

Comments received during the stage 1 consultation

I strongly believe Beeston should be in Nottingham South. Broxtowe is longer and thinner, and the areas of awsworth, greasley have similar needs, whereas Beeston is a university town and has similar more urban needs to parts of Nottingham South.

Would like to see the ten or so houses at the bottom of [RD:13] be moved in line with the rest of the Vale. As a resident here I do not feel the current boundary means my councillors are representing what is important to me. Similarly, we have spent years battling computer systems that think our postcode is City rather than Broxtowe so reporting a missed bin collection (happens quite frequently as these houses have a different collection day and service to the rest of the Vale), applying for schools, registering for the refuse site, etc is a nightmare and always requires multiple phone calls and escalations/exceptions... we have recently got this changed on Broxtowe Council's website although ironically your system is saying NG8[RD:3] is part of Nottingham South but the boundary actually cuts before it. Surely it would be more efficient for this to be part of City - aligned bin collections, highways maintenance (the other side of the road and the central verge gets mowed and leaves collected more frequently as a City area than the verge in front of my house which is Broxtowe). Happy to provide further input as part of any consultation.

Much of Beeston is heavily urbanised unlike Eastwood. Its population like city south (Lenton & clifton) is made up of a mix of students& local residents. key local issues are similar such as rising house prices & rent in relation to the number of student HMO. Much like city demand for working age council housing in beeston far outstrips demand compared to other parts of broxtowe. In beeston much of the buses are run NCT. Im not a resident of Eastwood but like Kimberly and Much of the northern Derbyshire/Nottinghamshire borderland is far more rural. It lacks investment and services. There is a mix of deprivation and land owners. A lack of transport. In a first past the post system grouping similar areas to improve representation and push local issues is surely key?

From a representation stand point it makes far more sense for Beeston to become part of city south constituency My health services are that of city south constituency. I walk my dog mostly in city.I use a city based social care agency. I living on the border & I say I live in Nottingham. Although city council mismanaged its finances, Nottingham City is underboundaried leading to reduced revenue from council tax. Beeston and places like West Bridgeford massively still use city council services. I'm sure others have left comments that are more facts driven.

Combining Beeston, as a fast developing urban area with strong transport links to the city, with some rural areas like Eastwood located remotely to the north with a very different population and environment is unacceptable. This forms a constituency for which it would be impossible to represent with a single representative, due to the fundamental differences and in the areas covered.

The current Broxtowe boundary does little to support the residents in the north of Broxtowe as it sits both far south and far north of the city of Nottingham. Far better to split Broxtowe geographically at the A610 with Eastwood, Giltbrook, Newthorpe, Watnall and Nuthall together for border change.

I am absolutely appalled at the proposed reorganisation. Kimberley and Nuthall are very much part of Nottinghamshire and have no link to places in Nottingham City like Bestwood and Aspley. It is ridiculous to try and combine these areas, as part of the Broxtowe constituency we have done quite nicely, I fail to see how lumping is in with some labour voting parts of the city would be a positive or remotely necessary move.

The proposed 'Nottingham North and Kimberley' is an artificial grouping of two parts of Nottinghamshire - in separate local authorities - which have little relation to each other, bar being adjacent. The neighbourhoods consisting of the City of Nottingham's northwest have more things to set them apart from the portions of Broxtowe with whom it may share an MP, than what unites them, especially regarding sociological, economic and transportation issues. Indeed, it is difficult for some parts of the constituency to even reach each other via public transport; areas like Bulwell, Top Valley and Bestwood require taking a convoluted route (via the city centre, in a reconstituted Nottingham East) to even get to Nuthall and Kimberley, and that can take upwards of an hour. Issues regarding the greenbelt and giant housing developments are far more likely to concern Kimberley and (Old) Nuthall residents than those of Aspley and Basford, for instance. Sociologically, those from Kimberley and Nuthall may identify as being from 'Nottingham', but they are obviously not, and only do it for convenience, especially for those not from Nottinghamshire.

Considering the inherent urban-suburban mixture of issues, it will also be harder for one MP to represent both parts of the proposed constituency well. For instance, issues such as transportation, housing, schools, retail and recreation manifest themselves dramatically differently in urban areas and their commuter towns. Kimberley and Nuthall are also considerably wealthier than their deprived Nottingham counterparts.

One must also note that the constituencies of 'Nottingham East' and 'Nottingham South' do not gain neighbourhoods from the surrounding Gedling, Rushcliffe, and Broxtowe local authorities, and are therefore solely within the City of Nottingham's boundaries, unlike the contrived 'Nottingham North and Kimberley'. It would be much better to alter the existing Nottingham constituencies more finely to apportion the city's population equally; the ensuring boundaries may have slightly lower populations than the surrounding ones covering Nottinghamshire (i.e. the status quo), but would adhere far more to residents' perception of what constitutes 'Nottingham'.

Unless the House of Commons adopts proportional representation via the single transferable vote (as used for the Northern Ireland Assembly and local councils in Northern Ireland and Scotland) or the additional member system (as used for the Scottish Parliament, Welsh Parliament, and London Assembly), there will always be a significant risk of gerrymandering and malapportionment. Using first-past-the-post perpetuates voter frustration (especially in areas where the winning MP can have significantly less than 50% of the vote) and results in massively disproportionate results - the UK is a significant outlier within the continent of Europe for this. Stop changing boundaries. If it ain't broke don't fix it. We don't pay people to sit in offices all day thinking up stupid ideas.

