Appendix 3

Number	Q5 Further Comments	Polling
		District

SP2	It would seem that increasing the number of Stoke Heath	AVA
	Councillors on the Council would be a way forward	
SP4	Get rid of existing PC as it doesn't do anything for the vast majority of	AVB
	people	
SP5	Seems a waste of resources in these exceptional times. I suggest leave it	AVA
	as it is. I cannot see any benefit just expense	
SP6	Should become less political.	AVB
SP9	We don't need another group of Councillors.	AVB
SP10	We don't wish to pay any more Council tax and if the PC is working	AVA
	why change it. I would imagine it is hard enough to get parish	
	councillors for 1 council let alone 2 The PC office has to close due to	
	circumstances in Stoke Prior probably funding so now is there	
	going to be enough for 2 councils without putting Ctax up.	
SP11	The case that the "petitioners feel that a disproportionate amount of	AVB
	the precept money is spent in the Stoke Prior ward" is simply not	
	made out on the information presented in their communication.	
	The maps which accompany it is quite the most indistinct that I	
	have ever seen. I would like to know how many petitioners there	
	might be. I suspect this may well be a case of tiny minority, causing	
	expenditure and getting excited about something which in reality	
	is trivial. As I have said: Case not made out	
SP14	I think our Ctax could be put to better use than sending out all these	AVB
	letters	
SP15	Happy with the way it currently works	AVA
SP18	My initial feeling is " why is it necessary to create another level	AVA
	of bureaucracy which would cost the ratepayers more and is unnecessary	
	at these difficult times. We do not know why the petition has been raised	
	so very difficult to judge. If residents feel left out then get involved"	
SP19	Regarding the precept not being spent in Stoke Heath that's how	AVA
	administration of my taxes to the government are not always	
	spent locally. Bare in mind a large proportion of Stoke Heath would	
	remain in Stoke parish as historically it went that far unless no parish	
	council was formed costs would rise due to administration.	
SP20	I see no benefit to increase bureaucracy and in particular costs in the community.	AVA

		1
SP21	The "suggested" (shaded green) of the proposed Stoke Heath Parish	AVA
	is NOT representative of Stoke Heath by any stretch of the	
	imagination! Where are the 000'S of properties to the east and west	
	of Hanbury Rd(from the Hanbury Turn to Rock Hill) you cannot call	
	Stoke Heath PC if it is not representing the residents living there! Other	
	properties along Redditch Rd are also seemingly "MISSING"	
SP22	I think the current PC does a good job and I can't see how splitting	AVB
	the budget further and yet having more people involved will make	
	any further difference to services other than spread the budget	
	more thinly.	
SP24	Where as creating a new parish could reflect individual needs more	AVA
	it just introduces more bureaucracy for a small area and means that	
	services could be restricted due to some households making	
	contributions for the same services	
SP31	It should be kept as one parish. Two parish's would cause duplication and	AVA
	unnecessary expense when tendering for services.	
SP32	A waste of public money	AVA
SP33	I do not see the need for creating two parishes when the current one	AVB
	is working very efficiently. Also the cost of doing this paying two lots of	
	councillors/election officers etc.	
SP35	I think that creating extra, smaller parish councils makes no sense.	AVA
	It will create inefficiencies due to its tiny size and end up costing the	
	ratepayers more. If Stoke Heath really feel that they have to create	
	Stoke Parish, then I suggest it makes more sense for them to join an	
	adjoining parish instead, Charford for example.	
SP36	I feel the current Parish serves all the community fairly at the moment. It	AVA
	is a waste of time, money and resources to create another parish. It's not	
	really necessary. Our current council is doing a great job.	
SP41	More dog poo bins are needed in the Stoke pound area-it's a real	AVA
	problem.	
SP42	Why are the homes on Weston Hall Rd called under Stoke Prior when	AVA
	they are in Stoke Works. Stoke Prior was before the railway bridges in	
	Shaw Lane. After was Stoke Works. I have lived in Stoke Works 85 yrs.	
