

# Worcestershire

## Personal Details:

**Name:** Mr Kit Taylor

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Postcode:** [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:** Worcestershire County Council (District or county councillor)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** Bromsgrove East

Whilst the object of the review is to have a uniform number of residents per councillor the boundary lines for this division takes no heed of the following points.

Community cohesion. The Tardibigge Ward which incorporates the Tutnal and Cobley Parish is one of the more rural areas of Bromsgrove and in conjunction with Bentley and Pauncefoot Parish council form a tight nit community which given the rise in rural suicide is a very important aspect to work done by a councillor, the move to the 2 councillor "Mega" ward has filled residents particularly the older resident ,who is currently befitting from known and personal contact ,with dismay. This area has absolutely no affinity with Alvechurch or the more urban Wythall in any case or form. The worry is a dual councillor division will take the easier option of town facing rather than rural and that a shared division, whilst common to other areas, is a foreign concept in Bromsgrove. This will also apply to the other semi-rural areas of the Lickey/Shepley wards, these are Bromsgrove facing areas cut off from the suggested Beacon Division by the Natural boundary of the Birmingham Rd. These areas are concerned that the councillor attention will be drawn to the urban area of Rubery which is the more Birmingham facing district of Bromsgrove.

Planning. The extra development and subsequent voters that are projected for Bromsgrove East is still subject to planning committee approval and whilst an optimistic delivery timescale has been put forwards by BDC there will be inevitable delays in housing and growth. Bromsgrove district council is currently formulating its updated district plan and currently there is no acknowledgement of any change or projections in this review of housing need or supply.

Please see the below table with the current delivery schedule for Foxlydiate.

Year 25/26 26/27 27/28 28/29 29/30 30/31 31/32 32/33 33/34 34/35 35/36 36/37 37/38  
Expected Dwellings Completed 35 135 180 210 210 210 240 240 240 240 240 210 170

However I have contacted the planning department and there are no applications for any reserved matters in the system. These houses although in Bromsgrove are for Redditch housing numbers and as Redditch has recalculated its housing numbers and as these houses are not now needed within their numbers I can see a great resistance within the planning committee to approve. So subject to appeals these may all be delayed for the next council and beyond. Thus keeping the voter numbers in a minus position

Political. As mentioned, the concept of a 2 councillor division is unknown in Bromsgrove. If the boundary commission ignores the concerns of residents in the Tardibigge, they are unable to see how councillors of 2 different political opinions could administer effectively a division that would be a mix of the easily contactable urban area with the more sprawling rural area. Conversations with the district councillors of the two areas affected by the draft proposals give rise to questions of accountability and service to the community.

Communication. As with all consultations, a consultation is only as good as its communication outreach, I have been dismayed at the lack of knowledge by residents and even of Parish councils about this process or even that a review was being carried out. The misunderstanding is deeply worrying and I do feel that the methodology of telling the resident about the review needs to be looked at.

Consistency. The reason for the movement of boundaries is to prevent voter numbers being out of line and parity between divisions. However there is no explanation as to why Divisions such as Client 10%, Pershore 14%, Broadway 10%, are left with numbers well over the ideal and Divisions such as Bromsgrove East -2% are under.

My residents and I object to these unnecessary changes.

## Attached Documents:

- boundary-objection.docx

Whilst the object of the review is to have a uniform number of residents per councillor the boundary lines for this division takes no heed of the following points.

Community cohesion. The Tardibigge Ward which incorporates the Tutnal and Cobley Parish is one of the more rural areas of Bromsgrove and in conjunction with Bentley and Pauncefoot Parish council form a tight nit community which given the rise in rural suicide is a very important aspect to work done by a councillor, the move to the 2 councillor "Mega" ward has filled residents particularly the older resident ,who is currently befitting from known and personal contact ,with dismay. This area has absolutely no affinity with Alvechurch or the more urban Wythall in any case or form. The worry is a dual councillor division will take the easier option of town facing rather than rural and that a shared division, whilst common to other areas, is a foreign concept in Bromsgrove. This will also apply to the other semi-rural areas of the Lickey/Shepley wards, these are Bromsgrove facing areas cut off from the suggested Beacon Division by the Natural boundary of the Birmingham Rd. These areas are concerned that the councillor attention will be drawn to the urban area of Rubery which is the more Birmingham facing district of Bromsgrove.

Planning. The extra development and subsequent voters that are projected for Bromsgrove East is still subject to planning committee approval and whilst an optimistic delivery timescale has been put forwards by BDC there will be inevitable delays in housing and growth. Bromsgrove district council is currently formulating its updated district plan and currently there is no acknowledgement of any change or projections in this review of housing need or supply.

Please see the below table with the current delivery schedule for Foxlydiate.

Year	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34	34/35	35/36	36/37	37/38
Expected Dwellings Completed	35	135	180	210	210	210	240	240	240	240	240	210	170

However I have contacted the planning department and there are no applications for any reserved matters in the system. These houses although in Bromsgrove are for Redditch housing numbers and as Redditch has recalculated its housing numbers and as these houses are not now needed within their numbers I can see a great resistance within the planning committee to approve. So subject to appeals these may all be delayed for the next council and beyond. Thus keeping the voter numbers in a minus position

Political. As mentioned, the concept of a 2 councillor division is unknown in Bromsgrove. If the boundary commission ignores the concerns of residents in the Tardibigge, they are unable to see how councillors of 2 different political opinions could administer effectively a division that would be a mix of the easily contactable urban area with the more sprawling rural area. Conversations with the district councillors of the two areas affected by the draft proposals give rise to questions of accountability and service to the community.

Communication. As with all consultations, a consultation is only as good as its communication outreach, I have been dismayed at the lack of knowledge by residents and even of Parish councils

about this process or even that a review was being carried out. The misunderstanding is deeply worrying and I do feel that the methodology of telling the resident about the review needs to be looked at.

Consistency. The reason for the movement of boundaries is to prevent voter numbers being out of line and parity between divisions. However there is no explanation as to why Divisions such as Client 10%, Pershore 14%, Broadway 10%, are left with numbers well over the ideal and Divisions such as Bromsgrove East -2% are under.

My residents and I object to these unnecessary changes.