With regards to the constituency of Broxtowe, where i am a resident the proposed changes are completely unfair. The area we would be gaining to the north are smaller villages with an older and more well off population, and a population the historically votes right (including a bnp mp a few elections ago) and the areas were losing are formed of many lower income areas formed of large council estates that generally vote left. In doing this, the voting of the area is almost definitely going to skew further right towards the conservatives, which is wholly unfair and, in my opinion, bordering on gerrymandering.

I oppose changes to constituency boundaries. Moving Kimberley into Nottingham North would change a Labour seat held by a bright and progressive MP into a marginal. That feels deliberate to me. Changes to boundaries without serious electoral reform is nothing more than gerrymandering!

I object to this amended to the boundaries. Broxtowe Borough currently provides excellent services unlike Nottingham City council which has appalling services and charge higher council tax for an inferior service. This is not political its about Nottingham City wanting to develop more land and gain more income at our expense.

Moving the boundary for the Watnall area to include it as part of Nottingham city will reduce the level of service provided and devalue the properties overall. The current providers Broxtowe Council are much better placed to support this community. Nottingham City is already too large and as a unitary authority fails to provide for the current population it covers. It makes no sense to increase its boundaries just to even out political spread. It would be better to increase Broxtowe's boundaries and reduce the cities. I do not support this proposal at all. It is short sighted and obviously politically driven. It will dramatically effect service level for all residents.

I believe that creating a new constituency of Nottingham North and Kimberley will cause unnecessary confusion regarding multi authority responsibilities ie city/unitary split, county and borough & unitary services in same parliamentary Constituency

Kimberley and Nuthall should not be moved out of Broxtowe. It is part of the identity of the area. Kimberley and Bramcote leisure centres are linked which means my membership allows me to use both because they are in Broxtowe. Even though I live in Kimberley my son goes to swimming lessons at the Bramcote centre. Being in Broxtowe feels like the suburbs of Nottingham as we are on the outskirts but moving into Nottingham North worries me as it brings us into the city. I worry what more development this will bring to where I live. We are in a beautiful green area but with good transport links to Nottingham and are already being invaded by HS2. I don't want to live in the city of Nottingham. I want to live in the outskirts with all of the perks this brings. My partner has volunteered in Broxtowe and we have enjoyed becoming part of the wider community. A change of boundary isn't just about geography but it will break up established communities who are supporting many people.

Would this change School holiday term dates? This will affect many families as many people choose Kimberley for their home due to the proximity to the m1 and travel to different counties who maintain the more traditional school holiday dates than Nottingham do.

I think this is a potential sneaky political move for certain political parties to gain more seats and therefore gain more power.

The existing boundaries for Broxtowe should be preserved, to maintain community and constituency ties between Kimberley, Nuthall, and Wathall with Bolsover, and since Broxtowe is already within the statutory electorate range - there is no need to change the boundaries.

The new division of are areas appear to be geographically haphazard. They show no consideration for natural locationally grouped areas. Surely the numbers of voters can be achieved for an area without ridiculous elongated wards or random spikes encompassing a small group of houses.

I have some concern about the proposals for Broxtowe. Broxtowe has for some time, geographically, been a long thin North to South constituency which, in Nottingham, is problematic. There are more ex-mining areas in the North with villages around them supporting older residents (see Awsworth, Eastwood) - far different from the needs of Beeston - with direct links to London, young professionals, and students. Indeed, an MP for Broxtowe has to essentially balance two very different sets of needs. While this has been the case, the one positive of the previous boundary was that this split was relatively even. The inclusion of residents living near Kimberley and Eastwood ensured, to some degree, that the needs of constituents in the North did not fall away to the needs of those in the South. However, I worry that the new boundary fails to protect this dynamic. The northern section of Broxtowe would become a meagre strip of land that looks like an afterthought, included only to boost the numbers to the needed level. Being outnumbered will no doubt mean the residents of Awsworth and surrounding villages will have their voice stripped away; they become the tail being wagged by the Beeston based dog. I feel strongly a much wiser split, more in keeping with the different populations and needs, would be to ensure Awsworth is linked closely with Eastwood and Kimberley - which is exactly the case in daily life. Our buses connect Eastwood, Kimberley and Awsworth (not Beeston), our jobs and facilities are between Kimberley, Eastwood and Awsworth (see Giltbrook retail park; Beeston), our families for generations are across these mining areas. The constituency has never been ideal in this regard, but these changes leave Awsworth isolated and vulnerable, beholden to the views of a more transient population with very constricting opportunities, jobs, wealth, housing options and services. Please consider

demographic indicators, social deprivation indicators, the needs of the population, and reconsider these proposals.

I just cannot see how the Eastwood area and Beeston are connected. It would make much more sense to enlarge the Beeston council towards the city centre, Dunkirk & some of Lenton and spread the Notts North Borough to encompass Eastwood. Or include Long Eaton with Beeston and let Ilkeston, Eastwood and Trowel be in the same council.

Really can't see how this is going to work. There are so many diverse areas in this proposed "new" constituency. How can a fairly rural area like this part of Broxtowe (constituency now) be put in with a small town like Bulwell which is in the City of Nottingham? No sense at all!

