

background papers 1



Extraordinary Council

Mon 10 Aug
2026
7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community
Centre
Castleditch Lane
Redditch
B98 7YB

**If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact
Jess Bayley-Hill**

Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH

Tel: (01527) 64252 (Ext. 3072)

e.mail: jess.bayley-hill@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs:

Susan Eacock
(Mayor)
James Aston
(Deputy Mayor)
Joe Baker
Juliet Barker Smith
Roger Bennett
William Boyd
Brandon Clayton
Matthew Dormer
James Fardoe
Simon Farmer
Andrew Fry
Bill Hartnett
Sharon Harvey
Joanna Kane

Wanda King
Nicola Lloyd
David Meredith
Gemma Monaco
Ashley Monk
Nic Pioli
Rita Rogers
Gary Slim
Jen Snape
Jane Spilsbury
Monica Stringfellow
Craig Warhurst
Ian Woodall

5. Future Wards within the Redditch Electoral Area (Pages 5 - 30)

The report on this subject that was considered at the Electoral Matters Committee meeting held on 30th July 2026 has been published in this Background Papers Pack for the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Electoral Matters Committee

30th July 2026

Proposed Changes for Future Wards within the Redditch Electoral Area

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Craig Warhurst Portfolio Holder for Finance and Governance
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Assistant Director	Claire Felton, Assistant Director of Legal, Democratic and Procurement Services
Report Author Darren Whitney	Job Title: Electoral Services Manager Contact email: darren.whitney@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk Contact Tel: 01527 881650
Wards Affected	All
Ward Councillor(s) consulted	All
Relevant Council Priority	High quality services and supported governance
Non-Key Decision	
If you have any questions about this report, please contact the report author in advance of the meeting.	

1. RECOMMENDATIONS**The Electoral Matters Committee is asked to NOTE:**

- 1) The results of the Redditch warding arrangements for interim unitary arrangements questionnaire.**

The Electoral Matters Committee is asked to RECOMMEND that:-

- 2) an updated ward pattern for Redditch be submitted to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to be included in the unitary authority's Structural Changes Order based on two three-member wards and five two-member wards, including ward names (as specified by the Electoral Matters Committee).**

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Early on in the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) process the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) asked for local authorities to include their suggestions for ward arrangements in their interim plans which had to be submitted by 21st March 2025. In Worcestershire, under either a single county unitary model for local government or a two unitary authority model, the initial

Electoral Matters Committee30th July 2026

response put forward was that the current county divisions could be retained and the number of members to be elected could be doubled for each ward.

- 2.2 On 19th May 2026, MHCLG wrote to local authorities in Worcestershire asking for their views on the Structural Changes Order (SCO). As part of their correspondence MHCLG stated, *"With regard to your suggested warding arrangements, these can be based on any combination of existing wards, divisions and parish boundaries. We understand there may be significant work compiling this, and that you may wish to wait until after a decision on which proposal is to be implemented to finalise this work. We will need any further information on warding by 17 August and would appreciate receiving it before this date wherever possible."*
- 2.3 It was proposed in Worcestershire that the initial Council size would either comprise of 114 Councillors for a single unitary authority or 54 (North Worcestershire) and 60 (South Worcestershire) in the case of two unitary authorities. It is now known that on 16th July 2026 the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government confirmed that he had decided to move forward with the implementation of the two unitary proposal for Worcestershire submitted by Bromsgrove District Council, Malvern Hills District Council, Redditch Borough Council, Worcester City Council and Wychavon District Council. These new councils will comprise the current areas of: Bromsgrove District Council, Redditch Borough Council and Wyre Forest District Council (referred to in the proposals as 'North Worcestershire') and Malvern Hills District Council, Worcester City Council and Wychavon District Council (referred to in the proposals as 'South Worcestershire'). There is no suggestion to change the numbers of elected Members representing the North Worcestershire Authority.
- 2.4 In the original proposals, the suggestion was that each current county division return twice the number of councillors for the new Council or Councils. This would mean all divisions apart from the Redditch electoral area would return two Councillors. Redditch divisions, in this scenario, would return four Councillors, a total of sixteen Members.
- 2.5 With the opportunity to provide feedback to MHCLG mentioned in paragraph 2.2, officers in Redditch cited concerns regarding four Member wards in the electoral area for Redditch within the new unitary authority. This is based on the complication of holding a principal election with four seats in each ward, the dilution of accountability and reducing representational clarity for residents.

