

Report of the Executive Director

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

1. Purpose of report

To ask the Governance, Audit and Standards Committee to approve the draft recommendations to be put forward for consultation as part of the Community Governance Review (CGR) which started in June 2021.

2. Background

At its meeting on 17 May 2021, the Committee approved the Consultation Proposals for the Community Governance Review. Following a 3 month consultation, the proposals were reviewed by a Task and Finish Group (TFG) in light of the comments received and alternative proposals put forward by Parish/Town Councils and members of the public. Set out in Appendix 1 are the Consultation Proposals, together with officer comments, the alternative proposals put forward during the consultation, and the TFG’s suggested draft recommendations which include changes which the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) will be asked to make to Ward boundaries. Maps showing the suggested boundaries are circulated as a separate document.

In looking at the parish boundaries, the 5 year land supply was taken into account as well as the importance of maintaining communities and the impact of any changes on parish councils’ precepts. The TFG recognised that the suggested alterations to parish boundaries which they have proposed will result in loss of precept for Awsworth, Eastwood, Greasley and Kimberley, effective from 1 April 2023. Nuthall Parish Council would gain from the proposed changes. Further details are given in Appendix 2. In looking at the financial implications, however, the TFG noted that there are a number of developments which are likely to come online within the next 5 years, including the sites at Newtons Lane, Awsworth, the former Kimberley Brewery site, Hardy Street, Kimberley, the Beamlight Site, Eastwood, and the Acorn Avenue site, Greasley which would mitigate against some of the loss.

There will be a 3 month consultation period on the draft recommendations from 1 December 2021 to 28 February 2022, after which there will be 2 months for the Council to consider the comments received and prepare and publish the final recommendations. The final recommendations will be considered by Council and a decision made on arrangements with a resolution to make a Reorganisation Order in May 2022.

As with the first consultation, a letter will be sent to all Parish/Town Councils, the County Council and all properties which could be affected by a boundary change, informing them of the proposals and the opportunity to submit comments. An FAQ sheet will also be included to cover some of the issues raised during the first consultation such as the effect of a boundary change on a property’s postal address or value.

**Recommendation**

**That the Committee CONSIDERS the suggested draft recommendations put forward by the Task and Finish Group and RESOLVES accordingly.**

Background papers: Nil

**Broxtowe’s Proposals**

**1. AWSWORTH**

**Awsworth Lane (Awsworth)**

Electors	10
Properties	6

From Parish	Kimberley
To Parish	Awsworth
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This is the area to the south of the A610 with properties accessing from Awsworth Lane (Awsworth). Historically this road was the main road between Awsworth and Kimberley before Ginn Close Way and the A610 were constructed. This street is now a dead end with no vehicular link to Kimberley.

Alternative Proposals

No alternatives have been proposed.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

- 1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**
- 2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.**

**Westby Lane**

Electors	6
Properties	2

From Parish	Awsworth
To Parish	Cossall
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

These properties are proposed to move from Awsworth to Cossall to keep the access for the proposed Cossall Parish all within one parish; therefore, if Babbington is not moved, this proposal can be ignored. If it is moved, given the comments of the Parish Council and residents, it is possible to run the boundary up the centre of the road.

Alternative Proposals

Awsworth Parish Council proposed retaining these properties. Residents have objected to the proposal. Cossall Parish Council did not directly reference this change.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That no change be made to the parish boundary, leaving the properties in Awsworth Parish.**

**2. BRINSLEY**

**Cordy Lane**

Electors	2
Properties	1

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Brinsley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

Saints Coppice Farm in Brinsley is accessed from Cordy Lane and isolated from the rest of Greasley Parish. This proposal would move the farm into the same parish as its neighbours.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals have been received.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**3. COSSALL**

**Newtons Lane/The Glebe**

Electors	118
Properties	220

From Parish	Cossall
To Parish	Awsorth
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

This area was identified at the last Ward review due to the boundary passing through properties on The Glebe and the access for the Awsorth properties being isolated and non-continuous from Awsorth Parish. Along with this consideration was that the Awsorth housing site, allocated by the Council’s Part 2 Local Plan in 2018, has an access point off Newtons Lane. Since the identification of the area and allocation, this access point is now considered the secondary access for the development with a new access due to be created on Shilo Way (the Awsorth Bypass). The current boundary would split the development site, with the likelihood that a situation could arise where the properties are again divided into different parishes. Therefore, it is proposed that the boundary is moved so that the development site is completely within Awsorth.