I have lived at my current address in Nuthall for 40 years and have not had any issues with the services I get from Broxtowe Borough Council. A move into the Nottingham City boundary would be a backward step in my opinion. Nottingham City has never been run well and the recent fiasco with Robin Hood Energy was the last straw. In my opinion, moving the boundary to encompass Nuthall, Kimberley and Watnall is purely for political reasons and totally unnecessary. It will probably affect my insurance premiums, Council Tax and services in an adverse way. I will certainly consider moving out of the village if this change goes ahead.

Broxtowe CC: I am concerned by the Commission's proposals to include the wards of Kimberley, Nuthall East and Strelley and Watnall and Nuthall West into the Nottingham North Constituency. Kimberley is a market town separated from the Nottingham City conurbation by green fields and likewise Nuthall is rural in character and would not fit easily into an urban constituency. By contrast, parts of Beeston are seen much more as a continuation of Nottingham City having strong links to the University and key businesses meaning it is often difficult to distinguish where one ends and the other begins. I would therefore propose a Broxtowe constituency that instead excludes the three Beeston wards of Beeston Central, Beeston North and Beeston Rylands. Broxtowe would therefore comprise of the following wards: Attenborough and Chilwell East, Awsworth Cossall and Trowell, Beeston West, Bramcote, Brinsley, Chilwell West, Eastwood Hall, Eastwood Hilltop, Eastwood St Mary's, Greasley, Kimberley, Nuthall East and Strelley, Stapleford North, Stapleford South East, Stapleford South West, Toton and Chilwell Meadows, Watnall and Nuthall West. This would give Broxtowe CC an electorate of 73,378

Ilkeston and Long Eaton CC: No objections to the proposed boundaries however I believe the name change is not necessary. The name Erewash has been in use since 1983 as the constituency comprises the majority of the Borough Council area. The name Ilkeston and Long Eaton would also likely exclude the other towns and villages in the constituency I believe that the name Erewash CC should be retained for this proposed constituency.

Nottingham East BC: would suggest a slightly altered Nottingham East constituency to comprise of the wards of Berridge, Castle, Dales, Hyson Green, Mapperley, Sherwood and St Ann's. This would give Nottingham East BC and electorate of 75,327

Nottingham North BC: In contrast to the commission's proposals, I would propose a Nottingham North constituency to be contained entirely within the City of Nottingham and comprise of the following wards: Aspley, Basford, Bestwood, Bilborough, Bulwell, Bulwell Forest and Leen Valley. This would give Nottingham North BC and electorate of 73,415

Nottingham South BC: Due to the exclusion of the 3 Beeston wards from Broxtowe CC, I would suggest they instead be included with the proposed Nottingham South BC. Beeston, in contrast to Kimberley and Nuthall is much more urban in character and although a town in its own right, it is much more a part of the Nottingham City conurbation due to strong transport links and the nearby university. I would propose that this constituency comprise of the following wards: Clifton East, Clifton West, Lenton and Wollaton East, Meadows, Radford and Wollaton West from the City of Nottingham and the wards of Beeston Central, Beeston North and Beeston Rylands from Broxtowe Borough. This would give Nottingham South BC and electorate of 76,259.

It seems strange to have such a long thin North-South constituency. Many people in Chilwell and Beeston work within the Nottingham City boundary and therefore have much more in common with the City residents than they do with the north of the proposed constituency. Even those who do not work in the City will use it for shopping or recreation. I would suggest that a "short, broad" constituency extending eastwards into Lenton and/or Radford would be more consistent. If the Commission considers that constituency boundaries should align with local Government areas, then perhaps it is time to reconsider the latter as well.

I am the Nottinghamshire County Councillor for Nuthall and Kimberley and the Broxtowe Borough Councillor for Nuthall East and Strelley. I wish to strongly object to your proposals to include Nuthall, Kimberley and Strelley into the Nottingham City parliamentary seat which you propose to call Nottingham North and Kimberley. This is clearly all to do with numbers and nothing to do with community of interest considerations. Even in the proposed name you separate Kimberley from Nuthall both of which have almost identical populations and are communities within themselves. Nuthall, Kimberley and Strelley have nothing in common with the City of Nottingham. Indeed many residents tell me that they have moved into Nuthall or Kimberley to get away from any influence or association with the City. Based purely on a numbers scenario you wish to push them back against their wishes. Both Nuthall and Kimberley are historical communities based on well established parish councils. Strelley has a regular parish meeting rather than a parish council. No such arrangement exists in the City and these locally based councils act as cohesive cement ensuring that the communities they represent are well represented. An MP covering these areas is unlikely to have any great interest in these communities since the overwhelming components of the constituency will be formed from Nottingham City which as a unitary authority operates in a different way. The only thing that connects Nuthall and Kimberley to the rest of the proposed constituency is the A610. There is a clear demarcation, not only physically between these two communities and the City but, also in outlook aspiration and achievement. The issues of my two communities are far different from those of the City and I have no doubt they would be forgotten as being peripheral to the rest of the proposed constituency.