SP46	I think we have a strong voice together rather than fragmented.	AVA
SP47	Local parishes are a waste of time. I asked for the street lights to be	AVA
	repaired and was told the parish had no money. Westenhall Road	
	development money has not been spent around Stoke Prior because	
	PC didn't fight for it.	
SP48	We are going through difficult times with COVID-19. Jobs and businesses	AVA
	all affected. This is not the time to be raising Ctax where this is already	
	high even if it is just the precept.	
SP49	What an awful waste of time and effort. Surely, there are more	AVA
	important things to be focused on.	
SP50	A collective voice is more powerful and I also suspect a split would lead	AVA
	to higher council taxes.	
SP51	By making an additional ward- surely this creates duplication,	AVA
	admin etc. leading to additional costs. Many other businesses etc	
	are merging to make efficiencies and cost savings.	
		-

SP54	Leave it the same	AVB
SP56	Would need further budget information to find out if	AVA
	disproportionate amount of money is spent on Stoke Prior Ward	
SP57	Really feel that whilst we are dealing with a global pandemic there are	AVA
	better things that LG should be dealing with.	
SP58	Rather than a split would it not make more sense to even up the number	AVB
	of councillors from each ward within the existing parish council. I e 6 for	
	Stoke Prior and 6 for Stoke Heath Ward. We feel sure that this would be	
	much fairer and cost effective.	
SP59	I think this is a pointless and costly exercise there is no need a spilt	AVA
	and the proposed boundary makes no sense. It should be larger	
	including all Stoke Heath or not at all.	
SP60	The area shaded green on the map does not include all of Stoke Heath	AVB
	It appears to exclude significant areas of Stoke Heath housing and	/
	indeed this property. No evidence has been provided of the current	
	split of expenditure. The claim that expenditure is disproportionate	
	maybe true but has not been substantiated. There is no financial	
	forecast for the proposed Stoke Heath parish. In short insufficient	
	information is provided to reach a decision at this stage.	AVA
SP62	I am against this as there is already a struggle to find people willing to be	AVA
	parish councillors; additionally in these difficult times people do not need	
	the possibility of increased taxes to fund additional needs of councillors.	
SP63	Stoke can support a parish clerk, assistant and web site. Splitting would	AVB
	double admin costs. It is a strategic nonsense on matters like	
	consultation about roads etc to separate the parish e.g. A38	
	improvements which is the boundary line. It would be unfair for	
	Stoke Prior to finance a playing field largely used by Stoke Heath	
	residents. I was one of the Forelands estate who supports the	
	northern extension of the parish. As said before this petition is	
	basically for a few people with their own agenda and without the ability to	
	deliver on their points.	
SP64	This is a complete waste of time and money!	AVB
SP65	I feel it is unnecessary to create an additional ward. The area is not that	AVA
	large in its entirety and can remain as one parish. It will create 2 wards	
	that will not agree so why complicate this issue.	
SP66	We think this is all a waste of money, leave as it is.	AVA
5P67	Good idea	AVB
5P68	The area proposed on the map is only part of Stoke Heath so it will make a	AVA
	2 tier system and could cause problems in the future as well as increasing	
	costs when there is no need as the existing parish works well.	
SP69	The separation will lead to more bureaucracy. Delaying procedures and	AVA
	improvements that affect both areas.	
SP72	There is no need to change and incur the costs of any change.	AVA
SP74	Stoke Parish Council do a good job in our opinion	AVA
6P77	Concerned on two counts	AVA
	1) may have to pay more Ctax and	
	2) proposed new parish doesn't seem	
	to contain all of Stoke Heath (or may	
	to contain an of stoke freath (of may	I
	be I have misinterpreted the map)	

CD01	I do not think by colitting the parish will be build a strang community	A) / A
SP81	I do not think by splitting the parish will help build a strong community.	AVA
	Many residents of Stoke Heath use public rights of way, recreational space	
	and fields within the Stoke Prior area as well as attend planned activities.	
