) to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities
c) to promote effective local government

Whilst the proposal achieves the first objective, it spectacularly fails to meet the other two, for example:

b) The proposed boundaries have been defined by someone who clearly has not the slightest knowledge of the area, using arbitrary boundaries that take no account of local community groups and partnerships. Can you explain the logic, for example, of slicing Moseley in two along a railway line that has not been used for 75 years, whilst leaving Moseley Village, Moseley Conservation Area, Moseley Parish Church, Moseley Park, Moseley Hospital, Moseley Farmers Market, Moseley Arts Market and the Moseley shopping centre OUTSIDE Moseley?

c) Your proposals would decimate a community that has been established over many years, and the organisations developed voluntarily by locals (Moseley Forum, Moseley Community Development Trust, The Moseley Society and Moseley in Bloom, to name but a few) to “promote effective local government”.

A recent meeting (attended by 400-500 local residents) voted overwhelmingly (only one vote against and two abstentions) to reject the proposals.

You will know, if you follow the national and local news, that these objections are not limited to Moseley residents, but are shared by many other communities in Birmingham.

I urge you to abandon these proposals.

Mr G Williams
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Jacqui Williams
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am not in favour of the new boundaries as I think this will have serious detrimental effects on Moseley as a community. There are many community groups that look to the council for support and funding, this will become extremely difficult with the new boundaries. Please do NOT let this go ahead

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Mr. Pascoe,

Having read the literature and attended local meetings concerning the proposed boundary changes, as a resident of [REDACTED] which is in the Banners Gate area of Sutton Coldfield, I wish to express my concerns regarding the proposed new ward boundaries for the area.

For one thing, the suggested name of “Parkside” is a completely nebulous name, as it does not give any indication of which side of the park it is situated, and has no relevance to any previously recognised name. I would suggest that the existing name of “Banners Gate” would immediately identify the location, as people already associate the area with the Banners Gate entrance to the park.

In addition to that, the boundary line for this area is obviously ill thought out. To include the Banners Gate entrance and the west side of the park within the Four Oaks ward, is completely ludicrous. It would mean that any matters arising on the west side which would affect residents on that side of the park, would be completely out of their control, as a Four Oaks councillor is unlikely to be too concerned about what is going on on the other side of the park, as there would be no mileage in it regarding potential voters, and the residents of the Four Oaks area are unlikely to show much concern, as it would not affect them. The residents who would be affected would have absolutely no representation.

A re-think of the name of the ward, and the area of the boundaries, need to be re-considered with regards to the best interests of the local residents. Together with every other local resident that I have spoken to, we are hopeful that a review of these matters will result in a common sense outcome.

Yours faithfully,

Jean Williams (Mrs.)
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Kevin Williams  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

just to confirm, I am happy and accept the ward called Tyseley where I live

**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:-

WE DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY NEED FOR CHANGE - LEAVE WELL ALONE.

Yours Sincerely,
Name:-
Address:-
Postcode:-
Email:-
Phone number:-
Dear Sirs,

I am protesting against the breaking up of the Sutton Veasey Ward. Boldmere and New Oscott are very well integrated and should stay that way also to include the piece of Sutton Park which is to be given to Four Oaks. Local ward funding to provide facilities would stop if this area of Sutton Park was put under Four Oaks Ward therefore PLEASE Do Not split up the historical Sutton Veasey Ward.

Yours sincerely

Mrs. Maureen Williams
I feel strongly that it would be grossly unfair to Sutton Coldfield if our local Councillors are reduced to 10, we should have at least 11 so that we are not swamped by the large number representing the huge conurbation of Birmingham.

Kind regards

Elizabeth Williamson.
We are informed by the Cllr. Neil Eustace that it is proposed to change ward boundaries and that this will include Yardley, where we live. As you may know, Yardley dates back to before the Domesday Book, its church is almost 1,000 years old and is part of the conservation area around it, which is about 5 minutes' walk from where we live. It seems very wrong to me to change the name as it is a part of history which should be preserved. We hope that the councillors involved will seriously bear this in mind when decisions are made.

In addition, we are members of the Yardley Baptist Church, Rowlands Road. If Rowlands Road is included in the boundary changes, this will also affect our church name, which identifies where we may be found.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. & Mrs. Williamson.
The Review Officer  
Local Gov. Boundary Com.  
14th Floor  
Mullbank Tower  
Mullbank  
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir,

Re: Proposed boundary changes - Birmingham.

I wish to express my support for Swanhurst Lane to return to the Moseley Ward and also register my support for the Moseley Community Group plan.

It is important that the community of this area should be consulted and respectfully listened to. This is our home environment of which the Moseley residents are rightly proud. You have the relevant knowledge, I would hope, of the history and heritage of this area which brings visitors from all over the country. Residents have worked hard to support this and as an "area" needs to be clearly defined & recognisable. That this location
exists within the confines of a large city should be heralded and supported.

Swanshurst lane + Swanshurst park is a well established & attractive part of the city which does not need to be reclassified to a named area that already evokes negative images & lifestyle.

My mother, two brothers & I have been here since 1969 & wholeheartedly support Swanshurst lane returning to the Moseley Ward (from the inappropriate Springfield Ward) and not being labelled as part of Sparkhill South.

It is a simple concept & business that if you recognise & support your workers (constituents) you will get far more support & investment back.

Yours faithfully
Dear Sir or Madam

Re. Proposed Boundary Changes to Birmingham and to the Moseley Village area

As a resident of both Birmingham and Moseley for the last fifteen and a half years, I am deeply concerned by the changes proposed to the ward boundaries across Birmingham as a whole, and more specifically by those proposed in the Moseley, Balsall Heath and Kings Heath areas of the City.

In terms of good governance of the City of Birmingham itself, I do not see how a reduction in the number of councillors will serve to improve the administration and running of the largest single council in the country and oppose the proposed city wide plans for re-drawing the ward boundaries.

Furthermore the proposal that all councillors be elected only on a 4 yearly basis rather than on a rolling basis as at present will, to my mind, be detrimental to the smooth running of the Council in that on-going matters across a ward will necessarily stop in the run-up to elections as all councillors will need to focus on the election campaign. Moreover where major political changes ensue then much accrued knowledge about local activities and concerns will be lost in one go. The current system of 3 councillors to a larger ward with a rolling programme of elections has the definite advantage of continuity in that regard.

If, however, such a plan to reduce the number of councillors is to proceed it would seem vital that any such revisiting of ward boundaries take into account all three criteria required in any Boundary Commission review: namely equalising the number of electors represented per councillor; reflecting community identity and providing for effective and convenient local government. The current proposal appears to disregard entirely the latter two criteria and in that regard must be revisited: the proposed ward boundaries carve up into nonsensical parts a cohesive and well established community and would make life significantly more complicated for those community groups which seek to improve and support the lives of those living in Moseley and Balsall Heath, if the intention is to provide for effective and convenient local government the proposed boundary will be a manifest failure in its intentions.