Electoral Matters Committee30th July 2026

- 2.6 Although there is no legislative upper limit on the number of Councillors who may represent a ward or electoral division, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) guidance states that divisions/wards returning more than three Councillors can dilute accountability to the electorate. The Commission will not normally recommend a principal ward area with more than three members unless there is compelling evidence to support it. Its guidance also provides that, for authorities holding whole-Council elections, electoral arrangements may be based on a combination of single, two and three-member wards. It is important to note that the MHCLG follows LGBCE guidance as far as possible when developing the interim electoral arrangements for new unitary authorities.


3. OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- 3.1 Officers discussed their concerns of wards returning four members with representatives from MHCLG and it was confirmed that they didn't ask for detailed warding as part of the original LGR proposals and therefore it was not necessary to link anything in those documents and that changes can be made in respect of the SCO for the new authority. Officers were reminded by MHCLG that ministers will decide the final Council size and that MHCLG are seeking local suggestions for the SCO in terms of warding. However, any different arrangements should use existing electoral areas, which may include current District or Borough wards, parish areas or county electoral divisions.
- 3.2 As there is only one parish within the Redditch electoral area, and officers were not proposing any change to the overall number of Councillors to be returned, the alternative approach was to consider the use of existing Borough wards as the basis for the interim warding arrangements. Maintaining the existing allocation of sixteen Councillors for the Redditch electoral area was considered important, as changing the number of Councillors for Redditch would go beyond a local refinement to the warding pattern and could have wider implications for the overall Council size and distribution of Councillors across Worcestershire.
- 3.3 The analysis showed that, in order to retain sixteen Councillors for the Redditch electoral area, the only viable arrangement would be to create seven wards: five two-member wards and two three-member wards.

Electoral Matters Committee

30th July 2026

Figure 1



As can be seen from figure 1 above, the ward patterning would involve combining two current Borough wards to create each three-member ward.

- 3.4 This approach was discussed with both the MHCLG and the LGBCE before taking any further action, both were content with the approach and the LGBCE expanded on the position regarding use of wards to create ward patterns: *“In our guidance to councils on developing warding patterns, we do advise against recommending any four-member electoral areas.”* They followed up with the fact MHCLG has adopted this guidance too and stated: *“It would certainly be appropriate to use Redditch borough wards as building blocks. In other LGR areas some councils have used wards as building blocks as a baseline, instead of electoral divisions, and so there is precedent for that approach. There are also instances where there has been a combined proposal using both wards and divisions as building blocks, so a Worcestershire approach along these lines should also fall within the guidance and be consistent with what we have seen elsewhere in the country.”*
- 3.5 Officers tested some scenarios and did note that electoral variances did have a greater divergence than the original divisional proposal including up to 19% so the LGBCE were asked for their comments on divergence. The LGBCE replied: *“that kind of electoral equality is not a*

Electoral Matters Committee30th July 2026

major concern at this stage and you should feel comfortable going ahead with the ward building blocks in Redditch” noting that their official guidance to Councils undergoing unitarisation states “*when developing interim warding arrangements, councils are unlikely to be able practically to adhere to all the criteria we follow when conducting an electoral review.*” The LGBCE further commented that this appeared to be “*a clear example of where effective & accountable local government takes priority over perfect electoral equality.*” Additionally, it was also noted that, in previous cases of unitarisation, interim arrangements have had variances in the range of 20-30% away from the average. Members may be interested to know that the new North Yorkshire Council had two divisions with a variance of more than 30% and 57% of divisions had a variance of more than 10%.