Alternative Proposals

Awsorth Parish Council support Broxtowe’s proposal, stating that it will ‘help facilitate proper planning in Cossall] parish and improve local accountability’. They also mention that residents in this area are likely to be using Awsorth’s facilities.

Cossall Parish Council have put forward the proposal that the boundary is moved so that the development site sits within Awsorth completely and the properties on The Glebe, Newtons Lane and Awsorth Lane all remain/move to Cossall Parish. If the feeling of community/local identity supports this, there is no practical reason it cannot happen.

Residents of the properties on the west of Awsorth Lane have raised their concerns and petitioned strongly to remain in Cossall. There is no impediment to this.

Residents on Newtons Lane and The Glebe have made representations to Cossall Parish Council, forwarded to Broxtowe, stating their strong feeling against the move.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That the proposal submitted by Cossall Parish Council that the development site sits within Awsorth completely and the properties on The Glebe, Newtons Lane and Awsorth Lane all remain/move to Cossall Parish, be put forward as a draft recommendation.**

**Robinettes Lane**

Electors	8
Properties	4

From Parish	Unparished
To Parish	Cossall
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area covers a wide sweep of the rural belt in the centre of Broxtowe. The four properties are addressed to Robinettes Lane on the west of the M1. It is proposed that the M1 therefore forms the sustainable boundary to Cossall Parish before following field boundaries to encompass the four rural properties.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**4. EASTWOOD**

**Newthorpe Common/Wheeler Avenue/Charles Avenue/Dovecote Lane**

Electors	564
Properties	338

From Parish	Eastwood
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

Broxtowe’s proposal suggested making the centre of Dovecote Road, Nottingham Road and Newthorpe Common the boundary between Eastwood and Greasley. Currently the boundary splits properties and streets in this area.

Alternative Proposals

There were alternatives put forward by Eastwood, Greasley and Mr Charlesworth.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That properties on Dovecote Road remain/move into Eastwood up to the boundary with the Greasley Sports Centre and the junction with Mill Road. Additionally, the allotments run by Eastwood Town Council to be moved into Eastwood Town Council’s area
2. That the rear boundary of properties on Charles Avenue be used as the boundary moving all properties on Charles Avenue into Greasley, including nos 1 & 2 Mary Road, 1 & 3 and 2-14 Wheeler Avenue, 1-5 Scargill Avenue, 357 to 363 and 346-360 Nottingham Road Eastwood.
3. All properties on Newthorpe Common, Minster Gardens, Fleetway Close, Keeling Close, Grey Street, Rockley Avenue, Dawson Close, Wyvern Close, Orchard Street and Brick Yard cottage’s, 2-8 1-9 and Halls Lane, 1-7 and 2-8 Daisy Farm Road, and all properties previously split off Commons Close and Violet Avenue to move from Eastwood Town Council area to Greasley Parish.

**Vale Close**

Electors	11
Properties	8

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Eastwood
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

The current boundary cuts through houses and splits off properties into Greasley on Vale Close, which is accessed from Eastwood Parish. It is proposed that these properties all move into Eastwood.

**Alternative Proposals**

Eastwood Town Council supports Broxtowe’s proposal. Greasley Parish Council are proposing using the centre of Mill Road and Dovecote Lane as the boundary for the parish. This would support Broxtowe’s proposal for Vale Close and additionally move in 43 electors and 30 more properties to Eastwood. This proposal would create a sustainable boundary at this point.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**  
**That properties on Vale Close, 79-103 Dovecote Road, 7-21 Mill Road and Beauvale Methodist Church, Dovecote Road move into the Eastwood Town Council area from Greasley Parish.**

**5. GREASLEY**

**Coach Drive**

Electors	441
Properties	256

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Eastwood
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

This area of housing was noted as being an anomaly during the last Ward review in 2014. Access is disconnected from the rest of Greasley Parish meaning residents have to pass through another parish before re-entering their own.