Having recently attended a public meeting regarding the proposed boundary changes it is clear that the people of this community are strongly opposed to the changes set out in the LGBCE proposals and (if there is to be a Birmingham-wide boundary review) strongly support the Moseley Communities' submission on a re-drawn boundary for our ward. It makes no sense to have an area with such a strong sense of community divided up among 5 separate wards and I urge you to reconsider the proposals in line with what the people of this community believe better represents our boundaries.

Yours faithfully

Phillippa Williams
Dear Sirs,

I am writing on behalf of my husband and myself to strongly object to the boundaries of yardley becoming Stechford East. We have lived in our house for 45 years if we wanted to live in Stechford we would have bought our house there. Please leave well alone, to change the area where St Edburghs church has been for a 1,000 years is ludicrous.

Yours Sincerely,
Mr & Mrs. Williams
I wish to object strongly to the draft proposals to redraw the ward boundaries so that the area is no longer in Hall Green but in Tyesley instead.

My house is over a hundred years old and has been in Hall Green since it was built.

I understand that Hall Green School, Hall Green Railway Station, Hall Green Parade and Hall Green United Community Church will all also be in the new Tyesley ward.

I feel that these proposals do not make sense. I also believe they will take away my local identity and confuse the local geography.

Hall Green is a historic area with a community spirit and feeling of belonging which will be threatened by the proposed changes. There are numerous community groups which will be negatively affected.

Please think again about the proposed changes which can only impact negatively on Hall Green residents.
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:-

Yours Sincerely

Name: T Williams
Address: 
Postcode: 
Email: 
Phone number:
North Birmingham Community Together

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

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to 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: Peter Willmore
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am writing writing to express strong dissatisfaction with the Commission’s proposals for boundary changes for the Moseley ward in Birmingham on the grounds that they divide an area with a strong unified local ethos and active cooperation in local government into parts which are then linked to functionally-unrelated neighbouring areas of Kings Heath and Balsall Heath. The proposed Moseley ward would not contain the Village Centre and Park—surely a key area (typified by the common use of the description "Village"), which is instead exported to join a new Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. The area around Billesley Lane and the Golf Course would become attached to Kings Heath, a proposal which takes no account of the existing links between this area and the Village, exemplified by the cooperation between the various churches in it. The Commission asserts that one of its aims is "to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities as well as promoting effective local government.". Moseley is an area with a strong tradition of active involvement in local government for example in connection with planning and the establishment of two conservation areas within the current boundaries. This has surely been fostered by the political geography and can only be damaged if these proposals are adopted, firstly because the fragmentation would make it much more difficult for the different areas to work together and secondly because there would no longer be any councillor whose primary interest would be indentified with the broader Moseley area. A.P. Willmore [REDACTED]

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Stephanie Willmore
E-mail: [MASKED]
Postcode: [MASKED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am writing to express strong dissatisfaction with the Commission’s proposals for boundary changes for the Moseley ward in Birmingham on the grounds that they divide an area with a strong unified local ethos and active cooperation in local government into parts which are then linked to functionally-unrelated neighbouring areas of Kings Heath and Balsall Heath. The proposed Moseley ward would not contain the Village Centre and Park—surely a key area (typified by the common use of the description "Village"), which is instead exported to join a new Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill ward. The area around Billesley Lane and the Golf Course would become attached to Kings Heath, a proposal which takes no account of the existing links between this area and the Village, exemplified by the cooperation between the various churches in it. The Commission asserts that one of its aims is “to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities as well as promoting effective local government.”. Moseley is an area with a strong tradition of active involvement in local government for example in connection with planning and the establishment of two conservation areas within the current boundaries. This has surely been fostered by the political geography and can only be damaged if these proposals are adopted, firstly because the fragmentation would make it much more difficult for the different areas to work together and secondly because there would no longer be any councillor whose primary interest would be indentified with the broader Moseley area.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object most strongly to the boundary changes being proposed for Birmingham and in particular Hall Green.

These changes are confusing, ie Mosely Village not being in the Mosely Ward and damaging to local identity and communities.

Hall Green/Mosely are known as the home of Tolkien and the Hobbit. There is the Shire Walk just opened, Sarehole Mill and Green Lane Ford. They will now be in Tysley.

Residents take a pride in their local community and activities. The type of property and residents have no link with Tysley and will be isolated in the new ward.

House prices will drop as houses in Tysley are significantly lower than in Hall Green.

Please review all proposed boundary changes in Birmingham.

Yours faithfully

Abigail Wills
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Elizabeth Wills

E-mail: [redacted]

Postcode: [redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

All I want to say is that my postal address is Northfield and I rarely visit Bartley Green and therefore Edgbaston. The reservoir seems to be a natural divide and my interests in what happens where I live is centred on Northfield. I bank there, I shop there, I give blood there. The buses passing my estate go to Northfield town centre yet I have no representation there!

**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:-

**This is a pure political decision. Erdington tends to vote Conservative.**

**By breaking Erdington up as proposed this dilutes the Conservative vote which will be lost amongst the overwhelming Labour vote in the new areas.**

**As local election turnout is very low already, people who normally vote Conservative will decide why waste a vote on an already guaranteed result and stay at home.**

Yours Sincerely

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone number: [Redacted]
North Birmingham
Community Together

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

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has announced it's draft boundaries for our area. Sadly they are proposing to break up well established communities across North Birmingham. We are a community campaign that is asking them to reconsider their proposal to better reflect our local communities. Our changes also better show equality of electors. 6 of our 8 wards have more 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!
Professor Colin Mellors  
Review Chairman (Birmingham)  
14th Floor Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London – SW1P 4QP

Ref: Local Government Boundary Commission for Birmingham

Dear Professor Mellors,

As a long standing voter in the Moseley Ward, for over forty six years, I write to your good self concerning rearranged proposed boundaries for Wards in the future Mosley Area.

As a result of the new completely erratic proposals to reconstruct a new Ward, it will devastate the past existing, very effective and influential operations of the Local Ward at this time in Birmingham.

I enclose an article that I have written, emphasising the retention of the Moseley Ward, as known to maintain its effective work. I appeal that you are able to arrange the retention of the important, and efficient Moseley Area as the centre of the Ward.

Yours sincerely

Murray Wilson-Browne

Enclosed: ‘Moseley Village’ Important Ward
The Moseley ‘Village’ as an Important Area in the Ward

Moseley is just three miles from the Centre of the Second Largest City in the Country, long established by residents, who may work in the city, or in the Moseley Centre, or to enjoy retirement.

At the heart of the existing Ward, in Moseley ‘Village,’ is a Centre for Community Groups, important Businesses, and the ‘Village Green’ used for frequent Markets around which are other essentials, e.g. Banks, Shops, Pubs, Cafes and good Restaurants.