- 3.6 A paper was taken to the Informal Working Group on Local Government Reorganisation in Worcestershire (which consists of the Leaders of Worcestershire councils and LGR Portfolio Holders) on 1st July 2026. At this meeting members of the group supported a seven ward solution for the Redditch Electoral Area and it was noted that Redditch Borough Council would want to consider the new ward patterns.
- 3.7 Redditch Borough Council Group Leaders met on 2nd July and agreed a meeting of this Committee. It has subsequently been agreed that an extraordinary Council meeting will be held on 10th August to consider ward patterning in the Redditch Electoral Area.
- 3.8 Officers produced a short questionnaire for all members of the Council so they could have a say on which wards they felt have the best community cohesion and community links to help identify the warding pattern of the Redditch Electoral Area for the shadow authority. A copy of the questionnaire and the relevant briefing note can be found in Appendix 1. Due to the timing of the deadline for responses to the questionnaire and also the deadline for publication of the agenda for the Electoral Matters Committee meeting, the results of this questionnaire, as detailed in Appendix 2, will be published in a supplementary pack for this meeting.
- 3.9 Members of the Committee are asked to consider the results of the questionnaire and to decide on a ward pattern to recommend to Council based on strong community links and effective community cohesion. The Committee may also want to suggest a name for the combined wards.
- 3.10 As described in the questionnaire briefing note, community cohesion can include:

Electoral Matters Committee30th July 2026

- shared shops, local centres or high streets;
- shared schools, health facilities, community buildings, parks or leisure facilities;
- similar housing, development patterns or socio-economic characteristics;
- shared transport links, main roads, walking routes or bus routes;
- recognised local identities or neighbourhood names;
- existing links between residents, community groups, voluntary organisations or local services;
- clear physical boundaries, such as main roads, open space, railway lines or natural boundaries; and
- whether residents are likely to see the areas as linked communities.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no additional costs at this stage.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 provides for the Secretary of State to issue invitations to Councils for unitary proposals.
- 5.2 Section 7 of the 2007 Act gives the Secretary of State power to make an SCO with or without modification.
- 5.3 The SCO will include provision for electoral arrangements including the number of Members of the unitary authority, the number and boundaries of electoral areas for the purpose of elections of Councillors to it and the number of Councillors to be returned by each electoral area.

6. OTHER - IMPLICATIONS**Local Government Reorganisation**

- 6.1 The proposal arises directly from Local Government Reorganisation as amended ward patterning for the Redditch Electoral Area will be forwarded to MHCLG, before their deadline of 17th August to help inform the creation of the SCO.

Relevant Council Priority

Electoral Matters Committee

30th July 2026

- 6.2 The proposals detailed in this report, relate to delivering quality services under the organisational priorities of high quality services and supported governance.

Climate Change Implications

- 6.3 There are no direct climate change implications arising from this report.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 6.4 There are no equalities and diversity implications for this report as access to polling stations within the electoral area would remain the same (unless changed under a review by this Committee).

Community Impact Implications

- 6.5 There are no direct community safety or health and wellbeing implications.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 7.1 As Ministers have the final decision on warding, if an indication from the Council on ward patterning isn't made a less favourable pattern might be chosen.

8. APPENDICES and BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Appendix 1 – Copy of questionnaire and briefing note to Elected Members
- Appendix 2 – Results of questionnaire (to follow)

Electoral Matters Committee30th July 2026

9. REPORT SIGN OFF

Department	Name and Job Title	Date
Portfolio Holder	Councillor Craig Warhurst	
Lead Director / Assistant Director	Claire Felton, Assistant Director of Legal, Democratic and Procurement Services	
Financial Services	Deb Goodall, Assistant Director of Financial and Customer Services	
Legal Services	Nicola Cummings, Principal Solicitor - Governance	14/07/26

APPENDIX 1

Redditch warding arrangements for interim unitary arrangements

Please ensure you have read the supporting information document before completing this form. The document can be found here: [Local Government Reorganisation - Redditch Warding Arrangements Briefing Note Member Questions Final 3.docx](#) It would be helpful to complete this form by **Monday 20th July** so the results can be considered at the Electoral Matters Committee.

When you submit this form, it will not automatically collect your details like name and email address unless you provide it yourself.