If parts of Broxtowe were to be included in any City based constituency there are other more logical places, such as Beeston which has a large student population that looks obviously to Nottingham University and the City for its requirements. This is in sharp contrast to Nuthall and Kimberley who look away from the City for their facilities. Children attend local primary schools in Nuthall and Kimberley, the vast majority of secondary pupils attend the Kimberley Academy. Leisure activities are provided by the Kimberley Leisure Centre and the community hubs/parish halls provide appropriate venues for many other activities that occur within the two communities. Residents look to the Kimberley shopping centre for most of their everyday needs and for other items they will go to the Giltbrook retail park which is just down the road but well outside of the City. There is a vibrant night life in Kimberley and restaurants in Nuthall which cater for the local population. Your proposals would obliterate the identities of the three communities that I represent as they would simply become part of greater Nottingham. That is not what people want. At the moment within the current Broxtowe constituency they are part of a collection of individual communities supported by long standing parish councils. This has been recognised quite easily by the various members of parliament because each community within the Broxtowe constituency is on an equal footing i.e. first among equals. Your proposals would bring that to an end and destroy what has been in place for over 100 years, thriving individual communities, which whilst having grown and developed, have managed to retain that village and community way of life. The communities of Nuthall, Kimberley and Strelley have never been part of the City or part of a parliamentary seat including Nottingham. They do not want to be part of such a constituency going forward. They are separate independent communities with a pedigree going back for many years. Please rethink this ludicrous proposal that you have put in front of us. To assist the Commission I append a suggested alteration to the Commission's proposals that will enable to suggestions that I have made to be implemented.

Broxtowe - TOTAL 73378

Bramcote 5838 Broxtowe
Attenborough and Chilwell East 5711 Broxtowe
Awsorth, Cossall and Trowell 4151 Broxtowe
Beeston West 4154 Broxtowe
Chilwell West 5783 Broxtowe
Greasley 5449 Broxtowe
Kimberley 5299 Broxtowe
Nuthall East and Strelley 4082 Broxtowe
Stapleford North 3557 Broxtowe
Stapleford South East 3968 Broxtowe
Stapleford South West 4035 Broxtowe
Toton and Chilwell Meadows 6349 Broxtowe
Watnall and Nuthall West 3660 Broxtowe
Eastwood Hilltop 3967 Ashfield
Eastwood St Mary's 3494 Ashfield
Eastwood Hall 1972 Ashfield
Brinsley 1909 Ashfield

Nottingham South - TOTAL 6259

Wollaton West 11153 Nottingham South
Lenton and Wollaton East 16041 Nottingham South
Meadows 6485 Nottingham South
Clifton East 12225 Nottingham South
Clifton West 7899 Nottingham South
Radford 10332 Nottingham South
Beeston Rylands 3538 Broxtowe
Beeston Central 4271 Broxtowe
Beeston North 4315 Broxtowe

Nottingham East - TOTAL 75327

Mapperley 10767 Nottingham East
Hyson Green and Arboretum 13302 Nottingham East
St Ann's 12264 Nottingham East
Sherwood 11074 Nottingham East
Berridge 10115 Nottingham East
Dales 10720 Nottingham East
Castle 7085 Nottingham South

Nottingham North
Bilborough 11941 Nottingham North
Aspley 10759 Nottingham North
Basford 11200 Nottingham North
Bestwood 11554 Nottingham

RE: proposals for ASHFIELD, NOTTINGHAM NORTH, BROXTOWE, GEDLING.

I believe that the initial proposals for these Nottinghamshire constituencies can be improved on, in order to keep the Kimberley ward in a fully shire constituency and to put the Bestwood & St Alban's ward with territory with which it has closer ties on account of schools whose intakes are mainly from the city of Nottingham. My solution is as follows:

1) The proposed ASHFIELD (71,703), but retaining the ward of Brinsley (1,909), giving a total electorate of 73,612.

2) With Brinsley removed, reducing BROXTOWE to 70,552, the Kimberley ward can be added (5,299) to produce a total BROXTOWE electorate of 75,851.

This causes less disruption to the current BROXTOWE constituency.

3) Without the Kimberley ward, the proposed NOTTINGHAM NORTH needs an alternative extra ward to meet the quota, being down at 69,216. This can be easily achieved by adding on the Bestwood St Albans ward (3,967) which contains residential areas continuous with the north-eastern corner of the current seat, and contains schools, not least a secondary school, with a predominantly City as opposed to county intake. Adding this ward gives us a NOTTINGHAM NORTH with an electorate of 73,183.

4) GEDLING is still within the quota range without the Bestwood St Albans ward, which has closer links with the north side of Nottingham than with suburbs to its east. Its proposed electorate is reduced to a perfectly acceptable 71,828.

I submit the above for your consideration.

PARLIAMENTARY BOUNDARY CHANGE FOR NUTHALL, STRELLEY, WATNALL AND KIMBERLEY

I am a Broxtowe Borough Councillor for Nuthall West and Watnall. The proposals to include Nuthall and Watnall into the Nottingham City Parliamentary seat is proposed to be called Nottingham North and Kimberley. This is clearly all to do with numbers and nothing to do with community of interest considerations. Even in the proposed name Kimberley is separated from Nuthall both of which have almost identical populations and are communities within themselves. Nuthall and Watnall have nothing in common with the City of Nottingham. Indeed many residents say that they have moved into Nuthall or Watnall to get away from any influence or association with the City. Based purely on a numbers scenario it is intended to push them back against their wishes. These areas are historical communities based on well established Parish Councils. No such arrangement exists in the City and these locally based councils act as cohesive cement ensuring that the communities they represent are well represented. An MP covering these areas is unlikely to have any great interest in these communities since the overwhelming components of the constituency will be formed from Nottingham City which as a unitary authority operates in a different way. The only thing that connects Nuthall and Kimberley to the rest of the proposed constituency is the A610. There is a clear demarcation, not only physically between these two communities and the City but, also in outlook aspiration and achievement. The issues of these two communities are far different from those of the City and I have no doubt they would be forgotten as being peripheral to the rest of the proposed constituency.