The Parish Church was first established, as a place of worship in 1497. The Moseley area has been a busy Suburb for one hundred and fifty years, enjoyed and developed as part of this vast City of Birmingham, which has steadily developed local resources, and satisfied the community.

Moseley has a long history of political involvement, and has one of the highest numbers of voting Electorates in the City. The people of the Ward wish to continue to act together as Members, and to know that the area will continue to be based in the Moseley Ward, as it has been since 1979.

Please take into account the wish of the present people who live in the Ward, and have voted effectively in the Area that has represented Moseley for many years.

From a Voter in the Ward
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

It is obvious that the person/s making this change in North Birmingham does not have any idea of the area or its history.

Yours Sincerely

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

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

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

Birmingham Mail highlights community being broken up:

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

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

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

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

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

* EXCLUSIVE IN ERDINGTON FOR FIFTY YEARS. IT IS HOME TO MY FAMILY AND MYSELF. OUR HOUSE IS CLOSE TO HAND. OUR POLICE STATION, ERDINGTON POLICE STATION, ALWAYS READY TO HELP WITH PROBLEMS. OUR DOCTOR IF WE ARE IN NEED. LOCAL GYMS ALWAYS AVAILABLE. SO MANY COMMUNITY NAVIATION CENTRES IN THESE HOMES, NOT JUST OSBORNE CENTRE. I PASSED THERE TO GO TO BIRMINGHAM UNIVERSITY ART SCHOOL, I PASSED MY CLUSTER COURSE THERE. AT OSBORNE CENTRE I NEEDED AS WE ALL DO OUR RAILWAY STATION IN SUTTON RD. WE ARE HOPING TO USE THE LVUATION IN SUTTON RD TO HAVE A TRAIN. HOW MUCH TURNOVER TO DIFFERENT DESTINATIONS MINUS THE TRAIN. I THINK YOU SAW OF PEOPLE WERE LUNKER YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN SO STUPID FROM ERDINGTON WE ARE OUR HOME, ERDINGTON IS WHERE WE BELONG. WE DON'T WANT PART OF US SPLIT AT ALL OUR BIRMINGHAM. THINK OF THE COST. WE NEED SENSIBLE PEOPLE WHO ARE DIRECTORS AND SENSIBLE THINGS. WE ALL OF US. ERDINGTON STRONGLY OBJECT TO YOUR PROPOSALS. YOU MUST HAVE TAUGHT SOME OF YOUR STAFF AT RE. SPEND 500 YEARS IN THE FAMILY. YOU HAVE DETERMINED. YOU MUST DECIDE EVER THINKING TO US. YOU ARE RUINING OUR LIVES.

Yours Sincerely

Name: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Phone number: [REDACTED]
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: suzanne wilson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

please change your proposals for the north of 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

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: sarah wilson
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I wish to strongly oppose the ill-thought-out Boundary changes. I attended a meeting regarding purposed boundary changes. Whilst I recognize some changes are necessary but, Moseley Village not in Moseley is ludicrous. What about our local communities, churches, forums and all the hard work done by various people to ensure Moseley continues to thrive whilst retaining its wonderful historical history. Please rethink the boundary changes and what the changes would mean for local people. What happened we're all in it together? Why destroy what is a wonderful diverse community? I can only hope there is someone with common sense who will take note and listen to what the people of Moseley wand and not ride rough shot over us please. Thank you,

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
To the Boundary Commission

Dear Sirs/Madam,

I am extremely disappointed and worried about the proposed change to boundaries, which will mean my house will no longer be in Hall Green, but the new ward of Tyseley.

I bought a house in Hall Green in 1976, because I wished to live in this "leafy" suburb, and have lived here ever since, my children were born, brought up and educated in Hall Green. Over the years some of the "green" has gone out of Hall Green, with the loss of many mature trees, and sadly an increase in vandalism and litter, but we still have open spaces, and retain the feel of a "leafy" suburb. To promote this, I am a member of Sarehole Environmental Action Team - in conjunction with the park rangers we help to clean up Hall Green, particularly around Sarehole Mill and Greet Mill meadows, and undertake various tasks to help retain the green environment. Why do I do this? Because I take a pride in this area, and realise the Council's resources can no longer cope with paying for many of these jobs to be done. I do this because I have chosen to live in Hall Green, and know how important it is to keep these green and open spaces for all to enjoy. I did not choose to live in Tyseley. It is a very different area, with compact inner city type housing, and if my house came within the Tyseley ward I think the priorities and spending choices would necessarily be very different.

I have worked very hard to care for Hall Green, and this has hurt and upset me. It is as if no one cares that I am a good neighbour and citizen and prepared to do what I can to maintain the standards of where I have chosen to live. The use of language and names are very important - I suspect if there had never been a "green" in Hall Green, and we had just been an extension of the inner city (Tyseley) - we would have lost many of the green parts of this area long ago. One of the greatest assets a Local Authority can have is the pride its citizens have in where they live. Residents of Hall Green have this pride, and many are prepared to do what they can to maintain the good identity of the locality. Labeling us with Tyseley strips away our pride, and leaves us feeling cheated and bereft.

I ask that you reconsider this propsal - it could save money in the short term, but in the long term will pull down the identity and local pride of the area leading to blight and the need for greater expenditure on social issues.

Please carefully consider the points I have made, as this is a decision which is very important to me and my wellbeing.
Yours faithfully,

Jane Winder (resident of [redacted])
Dear Local Government Boundary Commission,

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

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

It is simply quite a pointless, costly and frankly a ridiculous suggestion to enforce this change. It will annoy residents like myself who have lived in Erdington, to now be told they live in Pype Hayes/Stockland Green. The police station is ELTON. Station, the Abbey is ELDINGTON. Abbey Station is ELDINGTON. The sorting office is ELDINGTON. Sorting office have a recession when working people get to be left without things. In the last few years, there has been little or no pay rise for the people, (and) people struggle. Now you should waste money like this is not right! Am I just for equal councillors?? Who we never see anyway except for Robert Rider, Gareth, Bob Beauchamp! Leave Erdington alone.