	Surely by splitting the parish, Stoke Prior will still have to foot the bill for	
	the cleaning/maintenance of dog mess, dog bins, footpaths etc., social	
2002	space.	A \ / A
SP82	Pointless bureaucracy. Splitting things up always adds to the operational	AVA
SP84	costs of running things. Unnecessary extra financial burden. Volunteers to stand for Councillor	AVA
5804		AVA
	even harder to find from a smaller pool of population. No viable case for	
SP85	any changes has been brought to my attention.	AVA
5892	The creation of another parish would be a waste of public money,	AVA
	involving payment of a clerk etc. It is often difficult to find enough people	
CD00	to become councillors.	
SP89	Why change something that works fine as it is.	AVB
SP90	We don't think another parish will make any difference to us.	AVA
SP91	From my understanding of your letter, the new Stoke Heath parish is	AVA
	significantly smaller with more concentrated residencies - leaving	
	Stoke Prior with a greater area and less residencies - higher cost to	
	maintain - increase in Ctax.	
SP97	The Parish has spent a lot of money enlarging the Stoke Heath playing	AVA
	field for Stoke Heath residents. If it's split, would it mean they use it but	
	don't pay money to it's upkeep?	
SP101	I disagree with the idea of paying more in my Ctax to pay for the	AVA
	creation of a new parish when the current system works well. This will	
	also add additional layers into Bromsgrove council democratic process	
	which is already confusing!	
SP103	Seems unnecessary change with little ??? Likely increase in	AVA
	cost/household clerks remuneration, premises here for parish council	
	meetings, possible increased election costs. Such issues related to the	
	allocation of spending across the existing parish can be discussed and	
	resolved by the existing PC	
SP105	No. We can see no reason to change things from the current situation	AVA
	and are happy with the current Parish Council.	
SP106	If it's not broken. Don't fix it	AVA
SP100		
SP107	Creating two Parishes would only cost More Money, Which is	AVA
SP107	Creating two Parishes would only cost More Money, Which is unacceptable.	AVA
		AVA AVA
	unacceptable. I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The people	
	unacceptable.	
SP110	unacceptable. I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The people in the proposed RHA area would still expect to benefit and use facilities in the AVA & AVB areas.	
SP110	unacceptable.I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The peoplein the proposed RHA area would still expect to benefit and usefacilities in the AVA & AVB areas.Fragmenting the services could result in a loss of services/benefit to one	AVA
SP110 SP111	 unacceptable. I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The people in the proposed RHA area would still expect to benefit and use facilities in the AVA & AVB areas. Fragmenting the services could result in a loss of services/benefit to one or both of the parishes. 	AVA AVB
SP110 SP111	unacceptable.I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The peoplein the proposed RHA area would still expect to benefit and usefacilities in the AVA & AVB areas.Fragmenting the services could result in a loss of services/benefit to oneor both of the parishes.What is the point of PCs at all. I got the same service from Bromsgrove	AVA
SP110 SP111	unacceptable.I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The people in the proposed RHA area would still expect to benefit and use facilities in the AVA & AVB areas.Fragmenting the services could result in a loss of services/benefit to one or both of the parishes.What is the point of PCs at all. I got the same service from Bromsgrove Council as I do from the PC. The only difference is I get charged extra	AVA AVB
SP110 SP111 SP114	 unacceptable. I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The people in the proposed RHA area would still expect to benefit and use facilities in the AVA & AVB areas. Fragmenting the services could result in a loss of services/benefit to one or both of the parishes. What is the point of PCs at all. I got the same service from Bromsgrove Council as I do from the PC. The only difference is I get charged extra money on my Ctax. Scrap all PCs is my opinion 	AVA AVB AVB
SP107 SP110 SP111 SP114 SP115	unacceptable.I see no benefit to anybody for a split in the Parish areas. The people in the proposed RHA area would still expect to benefit and use facilities in the AVA & AVB areas.Fragmenting the services could result in a loss of services/benefit to one or both of the parishes.What is the point of PCs at all. I got the same service from Bromsgrove Council as I do from the PC. The only difference is I get charged extra	AVA AVB

SP118	I believe that any changes would create division and competition between	۸\/۸
3110	2 areas that are perfectly happy as one. I also	AVA
	believe that Stoke Prior precept would increase as the new parish would	
	have to support itself leaving Stoke Prior underfunded.	