Alternative Proposals

Greasley Parish Council’s response favoured keeping the area within their parish but realigning the boundary along the now canalised Beauvale Brook. Broxtowe received representations which objected to the proposal for historical reasons and because of the erosion to the parish. Eastwood Town Council supported the adoption of the Coach Drive area quoting the fact that they already form part of Eastwood at a borough and county level. The proposal submitted by Mr Charlesworth supported Broxtowe’s proposal.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**  
**That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**

**Beamlight Site/Braemar Avenue**

Electors	103
Properties	62

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Eastwood
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

This area lies to the east of Newmanleys Road at the New Eastwood turning off the A610. It is proposed to move this area, including the eastern half of the Beamlight development site, to Eastwood.

It was identified as an area of concern during the last ward review in 2014 as the properties are isolated from the rest of Greasley Parish and Ward.

Alternative Proposals

Two alternative proposals were received for this area. Firstly, Greasley wishes to retain the area, and add neighbouring properties to their parish so that the boundary goes down the middle of the road. This would also necessitate taking in half of Chewton Street to maintain access. Eastwood meanwhile agreed with Broxtowe but wished to add the rest of the old tip site so that all derelict land in the vicinity becomes part of Eastwood.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**

**Coatsby Road (Greasley)**

Electors	7
Properties	4

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Kimberley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area proposes moving the four properties at the end of Coatsby Road into Kimberley with their neighbours, thereby removing the split in the street and preventing the parish boundary going through houses.

Alternative Proposals

No alternatives to this area were proposed.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

- 1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**
- 2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.**

**Gilt Hill**

Electors	20
Properties	12

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Kimberley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

The properties on Gilt Hill currently within Greasley are isolated from the rest of their parish. It is proposed to move these properties and a small area of fields and have the boundary follow Gilt Brook.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted. Representations received supported the change.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**Ikea Island**

Electors	4
Properties	2

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Kimberley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area is adjacent to the Gilt Hill one but the properties are addressed to Nottingham Road. The proposal is to add these two properties to Kimberley as they are isolated from the rest of the parish but directly adjacent to properties within Kimberley.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were made for this area.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**Larkfields Road**

Electors	30
Properties	16

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Nuthall
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

This proposal prevents properties being split and aligns the boundary to the centre of Larkfield Road.

Alternative Proposals

Greasley Parish Council made no mention of this area in their submission. Kimberley Town Council made no mention of Broxtowe’s proposals but did object to Nuthall Parish Council’s proposals for this area. Nuthall Parish Council made two alternative proposals for their parish area. Both of these would absorb this area and are explored more fully later in this document. Representations made were based on Nuthall’s proposals rather than Broxtowe’s.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That option 1 submitted by Nuthall Parish Council to include all of the Larkfields Estate be incorporated into the Nuthall Parish area be put forward as a draft recommendation.**

**Lindley Street**

Electors	645
Properties	353

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Eastwood
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

This area includes Lindley Street, Brunel Avenue, Hackworth Close, Metcalfe Road and the streets off these. This was initially proposed due to its apparent alignment with Eastwood.

Alternative Proposals

Eastwood supported Broxtowe’s proposal for the same reasons as Coach Drive: the area is part of Eastwood at a borough and county level.

Greasley and Mr Charlesworth both suggested alternatives, which are explored later in the document under Other Proposals.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the Lindley Street area remain in Greasley.
2. That Greasley Parish Council’s proposals for the boundary to be the centre of Mill Road be adopted, including the even addresses on Mill Road, 36-42 Lower Beauvale, 1-7 and 2-8 Metcalfe Road and all properties on Brandyline Gardens.