Yours Sincerely

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Phone number: [Redacted]
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: robert wingham
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

neither of us wish to have yardley changed it is much more sensible to have stechford incorporated in our area.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Patrick Wing  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

Balsall Heath is a defined neighbourhood, which has been acknowledged with an approved Neighbourhood Plan. It is an active neighbourhood which over a number of years has sought to improve the neighbourhood to the benefit of the residents, people who work in the neighbourhood and visitors to its well known Balti restaurants. The proposal seeks to split the neighbourhood in half for the purposes only of reducing the number of Councillors and it does seem that no account has been taken of where people actually live...in defined neighbourhoods. Account should be taken and the neighbourhood of Balsall Heath should be left as a ward in its own right. Note should be taken of the submission by Bal;sall Heath Forum which seeks to represent the views of the neighbourhood.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
The suggestions for new lines through Erdington are absolutely ridiculous. Why is money being wasted on this scheme. Services will not be improved with a new map, they will become confused. I already live on three boundaries and I am fully aware of that confusion as I wouldn’t even have close emergency services because they are in different areas to me. This is another scheme that is wasting our money instead of focusing on improving existing services.
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Michael Wolffe  
**E-mail:** [Redacted]  
**Postcode:** [Redacted]  
**Organisation Name:** [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

I have lived in Moseley for over 50 years. It is a part of Birmingham with a unique identity and a cosmopolitan community. Moseley Park is known nationally through its Folk and Jazz festivals and is the centre of the community. Your proposed boundary changes would not only change the whole character of this vibrant cohesive community that has been built up over a long period, but unbelievably would place this historic Park outside of the Moseley Ward. The changes would also effectively unravel the work that has been undertaken over the years in developing community consultation and involvement in plans for the growth of Moseley. This has been evident in the widespread community involvement that has taken place with regard to the plans for widening use of Moseley Park as a community facility particularly through applications to the Heritage lottery, the Post Code lottery and the Arts Council. To split Moseley so that this historic Park and the centre of Moseley village is no longer in Moseley Ward is inconceivable and unacceptable. I urge you to revisit the boundary changes with a view to ensuring that Moseley Ward comprises the centre of Moseley village. Dr Michael Wolffe

**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:-

You will be taking our identity and ownership of our heritage from us for what reason?
I will expect a response to this concern.

Erdington is not placed on a map.
It's an area with history and a heart.

Yours Sincerely

Name: CHRISS WORWELL
Address: 
Postcode: 
Email: 
Phone number: 

05-02-2013
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!
What are the reasons for changing the Erdington boundaries?
I would like to attend the meeting when this issue will be discussed. This will enable concerned parties to participate in the decision about their ERDINGTON.

Sent from Samsung tablet
Dear Review Officer for Birmingham,

I am writing to you in regard to the proposed Moseley boundary changes. I feel strongly about these changes. I have only lived in Moseley since 2013 but it is now a place where I call ‘home’. I looked around many areas of Birmingham in my search for that home. I viewed fantastic properties that were not in fantastic areas. I chose to live in Moseley because it is a fantastic area. After all, Moseley was voted ‘best place to live’ by a national newspaper. Why would anybody want to change such an area? The only person whom I could imagine would do such a foolish thing is a person sitting in an office in London with a felt tip pen and a map of Moseley in front of them.
Moxley is a historical village. On my wall, I have a framed black and white photograph of the village green circa 1868. I frequently visit the annual Moxley farmer’s market and arts market which are held in the same spot as that photograph. People come from across the Midlands to buy and sell at the Moxley markets. In the proposed boundary changes, the markets will become ‘Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Park markets’. That just does not have the same ring to it.

Moxley Park and Pool is over the road from the village green. The fact that you require a key to enter this park adds to the charm of Moxley Park and helps keep it highly well kept. It is in this park that the two Moxley festivals take place, bringing visitors to the village. This brings a boost to the many independent shops and businesses in Moxley. If the proposed changes go ahead, then Moxley Park and Pool will now dive into the Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Park ward and the current Balsall Heath Park will fall into the Moxley ward. I have never been to
Balsall Heath Park because I feel frightened by the people who litter around there. However, I invite you to visit both parks with me. We can take a picnic. After visiting both parks, you can tell me which park you would like to keep in your village.

Moseley is a favourite meeting place for people of surrounding areas. This is due to the high number of independent bars, cafes and restaurants here. It is not fair for these small businesses to be in a different ward if the proposed boundary changes go ahead. One example is Carter’s of Moseley, a fine dining restaurant. I doubt that customer numbers would increase if it had to be renamed ‘Carter’s of Balsall Heath and Cannon Hill Park.’

Some firms and organisations will be in a position where they have to apply to councillors from more than one ward to make any changes. Where is your support in making things easier for small local businesses and organisations?
Moseley inhabitants are an interesting mix of people. We are proud to live where we do. I love living in this culturally interesting place called Moseley... as it is now. Why change the boundaries when it makes no sense for the local community? If you answer to that question is that it will equalise the number of electors each councillor represents then that is an irrelevant fact. A relevant fact is that Moseley residents are actively passionate about where they live and will fight to keep Moseley as we know it. Fact: the centre of Moseley should remain in Moseley Ward.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]

Elizabeth Way.
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Barbara Wood
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

As a resident of Kings Norton I feel that the boundaries as proposed by the Commission do not reflect the neighbourhood identities of those who live in the area. If there are to be boundary changes that recognise communities then the revised proposals as suggested by the local Conservative team do make more sense in that the community of West Heath is recognised as a stand alone area. As someone who has been involved in local issues for a number of years I can honestly say that West Heath very much see themselves as a community in the same way as the logical suggestion of Hawksley has been proposed. West Heath do not consider themselves as Kings Norton. The revised proposals suggested by the local Conservatives takes these divisions much more into consideration and as such I would strongly support adopting the proposed revisions to the boundary Commissions first attempt.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I have just watch on the tv where you propose to get rid of Erdington and include it into Stockland green total waste of time and money I have lived in Erdington for 50 years or actually in Stockland green but whenever I write my address I have always put Erdington Birmingham not Stockland green Birmingham instead of wasting money playing with boundaries use it on the health service, police or schools.
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Diana Woods  
E-mail: [Redacted]  
Postcode: [Redacted]  
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