SP121	The Stoke Heath parish should include AVB area as well. The "Stoke Heath	A)/A
36121	estate" cannot be split in two. It should include the	AVA
	whole estate up to and including Puddle Wharf island, to Hanbury turn	
	and all of Avoncroft. The "needs" and focus of this area are very different	
	to the Stoke Prior village.	
SP125	I would suggest this is down to personalities who do not like living in a	AVA
CD407	big rural met and also think that their community charge will go DOWN!	
SP127	I feel strongly that we should be promoting togetherness and all work	AVA
	together, creating another parish just creates more division, cost and	
	complexity that is not needed.	
SP129	Stoke Heath is amply catered for by Stoke Prior. There is NO need for	AVB
	these proposed changes.	
SP133	I find it quite astounding that this is being considered during the middle of	AVA
	a global pandemic! I would of thought local Councils had more important	
	duties to focus on at this time. I feel money could be spent better	
	elsewhere within the parish. For example the introduction of traffic	
	calming measures along Shaw Lane.	
SP136	Stoke Heath Parish to be extended to include all the properties in Stoke	AVB
	Heath	
SP139	We are not sure from the information given how splitting them would	AVA
	benefit anyone.	
SP142	It appears from the map included not all of Stoke Heath will be covered by	AVA
	the new parish? I have always assumed Stoke Heath starts from the new	
	houses just past The Hanbury Turn pub.	
SP144	I very much feel that we have a county council and a district council, why	AVB
	do we need another layer of bureaucracy with one parish council let alone	
	two.	
SP150	I don't want money wasted on setting up another parish council when	AVB
	already parished. Not necessary!	
SP156	If there is a feeling of neglect or inconsideration at the council by Stoke	AVA
	Prior representatives against this from Stoke Heath why not introduce	
	equal representation i.e. 6 from each parish.	
SP159	It works well the way it is It's just a few trying to rule the rest.	AVA
SP162	There is no reason given for change! What is the benefit?	AVA
SP163	Do not feel it is necessary or required to create a second parish	AVA
SP164	It would be interesting to see the income and outgoings to establish	AVA
	what is/has been spent in a year.	
SP166	Seems quite a small parish. Surely its better to keep it larger from a cost	AVA
	point of view.	
SP168	Establishing 2 parishes from 1 will incur extra costs in establishing 2	AVB
	bureaucracies meaning less money will be available for providing services.	
SP169	Feel there is no need for a new parish. Happy with existing persons and	AVB
	they have done a fine job over the years; parting of the 2 would break the	
	community spirit, and what is everyone gaining? For what people pay we	

SP170	I have listened to the argument from the potential Stoke Heath split	AVA
	campaign. They say they are so different as Stoke Prior is not rural, no	
	rural needs, but to me they are just like Charford i.e. a housing estate-so	
	MAKE THEM PART OF CHARFORD PARISH. I can't see the advantage of	
	making another small parish, parish council etc.	
SP172	I cannot see how the residents of Stoke Heath would benefit from forming	AVA
	a new parish.	
SP173	I believe the parish council would prefer to see the parish remain as it is	AVA
	and I agree. The area I understand is closer to Rock Hill and Charford	
SP175	Stoke Heath proposed council area represents a very small part of the	AVA
	total parish, it doesn't appear to have any great parks or areas to	
	maintain. It is difficult to understand what they feel they would need to	
	make them feel more part of a community. We all cannot be near to local	
	amenities and cost to maintain these are always a large part of the Parish	
	Precept. Any further devolvement of costs would inevitably require the	
	residents to pay more for the services.	
SP176	I am perplexed why its deemed necessary to create a new parish. It has	AVA
	hundreds of years history. They say change improves things for the better	
	but in my experiences its not so.	
SH2	We voted against having a pc originally & have not changed our view that	RHA
	we gain nothing. I have no idea what the current pc does in	
	my area. If the new council is going to cost more we would not be	
	interested in the change. We would like someone to tell us exactly	
	what the current pc actually does.	
