

Staffordshire

Personal Details:

Name: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: (Member of the public)

Comment text:

Attached.

Attached Documents:

- 0000318_202303221044_Redacted.pdf

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

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

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey as licenced for the purpose of Public Access to Government information and is not to be used for any other purpose without the permission of Ordnance Survey. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is not responsible for any errors or omissions.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

GREAT WYRLEY CP

A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKEDGE CP



E SILEY
F LEVEDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PORTON CP

I EAST
J KINGSGRUB & TREGGOTT
K LAKESIDE
L BROTTESLEY




WORSBURNE CP

M WORSBURNE NORTH
N WORSBURNE SOUTH



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

KEY


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

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
applied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey data and the provision of Ordnance Survey
on behalf of the Director of Public Resources & Crown copyright and database right.
Geographical reproduction belongs to Crown copyright and database right.
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England ©2022/2023 2021.

P10
KEY TO PARISH WARDS
UPPER CASES: P10
A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST
PENKIRIDGE CP
E GABLEY
F LEVEDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST
PERTON CP
I EAST
J KINGSWOOD & TREGGOTT
K LANSIDE
L WROTTISLEY
WHARFHOUSE CP
M WORKHOUSE NORTH
N WORKHOUSE SOUTH



0 0.75 1.5 3
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km


KEY
DISTRICT COUNCIL BOUNDARY
PARISH BOUNDARY
PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH BOUNDARY
WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
COSMALL
WAVELEY CP

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records. © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England G21226/1229 2022.




H. អនុសាសន៍



2 New County Area:
Patttingham Trysull
Lower Penn
Appendix 3.



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

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

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

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Crown. All rights reserved. No warranty is made by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) as to the accuracy or completeness of the information shown on this map.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

GREAT WYRLEY CP

A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKING CP


E GILEY
F LEVERULE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PORTON CP

I EAST
J KINGFISHER & TREGLU
K LUGG
L BROTTESLEY

WOMBOURNE CP

M WOMBOURNE NORTH
N WOMBOURNE SOUTH



0 0.75 1.5 3
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.2548 km

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

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 behalf of the Crown. All Rights Reserved. It is Crown copyright and is reproduced by permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) 2022.

P10
KEY TO PARISH WARDS

GREAT WYKE P1 CP

A LANEYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PERNODGE CP


E GALEY
F LEEDS DALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PERTON CP

I EAST
J KINGSWOOD & TREGGOTT
A LAMSDALE
L WROTTENLEY

WORMBOURNE CP

M WORMBOURNE NORTH
N WORMBOURNE SOUTH



New County Area:
Perton

Appendix 2

0 0.75 1.5
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km

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

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 applied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey aerial data with the assistance of Ordnance Survey as well as the Director of Public Resources. Crown copyright and database right. Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England ©2022/2023 2022.

P11
KEY TO PARISH WARDS

GRANT WYKE P11 UP

A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKIRIDGE CP


E GALEY
F LEVEDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PORTON CP

I EAST
J BRIDGEWOOD & TREGLUOT
K LAYSLIDE
L WHOTTSLEY

WALSBOURNE CP

M WALSBOURNE NORTH
N WALSBOURNE SOUTH



New County Area:
Patttingham
Lower Penn
Trysull
Appendix 3.

0 0.75 1.5
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km

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

Name

Address

Postcode

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

Signed

.....

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.



This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England G21884818 2011.

KEY

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

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
applied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey
on behalf of the Crown. All Crown copyright and database rights.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database rights.
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (2018) 01/2022.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

UPPER WYKE P1 & P2

A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PEAKS/RIDGE CP


E GALEY
F LEWISDALE
G NORTH & ST
H SOUTH EAST

PERTON CP

I EAST
J KINGSWOOD & TREGGOTT
K LAKESIDE
L WROTTESLEY

WORMBOURNE CP

M WORMBOURNE NORTH
N WORMBOURNE SOUTH



Existing County Area:
Pattingham Patshull
Perton

Appendix 1

0 0.75 1.5 3
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km

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

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
applied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey
on behalf of the Crown. All Rights Reserved. It is Crown copyright and database right.
Downloaded from Ordnance Survey on 01/01/2022. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is not responsible for any errors or omissions.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

UPPER WYRE FLY CP

A LARREYWOOD
B WYTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKIRLIDGE CP


E GALEY
F LEVETDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PERTON CP

I EAST
J WOODHOUSE & TRESCOTT
K LARREYWOOD
L WROTHESLEY

WORMBOURNE CP

M WORMBOURNE NORTH
N WORMBOURNE SOUTH



New County Area!
Perton

Appendix 2

0 0.75 1.5
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km


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

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 applied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Ordnance Survey material is reproduced by permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) 2022.

P11
KEY TO PARISH WARDS
GREAT WYKE P11 UP
A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST
PENKESIDGE CP
E GULEY
F LEVEDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST
PORTON CP
I EAST
J KIRKWOOD & TREGGOTT
K LAKESIDE
L WROTTENLEY
WALSOURIE CP
M WALSOURIE NORTH
N WALSOURIE SOUTH



New County Area:
Patttingham
Lower Penn
Trysull
Appendix 3.