**Comment text:**

I am writing to oppose the boundary proposals as they relate to Moseley. I have lived in Moseley for 25 years and have appreciated the cohesiveness of the area and its historic features. I believe the boundary commission proposals focus on voter numbers to the exclusion of a logical and sympathetic approach to Moseley boundaries. A proposal which excludes the parish church of Moseley, Moseley park and the centre of Moseley Village, home to the nationally renowned Moseley Farmers' Market seems perverse. I also believe it would be damaging to the businesses of Moseley to have to deal with a number of councillors across the borders of Moseley. Moseley is a vibrant, successful community and the people who live here are rightly proud of it. I think the draft proposals would damage the senses of identity that has been built up over many years and I urge you to reconsider the draft proposals which I believe would do great damage to the cultural, economic and social environmental nature of Moseley.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Janet Woods  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I read the LGBCE proposal for redrawing the ward boundaries in Moseley with dismay and exasperation. I support the intentions to 'improve electoral equality...', to 'reflect community identity' and to provide for effective...local government. The proposals, if enacted, would achieve the first outcome in a crude manner, but only by completely subverting the second and third. The current LGBCE proposals seem to be informed ONLY by the current electoral ward boundaries which are drawn simply to equalise the work involved in counting votes and have no substantive effect in non-election periods. The second outcome would be trashed. Historically Moseley Village has had a unique identity as a suburb of Birmingham. It has many community organisations - Moseley in Bloom, Moseley in Light, Moseley Regeneration Group, Moseley Community Development Trust, The Moseley Society, The Moseley Forum, Moseley Park and Pool, Moseley Farmers Market etc etc. Moseley also embraces two conservation areas and is clearly recognised as a community in the City’s Planning documents - The Moseley Supplementary Development Plan, the Shopping and Local Centres Special Development Plan and the Development of Mature Suburbs document. The community has an established record of working constructively with Local Government on the formulation of planning for a successful future. The LGBCE proposals will significantly undermine the possibility and value of this constructive collaboration. They would render 'effective and convenient local government' an impossibility. The interests of a community, which identifies itself as a community, would be represented as fringe concerns by six different ward representatives. Coherence, unity, identity and integrity would be things of the past. I attended a meeting to discuss these proposals, and was overwhelmed by the unanimity of judgement that implementation of the LGBCE proposals would be disastrous and would effectively undermine many years of good community and collaborative work, and disbelief that the LGBCE proposals were so poorly suited to achievement of their stated purposes. I would like to support the proposals for redrawing the ward boundary which have been submitted by Moseley Community Groups.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Roger Woods
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I'm writing to you to express my heartfelt disapproval of your plans for redrawing the ward boundaries in Birmingham. I know that several ward areas are disappointed by your proposals; for instance I appreciate the strength of feeling the Longbridge community will be expressing over its proposed demise. I believe the whole exercise to be misconceived and I have written to the Secretary of State urging him to interrupt the exercise and begin again. I am writing to you however to protest over your plans for Moseley and Kings Heath. It would seem to me that you have paid no heed to the importance of supporting this well-establish community. Your proposals would divide the community. Our interest groups and residents associations such as Moseley Forum and Moseley in Bloom would have to relate to councillors in different wards. The customary modes of governance of our extremely successful and cohesive community would be damaged beyond repair and community ventures would be destroyed. The work of councillors and volunteers in producing planning documents, in establishing two conservation areas would be severely hindered and disrupted and the future development of this nationally acclaimed suburb (see The Guardian 29/11/13 'Let's Move To Moseley' and The Sunday Times March 2015 - Moseley village named best place to live in UK after beating Mayfair and Mussel Hill) would be seriously obstructed. You will judge the strength of feeling from my community neighbours by the size of your post bag for this issue. Many will tell you of the damage your proposals will do and will explain how cohesive and successful our community has become over the last thirty years. I will not simply repeat these views but will urge you to abandon your current proposals and rework the boundaries back to something which looks like the current Moseley and Kings Heath ward. I have seen the Moseley Society proposal and approve of it. Please take seriously my views and those of the Moseley community. Yours sincerely Roger Woods

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
The Review Officer (Birmingham)  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14th Floor Millbank Tower,  
Millbank,  
London  
SW1P 4QP

26th January 2016

Dear Sir or Madam,

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

I feel very strongly about this as both wards are so totally different, and both deserve separate Councillors representing them.

Bournbrook is an area of mainly terraced houses classed as Houses of Multiple Occupation, inhabited by students of Birmingham University, and people working at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital – a fairly transient population. There are no conservation areas and the only community or residents' group now is the Tiverton Area Residents Association.

This area, with mainly student housing, creates many parking problems and noise when the students are 'up', environmental difficulties with the amount of nefarious refuse left littering the streets and gardens, as well as a large number of planning applications to enlarge and change the original properties.

In comparison, Selly Park consists of mainly larger terraced houses and detached residences inhabited by settled families and couples. The properties are often covered by land covenants imposed by previous generations in order to keep the area in a leafy and desirable condition. To this end there are several Community/residential groups:  
Selly Park Residents Community Association  
Selly Park Property Association  
Selly Park Conservation Area  
Selly Park Avenues Conservation Area

I would propose, therefore, that, instead of combining the two areas with their totally different demographics and needs and being represented by two Councillors, the two areas be represented separately by one Councillor each, making for a much better local involvement by each Councillor and the residents of each area.

I do hope that you will consider my proposals seriously, and with understanding for the needs of the local population.

Yours Faithfully,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Janet Worton

Comment text:

07 February 2016 The Review Officer, Local Government Boundary Commission for England I was born in Moseley in 1948 and live locally at the above address. I am writing to object to the proposed plan to change the boundary of the wards which will mean that Moseley is in several different wards. Moseley has a very strong community and identity and has benefitted from being able to interface with local government through a single ward. In the past there have been several wards and this was very detrimental to the efficient working of local organisations such as the Moseley Society, Moseley Forum and Moseley in Bloom. I could name 6 other local groups who would experience great difficulty. Do we want to change things so that we make life more difficult for volunteers giving their time to work for their community? The work on the Moseley Big Plan over many years would be completely wasted, disilluioning the many people who have contributed. It is ridiculous to tear Moseley apart to the extent that the centre of Moseley village, the Moseley Parish Church, St Columba’s Church, Moseley park, both Moseley conservation areas and the Moseley Exchange would no longer be in Moseley. In fact it brings your whole process into disrepute. I think that you would find it very difficult to defend these proposals using your own policy guidelines. I also object to the havoc you intend to other long established and historic Birmingham communities. Thank You

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
---Original Message---
From: Steve Wrench
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2016 11:43 AM
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Birmingham Boundary changes

I am writing with the strongest possible objections to the proposed changes for the Birmingham area of Yardley to be swallowed up into a new area called Stechford East.

This proposal is outrageous and completely unnecessary. The area of Yardley has been in place since the Domesday Book was written. The church, known locally as Yardley old church is over 1,000 years old and the community feel of the place is very strong.

The Council Leadership are proposing these changes for no reasons they can justify and to formerly belong to a well established community which dates back 1,000 years is to be thrown away on a whim. There is no need for this, no financial gain, the incurring of significant cost in making the change and to make the change will do nothing but annoy the residents of this area.

I live in Yardley at [redacted]. I like the place. I do not like Stechford which is an area of the city with a poor reputation. My own house and those of my neighbours are at risk of losing value by is change and I for one am not prepared to sit back and let it happen.

To recap:
1. No specific reason given for the change
2. No financial benefit to the Council or the local community by making the change
3. The Council will incur cost by making the change - why on earth would they do that?
4. Local house prices will reduce, affecting many people
5. The "new" area of Stechford East is a name the residents of Yardley do not want to be associated with

This is nothing to do with accepting change. It is all about not accepting the wrong change.

