

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Postcode \_\_\_\_\_

**I am a Resident of Perton Parish and reside in Staffordshire County  
Council Area**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

.....

.....

## **Local Government Boundary Commission**

### **Review**

#### **Staffordshire County Council**

Staffordshire County Council is currently 62 Members, the County Council have agreed that this should remain at 62.

However, there are numerous reasons, based upon the **South Staffordshire District Council Review, recently undertaken**, that give good reasons for an additional County Member for the South West area, so that Perton is separated from Pattingham and Patshull. Perton is a large populated area similar to Wombourne, which has set the precedence.

#### **Facts**

In the review, undertaken by the **Boundary Commission (BCR)**, of South Staffordshire District Council (SSDC) various points are given to support this:

#### **Paragraph 100**

The BCR received 12 submissions, which argued against Pattingham & Patshull being included within a District Ward, with the more urban Perton Parish. This is the opening gambit for a separate County Councillor for Perton.

The newly established District of 2 District Council seats, for Pattingham, Patshull, Trysull etc seats would make an excellent County Ward with no over lapping District Council Boundaries.

#### **Paragraph 102**

The BCR then confirmed that Lower Penn was geographically closer to Trysull, with shared interests, and better removed from the Wombourne arrangement.

### **Paragraph 103**

The County Councillor for Pattingham, Patshull and Perton, Jak Abrahams, defends the unique character of Pattingham and Patshull, which has different needs to Perton. One of these being the extensive geographical, area due to its Rural location.

### **Paragraph 104**

There were a number of submissions from Residents against inclusion with the larger and more urban Perton (or similar larger populations). Therefore, this gives evidence that Residents would like to remain rural, and confirm the need for a Perton County area.

### **Paragraph 105**

The BC states after careful consideration, of evidence received, that Pattingham and Patshull residents do not share community interests with Perton Village residents, and would possibly like to be linked with Trysull and surrounding areas. This also gives the opportunity to amend County areas to the requirements of the Electorate.

### **Paragraph 106**

BCR have now merged Pattingham, Patshull etc into a 2 Councillor Ward, which further supports that Perton should have a separate County Councillor.

This gives an opportunity for all areas to retain their uniqueness and I would ask that a separate County area be established for Perton.

If the current County makeup remains as is, problems will be caused, as the newly established area for Pattingham, Patshull and Trysull etc would be represented by 2 County Members, cutting that Electoral area in half.

Perton requires to be represented by its own County Member, due to the differing needs, from neighbouring Wards due to its Urban nature.

The needs of the Electorate in these areas differ Perton is Urban and Pattingham and Patshull etc are Rural in character.

**In the Promotional Material shown on the Website, in the pattern of Divisions, the current BCR proposals cut over existing District Boundaries, Your Literature states that they must not.**

## Local Government Boundary Commission Review Staffordshire County Council

### **Extracts taken to support request for additional County Member taken from Local Government Boundary Commission for South Staffordshire District Council**

**Paragraph**

100 In addition to the Council's proposals, we received 12 submissions about this area, most of which argued against the rural Pattingham & Patshull parish being included in a district ward with the more urban Perton parish.

**Paragraph**

101 The Council proposed two single-councillor wards for this area. One comprised Pattingham & Patshull parish and the other included three parishes, namely Bobbington, Lower Penn and Trysull & Seisdon. It did not include Perton and Pattingham & Patshull parish in a single ward. Its proposed Pattingham & Patshull ward is forecast to have 13% fewer electors than the average for South Staffordshire District Council by 2027.

**Paragraph**

103 Councillor Abrahams was of the view that Pattingham & Patshull parish should retain its single district councillor to protect and promote its **unique character, which had different needs to those of Perton parish.** Pattingham & Patshull Parish Council advocated for the parish to be represented by its own district councillor because of 'the extensive geographic area covered by the parish and the requirements for it to be represented in a different way from neighbouring wards due to its rural nature'. But it also indicated that if there was a need to increase the electorate, the rural community of Trescott could be included in its ward.

**Paragraph**

104 A number of the submissions from residents while against being included in a ward with the larger and more urban Perton (or with communities with larger populations) were of the view that they could be included with other rural communities, for example Trysull. Other suggestions were Bobbington, Old Perton, Trescott and 'over towards Seisdon & Trysull'. One resident was of the view that Trysull, Seisdon and Bobbington were all rural villages with similarities and common 23 issues including concerns over new development, transport, highways and preservation of facilities and traditions. This resident argued **against including Trescott in a ward with Pattingham & Patshull on the grounds that it would destroy the good relationship Perton enjoyed with its hamlets.**

**Paragraph**

105 On careful consideration of the evidence we received, we have been persuaded that overall, Pattingham & Patshull residents **do not share community interests** with residents of Perton Village. We note the different characteristics between the semi-urban Perton Village and this rural parish. At the same time, the submissions suggest that there are shared characteristics with other rural communities and parishes within the district, in particular Trysull & Seisdon and Trescott. With regards to Trescott, we did not receive any specific boundaries for this community. Moreover, we note the comments about their relationship with the rest of Perton parish.

