

Wolverhampton City Council[Cookie settings](#)**Accept all cookies**

No, give me more information

Personal Details: about cookies**Name:**

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

WV3 [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:**Comment text:**

I understand Tettenhall Regis, Tettenhall Wightwick and Merry Hill are remaining as they are. These areas have many similarities with the Penn Ward, so why is Penn changing? We as residents cannot understand the reason to change and are not happy. Residents are happy with the original system and do not want this to change! St Michael's Church is at the heart of Penn's identity, residents see it as the hub of Penn are very proud of the church which does so much for the community. Yet under the new boundaries, Penn is set to lose St Michael's church and residents are bitterly disappointed. There are local shops at the bottom of Coalway Road, these are used by local people and run by residents of Penn. Under the new boundaries Penn is set to lose these shops to Graiseley which as residents we cannot understand. Graiseley has its own shops and community areas, so expanding Graiseley to Coalway Road honestly makes no sense and we are not happy. The average number of electors in a ward per Councillor is 3,175. The Penn wards would still be within the range of 10% of the average electors over the forecast of 2026. So why are you making changes? Penn should be left as it is! The test around clear boundaries is definitely compromised as surrendering both sides of the Coalway road to Graiseley, and taking both sides of Goldthorn Hill and Coton Road to Blakenhall leaves Penn Ward no strong. We should leave the boundaries as they are, the people are not happy with the decisions you are making!

Uploaded Documents:

[Download \(https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1629646034_Local+Government+Boundary+Comission+2+.docx\)](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1629646034_Local+Government+Boundary+Comission+2+.docx)