SH3	A Very bad idea in my opinion I can't see why this would be even	RHA
	considered in 2020 Surely a waste of paper. Ctax is high enough and many	
	are on furlough and will be for months.	
SH5	I don't want to be in a parish they are just a waste of money BDC should	RHA
	cover everything there are too many layers of government.	
SH6	Think this is not suitable at all especially with COVID-19 19 going on-better	RHA
<u></u>	things to work on.	
SH7	Creating another PC must inevitably increase admin costs and therefore	RHA
	add to the burden on all rate payers effected. This cannot be right in this	
	time of struggling public finances. Stop whinging and make the council	
<u></u>	we have work for all.	
SH9	I have only lived in Stoke Heath for 18 months and so far as I can see	RHA
CU 4 O	everything seems to run quite smoothly.	DUIA
SH10	Why create two separate parishes with the expenses that will incur-2	RHA
	debts etc It will also create a divisive community by splitting Stoke	
	Heath in 2 parts. It is not always easy to get people willing to be	
C114.4	councillors. It works very well as it is-leave it	DUIA
SH11	I think the PC is not needed. We have a councillor at main council.	RHA
SH15	I believe the people who are active in this might have the	RHA
6114 C	objective of getting rid of the PC in Stoke Heath area.	
SH16	As pensioners we need to control expenses. Any change would not be in	RHA
CU 4 7	our control	
SH17	This split could be avoided if there is a more equitable split	RHA
	of allegiance on Stoke PC. I.e. 6 for Stoke Prior ward and 6 for Stoke Heath	
	ward	

SH22	Its about time to make the changes and I am looking forward to represent	RHA
	our NEW STOKE HEATH PARISH	
SH25	I think this is a good item to be considered. I would however like to	RHA
	highlight that if Stoke Prior/Works area were unable to "stand on their	
	own 2 feet" when considering the funding they may require - then this	
	option should not be approved as it would cause detriment to the area	
	and residents. I would be happy to pay more to support my local area -	
	get grass cut more often, etc. If you drive around Barnt Green you will see	
	a noticeable difference in regards to how the area is presented	
	when compared to the Stoke parish.	
SH27	No. Already speechless that this suggestion (i.e. for a new "Stoke	RHA
	Heath PC") has been made	
SH28	I personally am happy to remain as we are. The only proviso would	RHA
	be to have 6 parish councillors for Stoke Heath instead of 4.	
	thus an equal division between the two. It would also be beneficial for	
	Stoke Heath residents to be aware of what locally the parish council is	
	responsible for. i.e. roads, paths, hedges etc. As at the moment this is	
	unclear.	
SH30	Stoke parish have dominated Stoke Heath for many years now.	RHA
	The alleyways and hedgerows desperately need attention, and	
	repairs to the footpaths. This could be achieved through our	
	own parish using our own money.	
SH32	If this comes to fruition, I would absolutely object to my Ctax going up and	RHA
	it should never be based on Ctax bands. I am mortgage free but what I pay	
	in Ctax now, I have never paid when paying a mortgage. In this present	
	climate of covid19 I think there re more important things to think about	
	and Ctax rises are the least people want when there are so many people	
	losing their jobs. No-one wants more salt rubbing in	
	the wounds !!	
SH36	I very much doubt if this would increase a feeling of local democracy in	RHA
	Stoke Heath. I do suspect the cost would go up.	
SH38	Just more money to pay out for little or no return.	RHA
SH41	We have elected councillors to voice our opinions for Stoke Heath. If new	RHA
	parish created are those proposing it willing to stand? Depends on	
	increase/decrease in Ctax. Would they provide same services etc as	
	Stoke Heath have?	
SH42	Stoke Heath is an area that needs recognition in it's own right. We	RHA
	have no amenities and very little children's areas. SPEEDING TRAFFIC	
	on Wheatridge Rd NEEDS ADDRESSING NOW. The same for Hanbury Rd	
	and Austin Rd. It's a joke.	