Yours sincerely,
Steven Wrench
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Clive Wright
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

The suggested boundaries in the Birmingham area seem to take no account of natural community boundaries and catchments nor do the names properly represent the areas that they cover in many cases. It is difficult enough to engage communities but if they don't even recognise the areas they are deemed to live in this can only disenfranchise people further. I think you need someone / a team with more idea of demographics and social history to turn this into an opportunity to mobilise communities rather than alienate them

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: CLIVE WRIGHT
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: PERSONAL VIEW

Comment text:

The proposed boundary changes do not appear to have any reference to how people identify the area that they live in and ignores the history of Birmingham. One of the benefits of the boundary changes could be to engage people in local and national politics but alienating them by failing to recognise historic boundaries and identities is not the way to go. There needs to be a realisation that people do not conform to tidy groups of equal numbers but to the areas they live in, were brought up in and from where their families originate. It also seems crazy to have boundaries dissecting roads and even groups of houses. What common sense comes up with the idea of neighbours being in different areas. I suggest the boundaries need to be looked at again by people with some form of local knowledge and empathy if this process is not to further alienate the electorate

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hello,

I would like to lodge my concerns about your recent draft proposals for ward boundaries in Birmingham.

I feel that the proposals have been taken without due regard to the stated objectives set out in your report, namely:-

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

I do not believe that your proposals in any way take account of the last two objectives. An assessment of locally submitted proposals, in the appendix of the report, demonstrate that more often than not local submissions have been largely dismissed. Frequently with the odd claim that locally submitted proposals would split communities.

The lack of attention to local knowledge of how Birmingham communities are structured, and function, indicates that insufficient effort has been made to engage properly with local communities.

The purpose of this exercise was to create a model of local government that would be able to better engage with local communities (as per your third objective). In many cases (Moseley, Balsall Heath, Acocks Green, Hall Green and Erdington) your proposals split communities into many parts. This will make engagement with local government much less effective and considerably less convenient. In the examples cited above it is more likely that engaging with local government will become less convenient than it is at the moment.

This creates the situation where your proposals will create more problems for communities than currently exist.

The disquiet in Birmingham in relation to these proposals should indicate to you that that they have been drafted in haste. Such haste can be evidenced by the decision to hold such an important consultation over the Christmas period. This is in direct contradiction of previous Cabinet Office advice on good practice in consultation.

This process has been started as a result of the recommendations contained within the Kerslake Report. The Birmingham Improvement Panel have been supporting the City Council to make changes as set out in the report and, I believe their task is next to impossible in the light of these draft proposals. I have put together a petition to illustrate concerns with the Boundary Commission's process and report. This has been directed at the Improvement Panel to reflect their role in making significant change in Birmingham a reality.
I hope you will also take on board the number of people that have contributed to the petition and hope you will take on recognise their concerns in re-evaluating your plans. The petition currently stands at over 1000 signatures.

https://www.change.org/p/john-crabtree-chair-birmingham-improvement-panel-halt-proposed-changes-to-birmingham-s-ward-boundaries

Although I think the proposals are wholly flawed I would like you to take into account some specific comments in regard to the ward where I live, currently Moseley and Kings Heath.

I broadly support the proposal to create a new Kings Heath ward in order to reflect local identity. I do not support the current proposed border. Equally the proposals for the new wards of Moseley and Balsall Heath & Cannon Hill make little sense at all. They split communities in two and bear little resemblance to the submission made by with Moseley community groups nor Balsall Heath Forum.

The proposals made by local communities were entirely consistent with the objectives set out for this exercise and created a good plan for how future wards could work together and left room for anticipated population growth.

The communities of Moseley and Balsall Heath have a rich history of community development and as such are well aware of where local boundaries fall. I urge you to adopt the proposals that were submitted to you in the first stage of this process.

In altering your plans I would suggest that you design wards that fit natural communities and then give consideration to population numbers. This will then give you the ideal number of Councillors to support the City. Starting from the point of crude population numbers has clearly not worked.

Given the level of concern that is being felt across the City I ask you to reconsider your timetable and make effort to visit Birmingham and hear directly from the communities that feel so threatened by your current plans.

Many thanks

Daz Wright
Hello,

I would like the following linked petition to be taken into account within the consultation regarding Proposed Birmingham Ward Boundaries.

https://www.change.org/p/john-crabtree-chair-birmingham-improvement-panel-halt-proposed-changes-to-birmingham-s-ward-boundaries?tk=dltaZVfGrvMk1rKC8cmPe4SuKjK5F1ZKL14B46cRLQ&utm_source=petition_update&utm_medium=email

The petition lists the Boundary Commission as co-petionee.

So far the petition has 1140 signatures expressing concern with the process developed to draft ward boundaries. Copies of this will also go to the John Crabtree, Chair of Birmingham Improvement Panel and Greg Clarke, Secretary of State.

Please note that I did not add the consultation email address at the early stage of the petition as I didn't want you to overwhelmed with a 1000 notifications as people signed it.

I hope you see fit to take these views into consideration when responding to the consultation.

Many thanks

Daz Wright
I live in having looked at the proposed boundary changes I do not understand why this has been brought about as the changes do not improve the wards but instead make senseless changes. There is no benefit to the residents of Sutton Coldfield at all and it does appear that changes are being made for the sake of change and no other reason.

I suggest that the boundary commission drops this useless exercise and leaves the Sutton Coldfield area alone.

Gordon Wright
Dear Sir or Madam,
I am writing with regard to the proposal to change the boundary of the ward in which I live; Yardley, Birmingham. Yardley existed before Birmingham grew to surround it, and was independent until 1911. The area still maintains a village feel which is commented on by by visitors who see it as one of the most attractive and interesting areas of Birmingham. I am one of a group of people, not all of whom are church goers, involved in endless hard work to maintain the beautiful and historic church, which is a grade 1 listed, and the neighbouring Trust School, which is grade 2 listed. The buildings are set in public parkland and the whole area was designated by the City Council as a Conservation Area. Although officially called “St Edburgha’s Church”, it is known far and wide as “Yardley Church” and its spire is a landmark that dominates the local landscape. Also included in the heritage of Yardley is Blakesley Hall, a medieval manor house which is open to the public. Old Yardley Village is regularly visited by school parties and people from many faiths and walks of life, some of whom are visitors from abroad. Rather than being included in Stechford East, Yardley should keep its existing identity. The opinions and feelings of Yardley residents, who do so much so care for the area, should be valued and respected. Please keep Yardley as a separate ward.
Yours faithfully,
Mary Wright
I live in Sutton Coldfield, having looked at the proposed boundary changes I do not understand why this has been brought about. There is no benefit to the residents of Sutton Coldfield at all and it does appear that changes are being made for the sake of change.
I suggest that the boundary commission looks at what they have done and comes up with a more workable system or just leaves it alone.

Susan Wright
The Review Officer (Birmingham)
Local Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
London SW1P 4QP
cc The Rt. Hon. Greg Clark

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to add my voice to those who have already expressed their opposition to the proposed boundary changes for Birmingham.

