

I am in receipt of the above and having considered the contents, wish to comment in the strongest terms. Not only is this further consultation brought about by your wish - endeavouring to equal the electorate between 32 Councillors - you saw fit to allow 5 weeks consultation against 12 weeks for the initial consultation. Obviously, there was an oversight on your part re the question of Woodvale.

The principal village in Woodvale is Dodford, a former Chartist settlement and within the current conservation area. Bournheath and Fairfield are adjacent rural villages within the Green Belt. Woodvale does not have any compatibility with the Urban areas of Catshill, Sidemoor or Perryfield, either Environmentally, Culturally or Politically.

Woodvale enjoys a delineation from the Urban area by virtue of the M5 motorway. Further, it is an insult to propose a name change from Woodvale to Perryfield. Perryfield is an urban conurbation.

If Woodvale is to grow to your figure of 2302 (2018) so be it; there is little point in equating everywhere to average 2440.

Let me turn to Page 3 of your letter dated 26th February. Para.1 refers to Fairfield being included in the Romsley Ward. This is puzzling. Your own figures reveal 2162 (2018) for Romsley together with Fairfield currently 717 (2013) equating to 2879 - obviously a nonsense. It is manifestly wrong to combine Fairfield with Romsley; recent commentators to your office have outlined this in the first consultation re Belbroughton: Fairfield is in the Parish of Belbroughton and is within the Ward of Woodvale.

In conclusion, as the District Councillor for Woodvale, I have been inundated with comments from my electorate deploring the Commission's proposals penned at the behest of Bromsgrove District Council.

PLEASE REGARD THIS LETTER AS MY FORMAL OBJECTION TO YOUR PROPOSAL.

Cllr. B. Lewis, FCMI