Paragraph


106 Accordingly, as part of our draft recommendations, we have merged the Council's proposed single-councillor wards for this area to create a two-councillor Pattingham, Trysull, Bobbington & Lower Penn ward. We particularly invite further comments on this ward, including any additional evidence in support of Pattingham & Patshull being in a separate ward with a -13% electoral variance, or stronger evidence of its relationship with other communities in the area. We also welcome comments on the name of the ward and whether an alternative shorter name would be more appropriate.

# How to propose a pattern of divisions:

- Explain your opinion using evidence and examples.
- Think about the **three legal factors** the Commission uses to draw new boundaries:
  1. New divisions should leave each councillor representing roughly the **same number of voters** as other councillors elsewhere in the authority
  2. New divisions should - as far as possible - reflect **community interests and identities**, and boundaries should be identifiable. Consider transport links, community groups and facilities, natural or physical boundaries, parishes and shared interests.
  3. New divisions should promote **effective and convenient local government**. Consider the number of councillors for, the geographic size of, and the links between parts of the division.

Also divisions must not cross over existing district boundaries.

Have your say! The Commission gives **equal weight** to all submissions, regardless of whom they are from.




Map referred to in the South Staffordshire (Electoral Changes) Order 2022  
Sheet 1 of 1

Secondary alignment and routes shown on the mapping background may not be up to date. They may differ from the latest boundary information updated as part of this review.

This map is based on Ordnance Survey aerial imagery and the provision of Ordnance Survey as the sole source of data. Ordnance Survey is not responsible for any errors or omissions. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is not responsible for any errors or omissions.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

- GREAT HYPPEN CP  
 A LANDWOOD  
 B BENTON  
 C TOWN  
 D WEST  
 E GALEY  
 F LEVEDALE  
 G HIGHTON EAST  
 H ADULTON EAST  
 I EAST  
 J REDFORD & TARESCOTT  
 K LAMPSHED  
 L WROTHSLEY  
 M WOODHOUSE NORTH  
 N WOODHOUSE SOUTH



0 0.75 1.5 3  
Miles  
1 cm = 0.394 km

KEY  
 DISTRICT COUNCIL BOUNDARY  
 PARISH BOUNDARY  
 PARISH WARD BOUNDARY  
 WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH BOUNDARY  
 WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH WARD BOUNDARY  
 CODE NAME  
 NAME OF



Map referred to in the South Staffordshire (Electoral Changes) Order 2022  
Sheet 1 of 1

Boundary alignment and names shown on the mapping background  
may not be up to date. They may differ from the latest boundary information  
supplied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey  
on which the copyright of Public Rights is shown. It is not a legal document.  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is not responsible for any  
errors or omissions in this map.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

WEST OF THE RIVER

- A. LANSYWOOD
- B. NORTH
- C. TOWN
- D. WEST

PENNYRIDGE CP


- E. GARRY
- F. LEYDALE
- G. NORTH & EAST
- H. SOUTH EAST


PORTON CP

- I. EAST
- J. HIGGERSWOOD & TRESKOTT
- K. LAYTON
- L. WADSWORTH

WADSWORTH CP

- M. WADSWORTH NORTH
- N. WADSWORTH SOUTH




 Existing County Area:  
 Patterningham Patschall  
 Porton  
 Appendix 1

0 0.75 1.5 3  
 Kilometres  
 1 cm = 0.35481 km

KEY  
 DISTRICT COUNCIL BOUNDARY  
 PARISH BOUNDARY  
 PARISH WARD BOUNDARY  
 NAME BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH BOUNDARY  
 NAME BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH WARD BOUNDARY  
 COUNCIL NAME  
 PARISH NAME

[illegible]

W. F. HOOD, JR.



New County Area:  
Perton

## Appendix 2

0 0.75 1.5

0.75	1.5
0.75	1.5

0.75 1.5

0.75 1.5

KEY	
-----	DISTRICT COUNCIL BOUNDARY
-----	PARISH BOUNDARY
-----	PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
-----	WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH BOUNDARY
-----	WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
-----	WARD NAME
-----	PARISH NAME


Map referred to in the South Staffordshire (Electoral Changes) Order 2022  
Sheet 1 of 1


Boundary adjustments and names shown on this map are for information only and may not be up to date. They may differ from the latest boundary information supplied as part of the order.


This map is based on the Ordnance Survey map of the area and is not a legal document. It is intended to provide a visual representation of the proposed changes and is not intended to be used as a legal document.

KEY TO PARISH WARD

- MAP 1: STAFFS F1: 1/1
- A. LANDWOOD
  - B. KENTON
  - C. TOWN
  - D. WEST
- PENURDUGGE CP
- E. GARRY
  - F. LEVERDALE
  - G. SOUTH & EAST
  - H. SOUTH EAST
- FORDEON CP
- I. EAST
  - J. WESTWOOD & TREZGOTT
  - K. LARFORD
  - L. WEST TOLLEY
- WYANDRIDGE CP
- M. WYANDRIDGE NORTH
  - N. WYANDRIDGE SOUTH



 New County Area:  
 Potttingham  
 Lower Penn  
 Trysull  
 Appendix 3.



	DISTRICT COUNCIL BOUNDARY
	PARISH BOUNDARY
	WARD BOUNDARY
	WARD BOUNDARY CONCORDANT WITH PARISH BOUNDARY
	WARD BOUNDARY CONCORDANT WITH PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
	WARD NAME
	PARISH NAME