SH46	I have concerns you are looking at this during a time of COVID-19. If this	RHA
	does happen it is obvious tax will increase to cover the extra costs &	
	now is not the time to do this with people struggling and job losses.	
	Please consider the people in the ward and impacts of this decision.	
SH47	Stoke Heath should have a greater say. They have a large community	RHA
,	compared to the rest of the parish. Stoke Heath provide more to the	
	coffers of the parish, yet has less councillors. What are the others	
	bringing to the party? I feel that Stoke Heath are subsidising the	
	rural community. They should provide an equal amount -fairness for all.	
	provide all equal amount - raimess for all.	

SH50	We do not agree with being a parish in the 1st instance and see	RHA
21152	no benefit from the Ctax we pay for it.	DUIA
SH53	Happy with things as they are	RHA
SH54	A waste of time & effort, it's ok as it is. Just another excuse to raise	RHA
	our already extortionate Ctax !!	D 114
SH60	I don't have any problem with staying in the Stoke Prior Parish but can	RHA
	understand why keeping the two combined can be problematic, and	
	therefore happy to go with any changes that enable the parish to work	
	well, providing the best community care possible.	
SH63	At this present time we have more pressing matters with COVID-19. This	RHA
	should be discussed at a later date.	
SH64	We have enough parish councillors to adequately deal with any	RHA
	problems in the parish. We have enough bureaucracy in the present	
	set up in County council, district council etc. We have enough ego	
	seekers we don't need anymore.	
SH66	We were asked our opinion on Stoke Heath being included in the	RHA
	Stoke Prior parish years ago and we and many others said that we	
	didn't feel that Stoke Heath would benefit. WE WERE IGNORED!	
	It went ahead and we pay into a parish that does not include us in	
	anything. Our opinions clearly don't count anyway! We live directly	
	behind the A38 and have also shown our great concern about the	
	widening of the road and air pollution. We will again be IGNORED AND	
	THIS WILL GO AHEAD!!! We have NO FAITH IN BDC!	
SH70	I found this consultation very unclear. Though an educated person, I don't	RHA
	understand the difference between ward, parish and parish ward and	
	looking online including on the map, I'm none the wiser now! There is no	
	before and after map. Is the green area RHA to be split from AVB to the	
	west? Or from AVA and AVB combined? No boundary key. Either way I see	
	no logic in splitting half of the urban Stoke Heath estate (as I see it) from	
	the rest i.e. Cornfield/Furrows/Ploughmans etc are similar in nature to	
	Tythe Barn, Barley Croft, Granary etc. If any logical split were to be made	
	then town and country would be more sensible. Please keep the	
	Worcester Rd\A38\Stoke Heath triangle as 1 entity. Is this proposal	
	undoing the change(Stoke Council combining Stoke Heath & Stoke Prior)	
	made a few years ago? Is Stoke Prior village part of Stoke	
	currently? Perhaps a more fair distribution of the 12 councillors	
	should be considered.	
6H71	I studied the map enclosed and the other wards in Bromsgrove	RHA
	are much bigger. We don't need to be split up and have small wards	
6H73	On the map the green area proposed as Stoke Heath Parish Council does	RHA
	not include the area on the map which is titled Stoke Heath-surely this	
	area should be in the Stoke Heath Parish.	