I am sure that the desire and legal constraints to create 'Electoral Equality' have outweighed the other considerations of 'Community Identity' and 'Effective and Convenient Local Government'.

I live in the current ward of Moseley and King's Heath and although my road would still be included in the new Moseley ward, the proposed changes make a nonsense of the well-established and historical community of Moseley. We would be linked with an area with completely different socio-economic needs, to the detriment of the people living in those areas bordering Balsall Heath.

As I am sure has been pointed out, some of the anomalies are bizarre - Moseley Park and Pool would be in Balsall Heath and Balsall Heath Park in Moseley! The heart of the 'village' would be classified as being in Balsall Heath/Canon Hill. You might dismiss these as trivial matters as you could say that these areas could still call themselves 'Moseley', even if the boundaries recognised by the Council put them elsewhere. You could even decide to alter the names of the new wards.

More significantly, the changes proposed would seriously undermine the ability of local community groups to work effectively. With the decline in local government finances these groups have a vital role. There are well-established community groups, who, together with local councillors have worked hard to promote Moseley and make it a thriving and lively community. They have produced a development plan for the area traditionally thought of as Moseley. The Moseley Society is a civic amenities group which has helped create a Regeneration Group, a Community Development Trust and the Moseley Forum, which in turn has spawned the Farmers' Market and Moseley in Bloom. If your plans go ahead these groups would be dealing with 6 councillors in 5 different wards, hardly conducive to effective and convenient local government.

I am copying this to the Minister for Communities and Local Government Greg Clark in the hope that he will dismiss the whole idea of the boundary changes, as I know that other areas in Birmingham are unhappy with the proposals. In the meantime, I hope that you will think again about the lines you have drawn that will split one of the best known and much loved and areas of Birmingham.

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs. Sally Wright)
Dear Sir/Madam I am a resident of the Jewellery Quarter and have seen proposals for new Wards in Birmingham. I notice that the Jewellery Quarter is part of a new Ward provisionally called Winson Green, but you are active seeking recommendations for the name of this ward. Given your proposal basically sees you joining the heart of the old Soho Ward with the Jewellery Quarter, I suggest the simplest thing to do is call the new ward ‘Soho and the Jewellery Quarter’. Yours faithfully Tomas Wright
**Birmingham District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Jeremy Wyatt  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Postcode: [redacted]  
Organisation Name: [redacted]

**Comment text:**

I have reviewed the boundary changes as they affect the area within which I live, Moseley, and the surrounding areas: King's Heath, Balsall Heath, Cannon Hill, Sparkbrook, Sparkhill North and South. I also read in some detail the submissions you received from a group of Moseley societies, the Labour Party, and the Conservative Party. I would note that your proposal for the boundary for Moseley ignores every recommendation that you have received from the political parties, and from the local residents groups. The Labour Party and the joint submission by the Moseley Forum, The Moseley Society, The Moseley ReGen Group, The Moseley Community Development Trust and The Moseley Businesses were in close agreement, drawing the boundary very closely along the lines of the Moseley SPD which was adopted by the City Council in 2014. This would have 2 councillors and run from Moseley Bog to Cannon Hill Park (West to East) and from the Moseley Golf Club in the South to the natural boundary with Balsall Heath in the north. The Conservative Party proposal is somewhat different, proposing a smaller Moseley Village ward which would encompass only the core of other other proposal, but still a coherent core around the natural centre of Moseley. I also note that the submission from Moseley was by some measure the most detailed, showed the greatest degree of historical and community engagement, and was formed on the basis of strong cooperation both within Moseley and between the community organisations and the city council. I also note that the only submissions with an even vaguely similar level of community organisation were those from Harborne and Sutton Coldfield. I thus find it odd and disappointing that in drawing the draft boundaries you have chosen to completely ignore all the advice you have received on the subject of Moseley. For example, you have placed the part of Moseley to the west of the Alcester Road in a ward with Balsall Heath. There is no sense in this since those communities are separate. Second, you have achieved this by also splitting the natural community of Balsall Heath in half, in order to have a large Sparkbrook ward. Instead the western part of the Sparkbrook ward would mostly naturally have joined with the SparkHill North Ward to form a 2 councillor ward, Balsall Heath and the Eastern part of your proposed Sparkbrook ward to join to form a two councillor ward. Moseley would make some sense according to the conservative proposal, although it is the community of identity and business for the much larger group covered by the Moseley community organisations and the Moseley SPD. Worse than anything you have divided the very village itself right down the middle, splitting the conservation area of Moseley in two, and thus ensuring that all future development issues for Moseley village will be split across two wards. This is very poor planning. I appreciate fully that there are many considerations to be taken into account, and that ward sizes must balance, but there are clearly ways that Moseley as a community could have been preserved that would still allow this. I really should try to convey to you the strength of the Moseley community to let you understand how your proposal violates your own principle of drawing boundaries around natural communities. For example, Moseley has a coherent village plan, that would be split across wards under your proposals. It has Moseley in Bloom, which is a vibrant community organisation, and which regularly wins the urban prize regionally, and competes nationally, it has several distinct Moseley festivals each year: two in the private park, and one in the village. Moseley has it’s own community magazine: B13, and an extremely active set of community partners. All of these activities that make Moseley probably the single most coherent community in Birmingham. Indeed I would say that Moseley has one of the most integrated and active urban communities in the UK. Yet you...
have ignored all this. Why? It seems eminently sensible to me that you re-read the submissions you received, that you consider very carefully the following in order of importance: i) creating a boundary line that does not run through the village centre; ii) reuniting the Cannon Hill part of your proposed Balsall Heath ward with the rest of Moseley; iii) consideration, subject to the requirements for other ward sizes, the reintegration of other areas into Moseley, e.g. some of the areas between Moseley and King's Heath, and some of the Sparkhill South Ward to include Moseley Bog. Moseley has built an amazing community over the 16 years that I have lived here. It has become much more integrated. Your proposals will put innumerable barriers in the way of that, and thus undermine one of the great English urban communities. It can be easily rectified, and I would urge you to do so. yours Professor Jeremy L Wyatt

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I feel very strongly about Hall Green merging with Tyseley. Please forget this whole ridiculous idea. If I’d have wanted to live in Tyseley I would have bought a house there. Doing this will only devalue Hall Green. Leave us alone!
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Sam x
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Studland Road should be put back into Hall Green as Hall Green West/East. You are taking away the identity and heritage of the Hall Green area and affecting communities financially and emotionally. The boundary change will affect residents and communities within the Birmingham area and not the policy makers. Not many people seem to know what is going on as this seems to be happening behind closed doors. The residents of Birmingham should be involved in the decision making process as no-one knows Birmingham better than US!!
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Hello,

We would formally like to register our objection to redraw the boundaries to include homes on [redacted] into the Tyseley ward.
We believe that we are in the centre of Hall Green and the area has a rich heritage and identity that we as residents feel is important to retain.
To include the parade, train station and church into a new ward is not a sensible approach. Surely there must be more sensible methods to address this boundary review.

