

Gillespie, Matthew

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 September 2021 10:52
To: reviews
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to the proposed changes of boundaries to Penn
Categories: Matt, Submissions

Dear Sirs

Please confirm safe receipt . I tried to add this to your website at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk but the site yesterday appeared to feature a persistent error message (see below)



Error | Local Gov
 **consultation.lgbce**

The
Local Government
Boundary Commission
for England

Error

The website encountered an unexpected error. Please try again later.

Consequently I write in include my perspective as a resident of Penn as an objection to these proposals:

All of this messing about with our boundaries is an expensive and frankly unnecessary task, led by manipulative forces in Downing Street to further limit voting interest within the general public.

I've lived in Penn all of my life. Change for the sake of it is a ridiculous errand that will serve only those who don't live here and that seems ludicrous.

Here are my primary reasons to object to this proposal - But would say there are many others:

1. The test around clear boundaries is definitely compromised, the new proposal will leave Penn Ward no strong, clearly-identifiable boundaries.

Local people have always enjoyed a sense of community ownership within the Parish of Penn - In a time where we need unity and community to manage the strains on our civic budgets, clearly established boundaries and the traditional shared ethos of being part of Penn are vital to prevent further fragmentation here. Keep the boundaries as they are. The families of Coalway Road all vote at Woodfield Avenue and have no relevance to the Graiseley communities that border the city Centre. This will affect the cost of home insurance and car insurance so I'll be looking to recoup those financial losses from my city council for enforcing any boundary change.

2. The other test around 'reflecting community identity, has been ignored. Penn Ward will lose it's well-loved and only Catholic Church in our community.

This will particularly affect one religious group and seems prejudicial to that end.

3. Average number of electors in a Ward per Councillor is 3,175 with 10% allowance over forecast period of 2026. Penn Ward is within this recommendation. Please do not change this ratio by proposing these boundary alterations.

4. Penn Ward has similarities with Merry Hill, Tettenhal Regis and Tettenhal Wightwick and these three Wards are recommended to stay the same. So should Penn Ward Boundaries. Please allow us to remain part of the vital community dynamics of Penn by not changing our boundaries to incorporate areas we don't relate to.

Finally, if these original boundaries were good enough for the Romans who actually built Coalway Road - Then who are this bunch of berks who question them now, to make this challenge in the name of progress? It's a costly pointless vanity project & I for one, wholly object to it as it's ill-informed, badly constructed and entirely without merit when we have radically more important issues to address by means of the public purse. Please register my objection to these boundary changes as a life time resident of Penn.

Many thanks

Council tax payer, tax payer & resident.

Sent from my iPhone