**South of A610 (GRE-ESM)**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Eastwood
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This change is proposed so that properties on Newmanleys Road (South) are completely within one parish. It proposes the A610 to be the boundary between Greasley and Eastwood at this point before using field boundaries until meeting the borough boundary.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted.

Eastwood Town Council did not mention this area specifically but the proposal map showed it incorporated into the Beamlight Site/Braemar Avenue change which they supported.

Greasley Parish Council mentioned it tangentially in their alternative proposal by stating the boundary should follow the A610.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**South of A610 (GRE-ACT)**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Greasley
To Parish	Awsworth
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

The proposal is to make the A610 the sustainable boundary between Greasley and Awsworth. It does not affect any electors or properties currently.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted.

Awsworth Parish Council supported the proposal.

Greasley Parish Council mentioned it tangentially in their alternative proposal by stating the boundary should follow the A610.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.



6. KIMBERLEY

**Babbington Village**

Electors	63
Properties	32

From Parish	Kimberley
To Parish	Cossall
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

Babbington Village is a hamlet sitting between Awsworth, Cossall and Kimberley. Its vehicular access is from Westby Lane and links it to both Awsworth and Cossall. The residents of Babbington currently have to pass through Awsworth and Greasley before re-entering Kimberley Parish to access their polling station.

Alternative Proposals

Kimberley Town Council’s submission did not state that they wished to retain the village; *however*, they did state that they would be led by the residents of the village.

As the attached representations documents show, we have received several to remain within Kimberley and only one opposing this view.

Cossall Parish Council made no mention of Babbington within their submission.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That no change be made to the parish boundary, leaving Babbington Village in Kimberley Parish.**

**A610 Island (North)**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Kimberley
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This proposal suggests taking the boundary of the parish down the middle of the road, so that it becomes sustainable and easy to follow on the ground

Alternative Proposals

No alternatives have been proposed.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

- 1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**
- 2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.**

**Chilton Drive**

Electors	154
Properties	121

From Parish	Kimberley
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

Currently the boundary between Greasley and Kimberley goes through houses and splits Chilton Drive and Cloverlands Drive between the two parishes. The proposal is to take the remainder of Chilton Drive and Cloverlands into Greasley, along with Hillcrest Close, which accesses from Chilton Drive.

Alternative Proposals

Kimberley Town Council’s proposal retains this area but adds the other end of Chilton Drive, the properties on Cloverlands, the rest of Newdigate Road, Beryldene, Alandene and Corbiere Avenue into Kimberley. This proposal moves 404 electors and 218 properties, which is substantially more than the proposal by Broxtowe.

Broxtowe has not received any representations relating to this area.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

**That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation, but leaving Woodlands Close in Kimberley, moving the boundary to the eastern side of Newdigate Street to its junction with Cloverlands Drive.**

**Disused Railway**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Kimberley
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

This proposal moves the boundary to a recognisable point on the ground (a footbridge) and would be enacted if Chilton Drive moved from Kimberley to Greasley.

Alternative Proposals

No alternatives were proposed for this area, although it was subsequently noticed that the original line as drawn would take in the Flixton Road Play Area from Kimberley. It is now proposed by Broxtowe that this open space is left in Kimberley and the proposed line is along the side of the disused railway.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That the boundary be moved along the side of the disused railway, leaving the Flixton Road play area and open space in Kimberley.**

**Swingate**

Electors	12
Properties	4

From Parish	Unparished
To Parish	Kimberley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This proposal encompasses properties which are accessed from Swingate in Kimberley but are currently unparished and vote at Strelley. It is proposed that the M1 forms the sustainable boundary between the unparished area and Kimberley, with field boundaries as the boundary between Cossall and Kimberley at this point.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were made.