* Required

1. Please provide your name *

Enter your answer

2. Which Redditch borough ward or wards are you most familiar with? (select all that apply) *

- ☐ Astwood Bank & Feckenham
- ☐ Batchley & Brockhill
- ☐ Central
- ☐ Greenlands & Lakeside
- ☐ Headless Cross & Oakenshaw
- ☐ Matchborough & Woodrow
- ☐ North
- ☐ Webheath & Callow Hill
- ☐ I have borough-wide knowledge

3. When thinking about community links between areas, which of the following should be taken into account? (Please select all that apply) *

- ☐ Whether the areas feel like they naturally sit together
- ☐ Whether residents are likely to use some of the same local facilities or services
- ☐ Whether the areas have similar local issues or priorities

- ☐ Whether the areas have a similar local character
- ☐ Whether there are clear boundaries or barriers between the areas
- ☐ Whether the arrangement would make sense to residents
- ☐ Other

4. Which of the following potential ward pairings do you think have the strongest community links?
(please select 2, and do not use any ward twice) *

Please select 2 options.

- ☐ Astwood Bank & Feckenham with Webheath & Callow Hill
- ☐ Astwood Bank & Feckenham with Headless Cross & Oakenshaw
- ☐ Webheath & Callow Hill with Headless Cross & Oakenshaw
- ☐ Webheath & Callow Hill with Batchley & Brockhill
- ☐ Batchley & Brockhill with Central
- ☐ Headless Cross & Oakenshaw with Central
- ☐ Central with Greenlands & Lakeside
- ☐ Headless Cross & Oakenshaw with Greenlands & Lakeside

- ☐ Headless Cross & Oakenshaw with Matchborough & Woodrow
- ☐ Matchborough & Woodrow with Winyates
- ☐ Greenlands & Lakeside with Matchborough & Woodrow
- ☐ Greenlands & Lakeside with Winyates
- ☐ Greenlands & Lakeside with North
- ☐ North with Winyates
- ☐ Not Sure

5. What is/are the main reason(s) you think they have strong community links? (select all that apply)

*

- ☐ The areas feel like they naturally sit together
- ☐ Residents are likely to use some of the same shops, facilities or services
- ☐ The areas have similar local issues or priorities
- ☐ The areas have a similar local character
- ☐ The arrangement would support clear and effective representation

☐ The arrangement would make sense to residents

6. Are there any of the potential pairings that you think would be difficult from a community cohesion point of view? (please select any that apply)

*

☐ Astwood Bank & Feckenham with Webheath & Callow Hill

☐ Astwood Bank & Feckenham with Headless Cross & Oakenshaw

☐ Webheath & Callow Hill with Headless Cross & Oakenshaw

☐ Webheath & Callow Hill with Batchley & Brockhill

☐ Batchley & Brockhill with Central

☐ Headless Cross & Oakenshaw with Central

☐ Central with Greenlands & Lakeside

☐ Headless Cross & Oakenshaw with Greenlands & Lakeside

☐ Headless Cross & Oakenshaw with Matchborough & Woodrow

☐ Matchborough & Woodrow with Winyates

☐ Greenlands & Lakeside with Matchborough & Woodrow

☐ Greenlands & Lakeside with Winyates

☐ Greenlands & Lakeside with North

☐ North with Winyates

☐ Not Sure

☐ None of the above

7. If you selected any difficult pairings, what is/are the main reason(s)? (select all that apply)

*

☐ The areas do not feel naturally linked

☐ Residents are unlikely to use the same facilities or services

☐ The areas have different local identities

☐ The areas have different local issues or priorities

☐ There are physical boundaries or barriers between the areas

☐ The arrangement may not make sense to residents

☐ Other

☐ Not applicable

☐ Other

8. Is there anything else the Electoral Matters Committee should take into account when considering the proposed ward pattern?

*

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not sure



This content is created by the owner of the form. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner. Microsoft is not responsible for the privacy or security practices of its customers, including those of this form owner. Never give out your password.

Microsoft Forms | AI-Powered surveys, quizzes and polls [Create my own form](#)

The owner of this form has not provided a privacy statement as to how they will use your response data. Do not provide personal or sensitive information. | [Terms of use](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Government Reorganisation: Redditch Warding Arrangements Briefing Note

Why we are asking for Members' views

Redditch Borough Council is seeking views from all Members to help inform the proposed warding arrangements for the Redditch electoral area as part of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). This exercise is not connected to determining which unitary arrangement (a single county unitary or two councils, one covering the north and the other the south) is right for Worcestershire. Views relating to that have already been passed on to the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) for the Government to consider.