If parts of Broxtowe were to be included in any City based constituency there are other more logical places, such as Beeston which has a large student population that looks obviously to Nottingham University and the City for its requirements. This is in sharp contrast to Nuthall and Kimberley who look away from the City for their facilities. Children attend local primary schools in Nuthall and Kimberley; the vast majority of secondary pupils attend the Kimberley Academy. Leisure activities are provided by the Kimberley Leisure Centre and the community hubs/parish halls provide appropriate venues for many other activities that occur within the two communities. Residents look to the Kimberley shopping centre for most of their everyday needs and for other items they will go to the Giltbrook retail park which is just down the road but well outside of the City. There is a vibrant night life in Kimberley and restaurants in Nuthall which cater for the local population.

Your proposals would obliterate the identities of the three communities that I represent as they would simply become part of greater Nottingham. That is not what people want. At the moment within the current Broxtowe constituency they are part of a collection of individual communities supported by long standing parish councils. This has been recognised quite easily by the various members of parliament because each community within the Broxtowe constituency is on an equal footing i.e. first among equals. Your proposals would bring that to an end and destroy what has been in place for over 100 years, thriving individual communities, which whilst having grown and developed, have managed to retain that village and community way of life. The communities of Nuthall and Watnall have never been part of the City or part of a parliamentary seat including Nottingham. They do not want to be part of such a constituency going forward. They are separate independent communities with a pedigree going back for many years. Please rethink this ludicrous proposal that you have put in front of us.

I am fully supportive of the need to change the constituency areas in accordance with numbers. Breaking us away from Broxtowe - I do not have a problem with. However, we moved from the city to the county in order to have the same school holidays as my children. (I work in Nottinghamshire as a teacher) we paid a premium price in order to move to the county. I am appalled. Are we going to have to continue moving every few years every time you decide to review! Equally the cost of insurances in the city is higher and I have no doubt there will be a negative affect on our house prices. Surely Nuthall (a village) Watnall and Kimberley could be encompassed with another boundary in the COUNTY. How can a Village be in a city? It is non sensical.

The proposals to include Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley into the Nottingham City Parliamentary seat is proposed to be called Nottingham North and Kimberley. This is clearly all to do with numbers and nothing to do with community or interest considerations. Even in the proposed name Kimberley is separated from Nuthall both of which have almost identical populations and are communities within themselves. Nuthall, Kimberley Strelley and Watnall have nothing in common with the City of Nottingham. Indeed many residents say that they have moved into these areas to get away from any influence or association with the City. Based purely on a numbers scenario it is intended to push them back against their wishes. Nuthall, Kimberley and Watnall are historical communities based on well established Parish Councils. Strelley has a regular Parish Meeting rather than a Parish Council. No such arrangement exists in the City and these locally based councils act as cohesive cement ensuring that the communities they represent are well represented. An MP covering these areas is unlikely to have any great interest in these communities since the overwhelming components of the constituency will be formed from Nottingham City which as a unitary authority operates in a different way. The only thing that connects Nuthall, Kimberley, Strelley and Watnall to the rest of the proposed constituency is the A610. There is a clear demarcation, not only physically between these communities and the City but, also in outlook aspiration and achievement. The issues of these communities are far different from those of the City and there is no doubt they would be forgotten as being peripheral to the rest of the proposed constituency. If parts of Broxtowe were to be included in any City based constituency there are other more logical places, such as Beeston which has a large student population that looks obviously to Nottingham University and the City for its requirements. This is in sharp contrast to Nuthall, Strelley, Kimberley and Watnall who look away from the City for their facilities. Children attend local primary schools in Nuthall and Kimberley; the vast majority of secondary pupils attend the Kimberley Academy. Leisure activities are provided by the Kimberley Leisure Centre and the community hubs/parish halls provide appropriate venues for many other activities that occur within the communities. Residents look to the Kimberley shopping Centre for most of their everyday needs and for other items they will go to the Giltbrook Retail Park which is just down the road but well outside of the City. There is a vibrant night life in the area which caters for the local population. The proposals would obliterate the identities of these communities as they would simply become part of greater Nottingham. At the moment within the current Broxtowe constituency they are

part of a collection of individual communities supported by long standing Parish Councils. This has been recognised quite easily by the various members of Parliament because each community within the Broxtowe constituency is on an equal footing ie first among equals. The proposals would bring that to an end and destroy what has been in place for over 100 years, thriving individual communities, which whilst having grown and developed, have managed to retain that village and community way of life. The communities of Nuthall, Kimberley, Strelley and Watnall have never been part of the City or part of a parliamentary seat including Nottingham. They do not want to be part of such a constituency going forward. They are separate independent communities with a pedigree going back for many years.

In common with both my Parish and Borough councils I am totally against the proposed changes to the parliamentary boundaries which take Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley into the Parliamentary seat of the city of Nottingham. These areas are not part the city of Nottingham, they fall under the purview of Broxtowe Borough Council and are represented by an MP who whose constituency covers roughly the same area. I cannot help but believe the true needs and interests of these (what would become) "outlier" areas would be subservient to the general interests of the wider city area covered by the new constituency.