Kimberley Town Council did not refer to the area within their submission.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

- 1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**
- 2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.**

**7. NUTHALL**

**Brackenhurst**

Electors	2
Properties	1

From Parish	Nuthall
To Parish	Kimberley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This property is accessed from Knowle Lane and is split from the rest of Nuthall Parish by the A610, meaning the electors have a long trek to their polling station through Kimberley Parish.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were received for this change.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

- 1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**
- 2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.**

**KIM2**

Electors	96
Properties	68

From Parish	Nuthall
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	Part

Officer Comments

The polling district KIM2 was created because the current parish boundary splits streets and houses. It includes properties on Larkfield Road, Nottingham Road, Oak Drive and Rowan Court. It is proposed that the properties on Larkfield Road, Oak Drive and Rowan Court are moved into Greasley along with their neighbours. This would set the boundary up the centre of Larkfield Road and not require a ward change. However, the properties on Nottingham Road would remain in Nuthall Parish and because that would result in an unviable parish ward (fewer than 100 electors) this would mean that an aligned ward change would be needed for these properties moving them from Kimberley to Watnall and Nuthall West.

Alternative Proposals

Greasley Parish Council made no mention of this area in their submission.

Kimberley Town Council made no mention of Broxtowe’s proposals but did object to Nuthall Parish Council’s proposals for this area.

Nuthall Parish Council made two alternative proposals for their parish area. Both of which would retain this area and are explored more fully later in this document.

Representations made to us were based on Nuthall’s proposals rather than Broxtowe’s.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That the KIM2 polling district remain in Nuthall.**

**Little Holland Gardens**

Electors	5
Properties	2

From Parish	Nuthall
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	No

Officer Comments

The current parish boundary currently splits 33 and 35 Little Holland Gardens from the rest of the street. It is proposed that the boundary is adjusted to move these into Greasley Parish with their neighbours and prevent the boundary going through the middle of the house.

Alternative Proposals

Greasley Parish Council made no representation with regards to this change. The only representation received from residents supported Broxtowe’s proposal. Nuthall Parish Council made two alternative proposals for their parish area. Both of these would retain this area and are explored more fully later in this document.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**  
**That the properties in Little Holland Gardens remain in Nuthall Parish.**

**Nottingham Road (Kimberley)**

Electors	4
Properties	3

From Parish	Nuthall
To Parish	Kimberley
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

These three properties are accessed from the current Kimberley Parish. It is proposed to alter the boundary so that they are within that parish.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals have been made.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation with the additional realignment at 141 Kimberley Road, Nuthall to follow the curtilage of property.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**8. STAPLEFORD**

**Ewe Lamb Close**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Stapleford
To Parish	Unparished
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area includes verge and a garage site accessed from Ewe Lamb Close. It is proposed that the area becomes unparished, in line with the rest of Ewe Lamb Close. This ensures that should it ever be developed in the future, the properties are not in a different administrative area to their neighbours.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were made.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**North of Stapleford Allocation**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Stapleford
To Parish	Trowell
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This is an area of land north of the railway line/Stapleford housing allocation and to the west of Coventry Lane. As the proposal is to make the boundary the railway and Coventry Lane, this area would move from Stapleford to Trowell. It does not affect electors or properties.

It is worth noting that if the decision is to retain Coventry Lane (Bramcote North) in the unparished area, then the proposal would be to make this area unparished also rather than retain it in Stapleford.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted.

There was one representation from a member of the public that was in favour of retaining Boundary Brook as the boundary and not moving it because of the name of the brook/historical reasons.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. Remove from Stapleford & move to unparished area so that Boundary Brook & railway form the boundary at this point.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**Stapleford Allocation (Coventry Lane)**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Unparished
To Parish	Stapleford
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

The parish boundary currently follows the old line of Coventry Lane. This proposal would realign the boundary with the modern line and would prevent potentially issues of properties being split with the development of the Stapleford allocation on the west of Coventry Lane.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted.

One representation mentioned that historically Hulks Farm on the west of Coventry Lane was in Bramcote and should therefore be restored to the unparished area; however, for the moment Coventry Lane is a more sustainable boundary, for reasons outlined above as we do not know the layout of any new housing on the west of Coventry Lane.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**Trowell Park Drive**

Electors	38
Properties	17

From Parish	Stapleford
To Parish	Trowell
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area was identified as an issue during the last ward review in 2014. The properties are accessed from Trowell but sit on the Stapleford side of Boundary Brook. It is another area where they have to pass through a parish before re-entering their own. There are never going to be enough properties or electors in this small area to make a viable parish ward and therefore it is likely that this anomaly will persist for many years if not resolved.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted.