The purpose of this exercise is to gather local knowledge about community links between existing Redditch borough wards. This will help inform considerations about the most suitable ward pattern arrangements for the area irrespective of the decision on LGR. It is not asking Members to choose a final ward pattern that they would prefer, but information from this work will assist the Electoral Matters Committee in proposing a ward pattern, which will then ultimately be considered at an extraordinary Council meeting on 10 August.

What these arrangements would be used for

The warding arrangements being considered would apply to the **shadow elections only**.

These arrangements, if agreed by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), would be included in the Worcestershire Structural Changes Order and used for the first elections to the new unitary authority or authorities.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) has confirmed that reorganised areas are usually reviewed before their next scheduled unitary elections. This means that the longer-term warding arrangements would be considered through a full electoral review at a later stage

Why Redditch is being looked at separately

The original LGR submission at interim plan stage in March 2025 to MHCLG for Worcestershire was based on using current county electoral divisions, with the number of councillors doubled. In Redditch, this would mean each county division would return four councillors. MHCLG on 19th May 2026 asked for any further information on warding to be made available by 17th August or before.

Informal advice has been sought from MHCLG and the LGBCE. The advice received confirms that four-member wards are not normally supported, as they can dilute accountability and make representation less clear for residents.

For that reason, Redditch needs to consider a limited variation from the original approach.

What would change


The revised approach would use the existing Redditch borough wards as the building blocks, rather than the county divisions.

This would not change the overall number of councillors. The total number of councillors across Worcestershire would remain 114, whether there is one unitary authority or two unitary authorities.

For Redditch, the only alternative option is to use the existing nine borough wards and create:

- five two-member wards; and
- two three-member wards, each made up of two existing borough wards.

This means two pairs of existing borough wards would need to be combined.



Why the options are limited

There are very limited options available because the interim warding arrangements need to be based on existing electoral areas.

This means the arrangements must use existing borough wards, county divisions, parish areas, or a combination of these.

For Redditch, using the existing borough wards as building blocks is the only practical way to avoid four-member wards while keeping the overall number of councillors unchanged.

How electoral variance will be considered

Electoral variance remains a relevant consideration. This means looking at how evenly councillors would represent the electorate across each ward. However, the LGBCE has advised that, in the context of interim arrangements for local government reorganisation, the usual levels of electoral equality may not be achievable within the limited parameters available.

The key issue for this exercise is therefore to understand which existing borough wards have the strongest community links and would support effective and clear representation. This is referred to as community cohesion.

What we mean by community cohesion

When answering the questions, please think about whether different areas have natural links with each other.

This may include:

- shared shops, local centres or high streets;
- shared schools, health facilities, community buildings, parks or leisure facilities
- similar housing, development patterns or socio-economic characteristics
- shared transport links, main roads, walking routes or bus routes
- recognised local identities or neighbourhood names
- existing links between residents, community groups, voluntary organisations or local services
- clear physical boundaries, such as main roads, open space, railway lines or natural boundaries
- whether residents are likely to see the areas as linked communities.

How the responses will be used

The responses will be used to help officers assess community cohesion and effective representation between existing Redditch borough wards.

This evidence will be considered alongside electoral variance data and the advice received from MHCLG and the LGBCE. It will assist the Electoral Matters Committee, at its meeting on 30 July, in considering a proposed ward pattern for the Redditch electoral area.

Any recommendation from the Electoral Matters Committee will then be considered by Council at an extraordinary meeting on 10 August.

It should be noted that Redditch Borough Council is not making the final decision on the warding arrangements for the new unitary authority or authorities. The Council

would be making a proposal to MHCLG. The final unitary structure and electoral arrangements will ultimately be determined by Government through the Structural Changes Order.

Appendix 2

Member Questionnaire Analysis

A total of 16 responses were received to the Member questionnaire on the proposed interim ward pattern for the Redditch Electoral Area. The responses included input from Members familiar with individual wards, as well as six respondents who indicated that they had knowledge across the borough. This provided a mix of detailed local knowledge and a wider borough-level perspective.