5H74	This is not the time for distraction in politics; There is enough going on at	RHA
	the moment with days from Brexit and The Pandemic etc	
6H75	We could do with a community in Stoke Heath.	RHA
SH76	£30 It is not a large sum of money to pay for our services as they	RHA
30/0	stand. Why change anything? Stoke Heath would gain nothing by changing	

SH77	I pay for too much C/Tax now, I do not regard my council or parish as value for money.	RHA
SH84	We would be intrigued to know what proposals/ideas those promoting the creation of a separate P.C for Stoke Heath have. What benefits do they envisage and of course costings for a proposed new P.C for Stoke Heath. We are unconvinced of the need for Stoke Heath to be included in a Parish Council.	RHA
SH86	I think the Stoke Parish Council as it stands has the knowledge, expertise and resources to benefit its residents	RHA
SH87	It would make more sense if a new parish is considered to be needed to include the properties to include Avoncroft Road down towards the A38 big island. On balance it seems in its current proposed form like a waste of time.	RHA
SH89	I am not in favour of two separate parishes. I would just like to see more considerations given to Stoke Heath and its residents. There is clearly some bias for Stoke Prior otherwise this idea would not have been suggested. Lets keep one Stoke Parish and see all the areas of Stoke treated equally and fairly.	RHA
W SH1	Seems silly to create a parish for such as small area	RHA
W SH2	This proposal seems to make no sense. It is splitting the existing Stoke Heath community in two, along an arbitrary ward boundary which was drawn up purely for electoral reasons. If the proposal was to annex the whole of the Stoke Heath community (i.e. anything north of say the Ewe & Lamb) would make some sort of sense.	RHA
W SH3	I think the review/consultation letter could have been more explicit about the reasons as to this was being proposed. It would have been helpful to have had clarity around the issues so that an informed opinion could be shared. Broad examples for consideration are noted but no confirmed specifics. I would like to know what is meant by a "disproportional amount".	RHA
W SH4	I would be concerned about any increases in payments from us.	RHA
W SH5	Stoke Heath area contributes towards things like street lighting and lengthsman but receives little benefit from these	RHA
W SH8	Can't anyone in the Bromsgrove area find something more beneficial and sensible to do with tax payers money during a pandemic. This is another ridiculous and unimportant thing to spend money on, which I'm constantly being told is in short supply! Does anyone ever bother to find the cost of this so far?	RHA
W SH11	We appreciate the facilities at the recreation ground provided by Stoke Parish; also the well-maintained flower planters placed on the estate. The establishment of the John Corbett Way has proved a pleasant asset. Stoke Parish has also put on various events at the recreation ground for the whole parish. We don't know whether this has brought the separate communities closer but the councillors deserve credit for their efforts.	RHA
W SH13	Creating new PCs spreads the limited finances ever thinner. I don't see the logic in creating another set of costly administration for a smaller area (with less money). Make the existing PCs work instead of running away?	RHA

W SH14	The nature and needs of Stoke Prior and its surrounding areas is totally	RHA
	different to the Stoke Heath area as such these needs can only be met by	
	a separate Stoke Heath Parish council; that can focus on the area.	
W SH18	I object to the idea that one sector of society should not pay a tax or	RHA
	precept because they do not benefit as much as others. If Stoke Prior has	
	greater need then that should be met and people with less need should	
	be prepared to pay for the benefit of the wider community	
W SH19	Anything completely local has to be a good thing	RHA
W SH22	I think parish Councils are just a waste of parishioners money anyway as I	RHA
	already pay the district council and county council to do everything	
W SH25	The proposed parish of Stoke Heath does not seem to make a lot of sense,	RHA
	as there are areas designated as Stoke Heath outside the parish. If this	
	proposal included the AVB area it would include more of Stoke Heath in	
	the Parish of Stoke Heath. If the status quo were maintained, it may avoid	
	the requirement for another parish hall and the additional expense	
	required.	
W SH27	The separation can't be soon enough	RHA
W SH28	Dividing Stoke Heath into two sections seems illogical - both two small	RHA
	and part of the same estate	
W SH29	The creation of a new Parish would be an unnecessary expense.	RHA
W SP4	Seems like a waste of money unless savings can be proved for both	
	potential Parishes. We already have more than enough local layers of	
	government without a further split	
W SP6	I find it difficult to understand the rational behind the boundary for the	
	new parish. As I understand it Stoke Heath has historically been the area	
	between Avoncroft and the Worcester Road, why then has much of this	
	area (around the Hanbury Turn Pub) been excluded from the proposed	
	Stoke Heath parish? At the moment I have no real opinion around the	
	splitting of the Parish although I suspect it will do little to help the' us and	
	them' feeling that exists between a minority of urban and rural residence.	

A 'W' in front of the number is a return from the website rather than a paper return.