Stapleford Town Council and Trowell Parish Council both support Broxtowe’s proposal. We have received two objections from residents of Trowell Park Drive which mention the historical importance of Boundary Brook and the difference in precept. Trowell Parish Council have asked if the properties which receive a discount from Stapleford Parish because they border Clayfields House will continue to.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**Valmont Road**

Electors	28
Properties	14

From Parish	Stapleford
To Parish	Unparished
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area was identified during the 2014 Ward review as being a potential issue as the properties are addressed Valmont Road and therefore access is not within their parish. It is proposed to move these

Alternative Proposals

No alternatives were proposed.

Stapleford Town Council supported the proposal.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**9. TROWELL**

**Bilborough Road**

Electors	25
Properties	10

From Parish	Trowell
To Parish	Unparished
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area affected a handful of properties on the Broxtowe side of Bilborough Road. They were identified as being quite far from the main area of Trowell and almost disconnected.

Alternative Proposals

Trowell Parish Council wishes to retain the area and the representations we have received support that.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**  
**That no change be made to the parish boundary, leaving the properties in Trowell Parish.**

**Coventry Lane (Bramcote North)**

Electors	1
Properties	1

From Parish	Unparished
To Parish	Trowell
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This area, although small, was quite difficult. Further south we are proposing to use the centre of Coventry Lane as the boundary. This change would maintain this north of the railway line until it joins with the borough boundary; however, it does mean that the single property on the west of Coventry Lane is relatively isolated from the rest of Trowell Parish.

Alternative Proposals

No alternative proposals were submitted for the area, although one representation did spot the isolation of that property.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**  
**That no change be made to the boundary in view of the potential isolation of the property from rest of Trowell Parish.**

**Field Farm**

Electors	0
Properties	0

From Parish	Trowell
To Parish	Stapleford
Ward Change	Yes

Officer Comments

This change is proposed so that all the Field Farm development site is within the same parish with vehicular access to any property from the same parish, i.e. Stapleford.

Alternative Proposals

Both Trowell Parish Council and Stapleford Parish Council agreed with the proposal although representations from the general public mentioned retaining Boundary Brook as the boundary due to historical reasons and the name of the brook. The name of the brook would not change and therefore would retain that historical link.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**OTHER PROPOSALS**

**1. Brinsley**

Broxtowe originally proposed only taking in Saints Coppice Farm off Cordy Lane. However, during the Parish briefings another property was identified at 49 Mansfield Road which fulfils the same criteria of being isolated and in a different parish to its neighbours.

Additionally, Mr Charlesworth’s detailed submission also suggests taking in Grange Fields Farm into Brinsley Parish, again due to access being off Mansfield Road. To make a sustainable boundary that is relatively easy to follow on the ground he also suggests taking Brinsley Pit Tip into the parish.

Combined this would move an extra 2 properties and 3 electors from Greasley into Brinsley.

**Recommendations of the Task & Finish Group**

1. That a change of boundary to incorporate grange fields farm, 49 Mansfield Road and Brinsley Pit Tip in Brinsley Parish be put forward as a draft recommendation.
2. That the LGBCE be asked to approve a related alteration to the Ward boundary.

**2. Mill Road/Lower Beauvale**

Two alternatives to Broxtowe’s proposal were received for the Greasley-Eastwood boundary at Lower Beauvale.

Greasley proposed using the centre of Mill Road as the boundary and Mr Charlesworth proposes using the rear of the properties on the west side of the road, so all properties on Mill Road are within Greasley. Both suggestions provide a sustainable boundary.

Mr Charlesworth’s proposal also takes in Dorothy Avenue and properties addressed to Lower Beauvale.