My thoughts reflect the consensus of both the Borough and Parish Councillors elected by the community to represent them in all matters such as these. I trust the Boundary Commission will take the views of our elected representatives seriously and not press ahead with changes that quite frankly make no sense. If parts of Broxtowe have to be included in any City based constituency there are other more logical places, such as Beeston which has a large student population that looks obviously to Nottingham University and the City for its requirements. This is in sharp contrast to Nuthall, Strelley, Kimberley and Watnall who look away from the City for their facilities. Children attend local primary schools in Nuthall and Kimberley; the vast majority of secondary pupils attend the Kimberley Academy. Leisure activities are provided by the Kimberley Leisure Centre and the community hubs/parish halls provide appropriate venues for many other activities that occur within the communities. I believe these proposals would obliterate the identities of the communities of Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley as they would simply be subsumed into a "greater" Nottingham, something Nottingham City Council have been pushing for some time now and something the vast majority of people living in these communities do not want.

As a resident of Nuthall and part of the Broxtowe Constituency I am concerned about the changes to the proposed constituencies. I and my family believe ourselves to live in the County and do not feel to belong to the City. Our community is strong and vibrant and we use other areas of Broxtowe for shopping and recreation, such as Kimberley, Beeston and Eastwood. Currently I feel that the constituency reflects our local council and do not see how putting us with parts of the city keeps the integrity of our community. It feels like the city will encompass most of the outlying villages and small towns and this is being done by the back door via constituency changes.

I couldn't have put it better than my local councillors, and agree wholeheartedly:

Dear Resident

You may probably be aware of changes to the parliamentary boundaries which take Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley into the Parliamentary seat of the city of Nottingham. Nuthall Parish Council and your Borough Councillors are against these proposals for the following reasons.

PARLIAMENTARY BOUNDARY CHANGE FOR NUTHALL, STRELLEY, WATNALL AND KIMBERLEY

The proposals to include Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley into the Nottingham City Parliamentary seat is proposed to be called Nottingham North and Kimberley. This is clearly all to do with numbers and nothing to do with community or interest considerations. Even in the proposed name Kimberley is separated from Nuthall both of which have almost identical populations and are communities within themselves. Nuthall, Kimberley Strelley and Watnall have nothing in common with the City of Nottingham. Indeed many residents say that they have moved into these areas to get away from any influence or association with the City. Based purely on a numbers scenario it is intended to push them back against their wishes.

Nuthall, Kimberley and Watnall are historical communities based on well established Parish Councils. Strelley has a regular Parish Meeting rather than a Parish Council. No such arrangement exists in the City and these locally based councils act as cohesive cement ensuring that the communities they represent are well represented.

An MP covering these areas is unlikely to have any great interest in these communities since the overwhelming components of the constituency will be formed from Nottingham City which as a unitary authority operates in a different way. The only thing that connects Nuthall, Kimberley, Strelley and Watnall to the rest of the proposed constituency is the A610. There is a clear demarcation, not only physically between these communities and the City but, also in outlook aspiration and achievement. The issues of these communities are far different from those of the City and there is no doubt they would be forgotten as being peripheral to the rest of the proposed constituency. If parts of Broxtowe were to be included in any City based constituency there are other more logical places, such as Beeston which has a large student population that looks obviously to Nottingham University and the City for its requirements. This is in sharp contrast to Nuthall, Strelley, Kimberley and Watnall who look away from the City for their facilities. Children attend local primary schools in Nuthall and Kimberley; the vast majority of secondary pupils attend the Kimberley Academy. Leisure activities are provided by the Kimberley Leisure Centre and the community hubs/parish halls provide appropriate venues for many other activities that occur within the communities. Residents look to the Kimberley shopping Centre for most of their everyday needs and for other items they will go to the Giltbrook Retail Park which is just down the road but well outside of the City. There is a vibrant night life in the area which caters for the local population.

The proposals would obliterate the identities of these communities as they would simply become part of greater Nottingham. At the moment within the current Broxtowe constituency they are part of a collection of individual communities supported by long standing Parish Councils. This has been recognised quite easily by the various members of Parliament because each community within the Broxtowe constituency is on an equal footing ie first among equals. The proposals would bring that to an end and destroy what has been in place for over 100 years, thriving individual communities, which whilst having grown and developed, have managed to retain that village and community way of life. The communities of Nuthall, Kimberley, Strelley and Watnall have never been part of the City or part of a parliamentary seat including Nottingham. They do not want to be part of such a constituency going forward. They are separate independent communities with a pedigree going back for many years.

I think this is a perfectly logical and sensible boundary change. Kimberley and Nuthall are a self contained community and it would be easy to move them into a new constituency without having any negative impact, whereas attempting to move other parts of the constituency, for example,

parts of Beeston would cut communities in half. This is the best choice in my opinion.

As a resident of Nuthall I agree with the proposal boundary change to include Nuthall Watnall Kimberley and Strelley in the new North Nottingham and Kimberley constituency. These places are established settlements on the edge of the existing Nottingham North constituency, whose residents have close connections with Nottingham. These connections are through employment with many resident's working in the City; learning as the FE and HE provision residents attend is in the city; culture and leisure. for entertainment, hospitality and retail; and healthcare for many primary and secondary care treatment including 2 major hospitals. These places are all symbiotic with Nottingham North with all arterial routes from these places directed through Nottingham North into the City Centre.