Yours sincerely
Mr S. YACOOb
MR K PARKES
The Review Officer (Birmingham),
Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
14th Floor Millbank Tower,
Millbank,
London,
SW1P 4QP.

Dear Sir,

Re: Boundary Commission Proposals for Moseley, Birmingham.

I oppose your proposals for Moseley.

Moseley has recently been called “the best suburb in Britain”
It is a popular local centre and has a great Community identity and spirit.

Your proposal for a single ward "Lesser Moseley" with but one Councillor out of 101 - less than 1% of the Council, is destructive of that Community identity.

Your proposed "Lesser Moseley" includes Moseley Church of England School and most of St Agnes Moseley Conservation Area, but excludes:
- Moseley Village with all shops, pubs and post office,
- Moseley Parish Church,
- Moseley Hall and Park,
- Moseley Railway Station, soon to be re-opened,
- Moseley Conservation Area,
- Moseley Swimming Baths, former Library, Art School and Moseley Grammar School,
- Moseley Golf Club.
- Moseley Bog, (where Moseley’s most famous son J.R.Tolkien first saw the Hobbit).

The Moseley Society, Moseley Forum, Moseley in Bloom and other organisations will have to deal with Local Government Officers and Councillors in five other wards with differing identities - this will be ineffective and inconvenient for all concerned.

Yours faithfully,
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

**Name:** freda freda

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I think the boundary change will cause more problems than existing. 'The boundary change' In my mind shouts out 'Boroughs' like in London. London Council is not a council we should follow. We are the largest Council in England and other council look at us for improvement, yes like all councils we can improve, however the boundary change is one which we should not. I genuinely beleieve we have a great council and creating more wards will cause more issues and take up more resources in the long run. I dont want to become like london council because that is is mind field of its own. By creating more wards, no one will know whos doing what, everyone will start doing odd little bits to their own area, its will become a mess and i dont think this is a well thought out plan. I think because there is so much pressure in making chnages that the leaders are not looking at the bigger picture. I hope you take into consideration my thoughts.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Mubarak Yousif
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I'm against pushing me to the Weoley Castle ward! I bought this house recently based on the fact that it is not part of Weoley. Please, either to remain the same (Barley Green), or to be added to the Harborne side. Really I'm not sure about the similarities you are seeing between Wentworth way and Weoley Castle!
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25th January 2016

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

Dear Sir

Re. Moseley

With due respect I request that the proposed boundary changes be reconsidered. They seem to have no benefit save that Wards with appropriate numbers of residents are created, but Moseley, inspite of being near a 1,000 years old, to all intents and purposes, will be destroyed.

I believe that one of the major social problems facing the Western World is the decay of Cities, especially those that were centres of manufacturing. There seems to be an unending headlong scramble to outer suburbs, and far beyond, with obvious damage to rural areas and green belts, and pressure on transport facilities, while Inner suburbs become centres of decay, youth unemployment, social unrest, drugs and race conflict, areas you want to get out of as soon as practical.

Moseley is not an Outer suburb nor a Warwickshire village – it has multiple races, and multiple types and standards of dwellings – but it is a place people like to live – due, not least, to sterling work done by various community leaders (one of whom was awarded an OBE not so long ago) The work of these leaders would be virtually impossible under the new proposals and there would be small point in trying to improve or protect a Moseley that no longer exists.

Please Sir should we not be trying to replicate Moseley rather than smash it up? Cities need Inner suburbs like Moseley, with Parish Church and Village centre - please reconsider.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Yule
Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Ella Zajac
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

re Proposal for Roads in Hall Green going into Tyseley Ward. I have lived in Hall Green for 40 years, I went to Hall Green Methodist Church as a child and go to the same church, Hall Green Community Church as an adult (it changed its name last year). The Church has been in Hall Green for 92 years. I have been brought up and live in Hall Green (West) and I am a better person because of it. It has enabled me to work Full Time for 30 years contributing to the city. I use Hall Green Train Station to commute to work. I use Hall Green library, Hall Green Parade shops and am proud of the area's history - Sarehole Mill etc, its nice to tell people you live in Hall Green with assoc. alumni and history attached. SO please keep Hall Green as it is, please keep the status quo, it means a lot to me, it has been and is my life. Please do not put the proposed roads in Hall Green into Tyseley Ward. You can see how Hall Green has shaped me to the better, above. don't take this opportunity away from others by putting the roads into a ward with different needs. Hall Green is great as it is, please don't ruin it Regards Ella Zajac [REDACTED]
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: el zaman
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I strongly object against the new proposed boundaries for the moseley area. The boundary commission has already ignored the community's views! Under their current proposals Moseley Village Park, Moseley Hospital and the Farmers Market will all be within a new ward. Also the conservation areas will be split in half and the residents of moseley we will end up marginalised and ignored! Can you please reconsider the proposed plans and not further divide up our area.
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Raja Zaman
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Hall green

Comment text:

dear whom it may concern I have been informed of the boundary changes to be made to Hall green which I was shocked about. I currently live on [redacted] and under the new plans I will no longer be a part of Hall Green and now become part of Tyseley which is a highly industrialised area, I feel this is very unfair as I chose to live in Hall green as it is an area of historical interest, dating back to the 16th century, taking its name from Medieval family whose moated hall stood at the junction of school road and fox hollies road. The shopping centre has expanded along Stratford road. the area is proud of its arts and craft building and listed church of Ascension building forming part of a conservation area. hall green school has been around for 300 years, a station for a 100 years and sarehole mill 250 years under new proposals these will no longer be a part of hall green I don't understand how this is plausible as they are all named after the area hall green not Tyseley. Recently Hall Green has had extensive demographic changes for years the people of hall green have been working hard to forge good community links between different faiths and generations. It needs stability so the community can be nurtured. The boundary commission is now intending to undo all the good work. hall green has only one council asset, the library but it is rich religious community and has high field hall. If ward of Tyseley is created gree hall green will lose south and City college, sarehole mill, hall green school, station, parade, hall green medical centre, hall green community church. We have three councillors who can cover each other sickness which would be more difficult under new proposals. Also this is highly unfair as previously tetley road, Runnymede road were part of hall green but later became spark hill. This destroyed the hall green community links were no longer kept. There house prices also reduced as they become spark hill and insurance prices for cars increased. I would not want this to happen to my hall green community
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Birmingham District

Personal Details:

Name: Qumar Zamin
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I have lived in Tyseley all my life and I am very happy with this new ward. I think its a great idea that we have created a one member ward. I have all also seen a leaflet put out by B28, which claims that house prices will fall after the creation of this new ward. I belive this type of misinformation is very bad for community cohesion. I also note the chairman of B28 is also the chairman of the Hall Green Labour Party.
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