**Greasley Proposal**

Electors	125
Properties	90

From Parish	Eastwood
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	No

**Mr Charlesworth’s Proposal**

Electors	139
Properties	85

From Parish	Eastwood
To Parish	Greasley
Ward Change	No

Addressed at 4 above.

**3. Nuthall Parish Council**

Nuthall Parish Council made two alternative proposals to Broxtowe’s for their parish area. They went out to consultation for both options and the results are within the representations document. Neither option contravenes any of the criteria for a sustainable parish.

**Option 1 – Nuthall + Larkfields**

Instead of running the boundary down Larkfields Road as proposed by Broxtowe, Nuthall suggested taking in the whole of the Larkfields Estate to the disused railway line.



Option 2 – Nuthall and Watnall

In addition to the streets suggested in Option 1, Nuthall proposes taking in the whole of Watnall to make a Nuthall and Watnall Parish.

See above – 5.

**4. Stapleford Town Council**

Stapleford Town Council looked at three options in addition to Broxtowe’s proposals – absorbing part of Bramcote, absorbing part of Toton, absorbing both parts. They did not go out to consultation with affected electors. They finally submitted to Broxtowe a proposal that annexes half of the Toton Strategic Location for Growth. They have proposed it because it is a historical boundary.

Analysis

Broxtowe have received a number of representations from members of the public since Stapleford Town Council’s intentions were publicised. Bramcote residents were able to persuade the Town Council to drop the proposal which would affect them. Since submitting the option to include half the Toton site, Broxtowe have received multiple representations from Toton residents stating they support Broxtowe’s proposal to maintain the boundary along the A52.

The proposed boundary suggested by Stapleford does pose certain concerns when evaluated against the four criteria - it is not in a sustainable location, it splits a proposed housing site where the layout is not certain, and therefore will likely split properties in half, and the site is separated from the rest of Stapleford by a major trunk road. Their own submission which includes an image of one proposed layout for the housing site, clearly shows the proposed boundary running through properties. They do state that in the future it could use a road which is shown on that layout; however, the layout is not final and we must use sustainable boundaries which currently exist.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That the Task & Finish Group does not recommend the inclusion of Stapleford Town Council’s proposal as a draft recommendation.**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**1. Kimberley School and Leisure Centre**

It was again noted during the parish briefings and subsequently that the parish boundary splits the school site in half. It is now proposed to take the boundary around the edge of the playing fields so that the site is completely within Kimberley.

**Recommendation of the Task & Finish Group**

**That the proposed change be put forward as a draft recommendation.**

**2. Nottinghamshire County Council**

Nottinghamshire County Council responded to the consultation to say they would like to acknowledge their interest in the review but did not wish to make any comments at this time. They would consider the draft recommendations when they are published and if appropriate make representations then.

## APPENDIX 2

Estimated Changes to Parish Precepts

To Parish	Properties	Electors	Added Electors	Added Properties	Added Precept	Removed Electors	Removed Properties	Removed Precept	Net Electors	Net Properties	Net Precept
Awsorth	979	1,591	12	7	578.09	113	53	4,595.81	-101	-46	-4017.72
Brinsley	1,042	1,878	4	4	300.70	0	0	0	4	4	300.70
Cossall	319	590	121	57	2,188.40	2	1	48.63	119	56	2,139.77
Eastwood	5,061	7,975	618	376	11,167.58	1,038	631	18,309.64	-420	-255	-7142.06
Greasley	4,925	8,708	1,161	727	33,461.54	1,571	965	45,780.24	-410	-238	-12,318.70
Kimberley	2,859	4,735	49	26	1,723.26	137	105	4,692.34	-88	-79	-2,969.08
Nuthall	3,254	6,175	922	570	23,413.60	6	4	296.00	916	566	23,117.60
Stapleford	7,235	11,616	0	0	0	66	31	723.59	-66	-31	-723.59
Trowell	1078	1,968	38	17	1,547.42	0	0	0	38	17	1,547.42
Unparished	25,375	40,552	28	14	22.18	20	8	14.23	8	6	7.95