0 0.75 1.5
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3540 km

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

Name _____

Address _____

Postcode _____

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

Signed

.....

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.

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 applied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Crown. Crown Copyright and database right. Ordnance Survey 100019166. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England 02/05/2022 10:11.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

GREAT WYRLEY CP

A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKEDGE CP


E GALEY
F LEVEDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PORTON CP

I EAST
J KINGSGROVE & TRELOTT
K LAKESIDE
L WROTTESLEY

WOMBOURNE CP

M WOMBOURNE NORTH
N WOMBOURNE SOUTH



0 0.75 1.5 3
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3946 km

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

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material, with the permission of Ordnance Survey
on behalf of the Crown. All Rights Reserved. Ordnance Survey is a registered trademark of Ordnance Survey.
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England. ©2022/2023.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

WYKE & WYKE P.1 UP

A LANSWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKURGE CP


E GALEY
F LEWISDALE
G NORTH & EAST
H SOUTH & EAST

FERTON CP

I EAST
J KINGSWOOD & TREDEGOTT
K LANSIDE
L WROTTESLEY

WALSBOURNE CP

M WALSBOURNE NORTH
N WALSBOURNE SOUTH



Existing County Area:
Pattingham Patshull
Perton

Appendix 1

0 0.75 1.5 3
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km

KEY
DISTRICT COUNCIL BOUNDARY
PARISH BOUNDARY
PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH BOUNDARY
WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
WARD NAME
COBELL
WYKE & WYKE P.1 UP

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 system as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey data and the provision of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Register of Public Boundaries. It does not constitute a legal right. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) 2022/2023.

P10
KEY TO PARISH WARDS

GRANT WYKE CP

A LANDWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENRODGE CP


E GALEY
F LEWISDALE
G NORTH EAST
H NORTH EAST

PERTON CP

I EAST
J KINGSWOOD & TREGGOTT
K LANSIDE
L WHISTLETON

WALSOURNE CP

M WALSOURNE NORTH
N WALSOURNE SOUTH



New County Area:
Perton

Appendix 2

0 0.75 1.5
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km

KEY
DISTRICT COUNCIL BOUNDARY
PARISH BOUNDARY
PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH BOUNDARY
WARD BOUNDARY COINCIDENT WITH PARISH WARD BOUNDARY
COS SALL
LANSIDE CP

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records. © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England 2015/01/15/2012.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

GREAT WYVERN CP

A LARDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKEDGE CP


E GABLEY
F LEVEDALE
G NORTH-EAST
H SOUTH-EAST


PERFORD CP


I EAST
J KINGSWOOD & TREGGOTT
K LAKESIDE
L WROTTESLEY

WYLBOROUGH CP



N WOLSCOURNE NORTH
O WOLSCOURNE SOUTH




 New County Area:
Patttingham Trysull
Lower Penn
Appendix 3.



KEY

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

CODSALL
10/07/07



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

Signed



.....

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

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 data with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Director of Public Resources. © Crown Copyright and database right. Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England 02700 400000 2022.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

SPOT AT WATER F1 UP

A LANDWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKIRIDGE CP


E GABLEY
F LEVEDALE
G NORTH & EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PORTON CP

I EAST
J KIDSGROVE & TRESCOTT
K LAKESIDE
L WROTHESLEY

WORMBOURNE CP

M WORMBOURNE NORTH
N WORMBOURNE SOUTH



Existing County Area:
Pattingham Patshull
Porton

Appendix 1

0 0.75 1.5 3
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km

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

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
applied as part of this review.

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey aerial data with the provision of Ordnance Survey
as part of the Review of Public Resources © Crown copyright and database right.
Discontinued reproduction between Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England ©2022/2023 2021.

KEY TO PARISH WARDS

UPPER WYRE P10 CP

A LARDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST

PENKEDGE CP


E GALEY
F LEVERDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST

PERTON CP

I EAST
J KINGSWOOD & TREGGOTT
A LARSDALE
L WROTTICLEY

WHALEHOUSE CP

M WOMBOURNE NORTH
N WOMBOURNE SOUTH



0 0.75 1.5 2
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3548 km


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 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 data with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Crown. All rights are reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from Ordnance Survey. For more information see Ordnance Survey Notice No. 1000. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) 2022.

P11
KEY TO PARISH WARDS
UPPER WYKE CP
A LANDYWOOD
B NORTH
C TOWN
D WEST
PENSGROVE CP
E GALEY
F LEWISDALE
G NORTH EAST
H SOUTH EAST
PERTON CP
I EAST
J BRIDGWOOD & TREBLOTT
K LAMSDON
L WROTTESLEY
WHARFHOUSE CP
M WORMSBOURNE NORTH
N WORMSBOURNE SOUTH



0 0.75 1.5
Kilometres
1 cm = 0.3544 km

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