

# Coventry

## Personal Details:

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

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** Lower Stoke

I am emailing my feedback to your proposed Coventry Local Government Boundary Changes.

As a resident of Lower Stoke I have 2 objections to your proposals which I will outline below:

1. Your rejection of the council's proposal to take the area west of Aldermoor Lane in to St Michael's.
2. Your proposal to split Lower Stoke along Longfellow Road instead of keeping the existing boundary at Ansty Road.

For the first point (St Michael's & Lower Stoke), you state in your proposal that "running a boundary along Aldermoor Lane would divide the community that exists in that area". I believe your assessment here to be fundamentally incorrect. The Stoke Aldermoor community existed before the newer former-factory-site community and there are clearly different characteristics between these older and newer communities. As a resident of the Lower Stoke area, I do not believe that this community will feel divided as a result of this. They are two very different communities by any measure that you look at them by.

Additionally, you state that "the old railway line remains a more identifiable boundary" and that you would like to hear further evidence on this. As a local resident, I can assure you that very few residents will be aware of the existence of this railway line and to state that this is a "more identifiable boundary" than the council's proposal is laughable. Further to this, there is a project in the works to convert this old line to a self-contained walking and cycling loop, which will only further diminish it as a boundary of any sort.

I believe the council's proposal to be fair and sensible. It creates a much more sensible boundary here than the old railway line. In addition to this, it goes a big step towards the overall goal of this boundary review by dealing with the elector variance in St Micahel's from the "oversubscribed" numbers in Lower Stoke, without splitting or dividing any pre-existing community.

On the second point (splitting Lower Stoke along Longfellow Road), as a local resident I believe that your proposal is fundamentally incorrect here too.

You state that the proposal "best reflects the Stoke Community and uses the most identifiable boundaries". Longfellow Road is a residential street and in no way is a more identifiable boundary than the existing boundary at Ansty Road. Ansty Road is a dual-carriage A-road and one of the most vital and busy routes in the City, linking the City Centre to the east of the city (which includes the hospital, M6, M69 and more).

The properties and communities south of Ansty Road and north of Longfellow Road that you are proposing to move do not share any of the characteristics with the properties and communities north of Ansty Road in Upper Stoke. They are far more linked to the other Lower Stoke communities to the South.

In fact, the whole area is locally known as "Poet's Corner" as most of the roads north and south of Longfellow Road are named after famous poets. These communities all share the very similar characteristics and properties and are closely linked to nearby roads like Burns Road, Church Lane, Grenville Avenue, Tennyson Road etc... as well as to Binley Road to the south which is also a main route in the City.

Your proposal makes no consideration on an existing, tight-knit community here being split for what is, realistically, little to no gain in variance to either Lower Stoke or Upper Stoke. It achieves nothing towards the goal of this review and is based on the flimsy and incorrect premise of Longfellow Road being an identifiable boundary.

I hope that you reconsider this part of your proposal for these reasons.

I have been a resident of Lower Stoke for my whole life and while I agree with the need for the boundaries to change to address the variance in electors and broadly agree with all other proposed changes, I believe that your proposals put are based on incorrect assumptions about the Lower Stoke community and will leave the ward divided along incorrect lines.

I am happy to be contacted to discuss my views further if required.

If you could please acknowledge receipt of this email to confirm that my views have reached you.

Kind regards,



Lower Stoke Resident.

## **Attached Documents:**

*None attached*