Members were asked to select the two potential pairings they considered to have the strongest community links. Four pairings received notably greater support than the remaining options, as summarised below:

Potential Ward Pairing	Selected as having the strongest community links	Identified as difficult from a community cohesion perspective
Astwood Bank & Feckenham with Webheath & Callow Hill	7	3
North with Winyates	7	3
Batchley & Brockhill with Central	7	6
Greenlands & Lakeside with Matchborough & Woodrow	6	2

The questionnaire demonstrates broad support for these four pairings over the remaining options, all of which received three or fewer selections (see page 3). However, the results also show differing levels of consensus between the preferred pairings. Whilst Astwood Bank & Feckenham with Webheath & Callow Hill, North with Winyates, and Greenlands & Lakeside with Matchborough & Woodrow attracted relatively few concerns, the proposed pairing of Batchley & Brockhill with Central generated more mixed views. Although it was identified by seven respondents as one of the strongest community pairings, it was also identified by six respondents as being difficult from a community cohesion perspective. This suggests that, whilst there is support for the pairing, Members hold more varied views on its suitability than for the other leading options.

The comments received suggest that the concerns about this option related particularly to ongoing and future housing development in both the town centre and Brockhill, the potential size of the resulting electorate, and the importance of retaining a clear focus on the town centre.

When considering community cohesion more generally, Members consistently identified the following factors as being the most important:


- Areas sharing similar local issues or priorities (15 responses)
- Areas naturally sitting together (13 responses)
- Residents using the same local facilities and services (12 responses)
- Areas sharing a similar local character (12 responses)

The free text comments reflected these themes, with Members highlighting the importance of maintaining established community identities, recognising future housing growth and electorate changes, considering school catchment areas and transport links, and ensuring that any proposed ward pattern is readily understood by local residents.


Questionnaire Response Overview

The following charts provide a visual summary of the responses received to the member questionnaire. They are included to support the analysis set out above and illustrate Members' views on the key factors influencing community cohesion and the proposed ward pairings. Any additional comments provided as part of the questionnaire have also been included.


3. When thinking about community links between areas, which of the following should be taken into account? (Please select all that apply)




4. Which of the following potential ward pairings do you think have the strongest community links? (please select 2, and do not use any ward twice)




5. What is/are the main reason(s) you think they have strong community links? (select all that apply)



6. Are there any of the potential pairings that you think would be difficult from a community cohesion point of view? (please select any that apply)



7. If you selected any difficult pairings, what is/are the main reason(s)? (select all that apply)



Comments provided:

It needs to think of the residents regarding the old part of the town joining with a new part of the town

Residents should be given a questionnaire to complete as they may feel as this concerns their area and postcode its something they should take part in and have their say.

The Villages have always had a different identity to many parts of Redditch and there requirements from a council are fundamentally different

To not make the new ward too big.

This is a difficult situation and I recognise there is not a perfect answer. I would put Astwood bank / Feckenham with Callow Hill / Webheath. I think the wards which join together should have some similarities, and these are the two most rural wards. Although spanning a large area they do not have large areas of social housing within this. I recognise there is some expansion along the Bromsgrove border but these will not all be within the Redditch boundary. These two wards have more of a village feel – especially Astwood Bank. I would also put Winyates with North. These wards share a boundary, as well as a bus route. They have their own distinct centres. They share a variety of housing types with dense areas of social housing alongside private estates. Church Hill residents tend to access Arrow Vale school pyramid with the middle school feeding to Arrow Vale. As education will fall under unitary control this needs to be considered. I would have concerns over Central and Batchley / Brockhill being merged as these are experiencing continued development with flats in the town centre and the ever expanding Brockhill estate. These wards are already growing and will create a very large electorate if merged. I think the importance of the town centre means central should remain a ward on its own, especially in terms of economic development. The current boundaries between Greenlands / Lakeside and Matchborough / Woodrow. Whilst I feel Woodrow might sit well with Greenlands I do not think Matchborough fits with that ward. They also both have high numbers of social housing which tends to put extra demand on councillors. I would be wary of creating this as one ward as the workload would be extensive. I think they should remain separate. There is an option of putting winyates and matchborough together but I think this would make a potentially problematic estate with too much social housing. Headless Cross and Oakenshaw is fairly diverse. Its only natural partner would be Astwood bank but as mentioned earlier that fits better with Webheath. HCO is geographically less connected to Astwood Bank. The boundaries of HCO are very well defined as they are.

This page is intentionally left blank