I am horrified at the prospect of Kimberley joining Nottingham City. I hope we can stay as we are, or the whole area will be ruined.

I support the proposal to include Kimberley etc with North Nottingham in a reshaped constituency. Some part of Broxtowe Borough must be left out of that constituency and this is the correct part. People living here have much closer links with North Nottingham than with Beeston and the South of the borough. We work there, shop there and spend leisure time there. We also pass through it to enjoy the benefits of the the rest of the city. It would be helpful to have an MP familiar with, and involved in, issues affecting both a city area and a county area.

This seems a crazy change and will mix area that all under city and county councils and will cause all sorts of pain as to who is responsible. It is bad enough trying to get ownership on some items now! I do not feel that this is in the interests of the residents.

I do not agree with the proposal to extend the Broxtowe further north to an area north of Eastwood. You state "As far as possible, we try to have regard to local ties, geographic factors" i believe that constituents in the densely populated south of the current constituency had far stronger 'local ties' and there are stronger 'geographical factors' to link Broxtowe with parts of Wollaton and/or Long Eaton. Please consider revising your proposal to create a constituency of geographically and local linked constituents (as per your stated aims)

How dare my local MP say my ward feels part of the city. I definitely do not feel part of Nottingham South! For a start Nottingham South is south of the River Trent I live North of the Trent and NOT in the city. I smell a rat, is being proposed because we have local Labour councillors? I am not a Labour voter and will not be pulled in with them. We are part of Broxtowe and will never feel part of the city of Nottingham

I strongly object to Beeston or Beeston Roland's becoming part of the city as suggested by our 'MP' who clearly has no sense of our community as he doesn't live here! I am not part of the City and do not want to be part of the city, he is quite clearly wanting to do this as both Beeston Central and Beeston Roland's are Labour voters and he is wanting us out of the equation so he can keep his seat, this is an illegal practice and I believe it even has its own name. I am not part of the City and will not be made to be part of the City!

It's illogical to add Nuthall into Nottingham City area. Surely adding beeston with its connections to Nottingham Uni would make more sense. We are not city people more community and country. Broxtowe is part of our identity

Having reflected on the proposed boundary changes and talking to some people of kimberley I realise that changing the constancy boundaries will make little difference as both the other authorities of Broxtowe Borough council and Notts county council will remain Our MP Darren Henry is touting that Kimberley stays in Broxtowe constituency and split Beeston in two. This will ruin there community if a town is split in two and realistically we have as much in common to Nottingham North as we do to Broxtowe south ie Beeston

Revert name to Nottingham North. The seat now takes in Nuthall and Kimberley but both are dormer villages for the city, and also it would be unfair to elevate one above the other.

I do not wish Kimberley to be moved from its current location as part of Broxtowe. I have lived in Kimberley for 40 years and been happy with 'the town and particularly its political representation, and this would certainly change were we to be moved. As such my views would definitely not be represented..

We are in support of the proposed change to review the boundary of Stapleford & Trowell. Currently our property sits in the boundary of Stapleford, but cannot be accessed directly. The proposal is to move properties beyond the boundary brook on Trowell Park Drive into the Parish of Trowell. We support this move.

I fully agree to the commission's view that Nuthall and Kimberley should be removed from the Broxtowe constituency and become part of Nottingham North constituency. We have much more in common with Nottingham than Broxtowe. Nuthall and Kimberley is a part of Broxtowe that lags behind in investment. The southern part of the constituency attracts all the investment. My wife and I go to Nottingham for the cinema, theatre and shopping. I have been campaigning for the tram to be extended to Nuthall and Kimberley for over 10 years without success as we are outside the city boundary.

It concerns me that our area is being linked up with the city, we have a lovely community here with our own parish councils, members of which are really beginning to engage with members of the public on local matters. I fear this work between residents and council members would then take a massive plummet and be affected. Please don't change our set up just when residents are starting to feel heard and understood

My husband and I both work in Notts County Council schools. We chose to live in Nuthall because our children would attend county council schools so we all have the same holiday dates. Making Nuthall part of the city would be disastrous for us because we could potentially have different holidays from our children.

I believe that Beeston has a lot more in common with the City of Nottingham than the rest of Broxtowe and it should be part of Nottingham South instead. It is an urban area with a unique character.

I object in the strongest possible terms to being forced to become a part of Nottingham City, whether it is for constituency boundaries or otherwise. I am happy to remain in Nottinghamshire under the control of Broxtowe Borough Council and Kimberley Town Council. As the old saying goes, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it".

Nuthall, Kimberley, Strelley and Watnall have nothing in common with the City of Nottingham. We moved into this area to get away from any association with the City. We are historical communities based on well established Parish Councils. We look away from the City for our facilities whereas areas such as Beeston which has a large student population looks to the City for its requirements so this would make more sense to include areas such as this. These proposals would obliterate the identities of our communities as we would become part of greater Nottingham which we strongly object to. We are separate independent communities going back over 100 years and do not wish to be a part of this new constituency going forward. Any future MP covering these areas is unlikely to have any great interest in our communities and would only be interested in what is good for the City which is not necessarily beneficial to us. There is no logical reason to extend the City boundaries any further than they are now. We refuse to lose our individual identities and this is clearly a number crunching exercise and nothing to do with preserving our communities. It could also threaten our Green Belt land which keeps our communities separate.

I support the current proposal. I live in Kimberley and it doesn't make much difference where the boundary is drawn, but I do support a better balance of constituents in our constituency.

I have used the Erewash Canal for over 40 years and particularly value the Industrial Heritage of this area - it is unique and has a great community spirit to match.

I am sure that the proposal to change the name of the Parliamentary Constituency from Erewash to something else would have a detrimental effect on the community here, and I see no reason for making such a change.

The houses on [RD:8] have also historically been associated with Greasley Ward. This makes little sense however as the main road and dwellings all identify with Kimberley. We get no election material for the correct ward and moving forwards if the parliamentary boundary were to move too I fear we would be missed from issues relevant to us. These houses identify with Kimberley and should be part of the new Kimberley North constituency. Leaving a spur of houses in Broxtowe makes very little sense.

Please see attached document that outlines the views of Nuthall Parish Council.

I received an email from my MP on the boundary changes. I understand the sense in Eastwood being represented as part of the same constituency as the local council, however, I do not think Broxtowe is a sensible constituency and as a consequence I would prefer it and it's local council be removed altogether. Since the new Government took charge, our MP, Lee Anderson has been very successful in procuring central government funds for Sutton-in-Ashfield and Darren Henry has done similarly well for Stapleford in Broxtowe. Once again, Eastwood is left until last. Putting Eastwood back in the Broxtowe constituency will not change this. The ridiculous geographical shape of the constituency results in the disinterest of Government at all levels in the very poor area of Eastwood. It is understandable as I am sure Beeston, Bramcote, Chilwell, Attenborough and the soon to be regenerated Stapleford, all in the south of your proposed constituency, are home to the overwhelming majority of constituents. Consequently, if you want to get re-elected, Eastwood is not at all important. We will never be "levelled-up" on this basis. While I understand your drive for a reasonable proportion of constituents to MPs, might I suggest a different approach. Instead of defined constituencies, it would be better to have super groups defined by sensible geographic boundaries with more than one representative. This area could then elect a number of MP's proportional to it's population. Parties could field more than one candidate if they wished (and risk splitting their votes) yet I would keep a first past the post system which is easy to understand for the electorate. If Broxtowe, Erewash and the two adjacent Nottingham constituencies elected 4 members in this manner, it is likely we would have MP's of more than one colour who would then be forced to work together for the benefit of their constituents. This would mean that because there is no definite population centre for any one MP, voices in smaller more remote areas are more likely to be heard. It might also reduce the divisiveness of our politics if MP's of different colours are made to realise their ideologies are secondary to the needs of their constituents. Anyway, Broxtowe isn't a real place and it shouldn't be a constituency. It is a geographical anomaly wedged between Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire that nobody knows what to do with

I fully support the boundary change which will create the new constituency of North Nottingham and Kimberley. It is more logical than our current constituency of Broxtowe as we are closer to North Nottingham. Also, people in this area rarely go to the south of Broxtowe whereas they often go into Nottingham City. I have heard claims that we would be destroyed as a community. This is, quite frankly, ridiculous scaremongering. It won't have a detrimental effect on the Kimberley/Nuthall/Watnall area - we will retain our identity whatever the parliamentary boundaries are.

Really don't want to be in the Nottinghamshire city boundaries or council. We are a small community and wish to remain so and if 'd have wanted to be included in the greater Nottingham council I would have lived there. We moved to nuthall to get away from that council and are very happy with Broxtowe. We don't want this change. We have local parish councils who are our voice we don't want to lose our identity. Why should MPs dictate. A very irate member off the public

Here in Nuthall, we are separated from the City, with shopping and leisure facilities best suited to the smaller communities in this area of Broxtowe. Broxtowe Borough Council can look after our needs quite adequately, and are not shackled by the financial burdens which Nottingham City face. I believe the intention to expand the City boundaries has only one clear aim, and that is to increase the number of households within the City's grasp who will then be forced to pay Council taxes to the City in an attempt to bail out the City Council. I also believe these additional funds will therefore not be used for the benefit of the former residents of Broxtowe who will have

been subsumed into the larger City conglomeration.

i have been living in nuthall for best part of 25 years plus as have always regarded as part of the county. i dont think there is any similarity in demographics with the city boundary and i totally oppose to nuthall being classed as part of nottingham city in the proposed changes.

i am also opposed to the whole way of work of nottingham city council with its blatant spend on pet projects which has driven the council to be virtually bankrupt. i therefore do not want any part of this and prefer nuthall to remain in broxtowe constituency anf within nottinghsm county council. also there is very little if any commonality with the city with regards to health and social care, deprivation, and most resource we tend to use are in the county and not the city region. communities in nuthal. watnall, kimberley have different needs to the ones in city and the new proposal would simply destroy this.we would like to maintain our communities and not be merged into a largely unaccountable unitary authority as the city council.

Watnall has never been part of Nottingham City and should not be included in the proposed Nottingham North and Kimberley Parliamentary Constituency. Watnall comes under Greasley Parish Council, which was formed in 1894 and is one of the largest parishes in Nottinghamshire. It encompasses the villages of Giltbrook, Greasley, Moorgreen, Newthorpe and Watnall. The boundary change proposed would split Watnall from these other areas. In Watnall we see no strong links with Nottingham. However, Watnall has very strong historical links with Greasley, Newthorpe and Moorgreen. These areas are joined by the open fields between them, the proximity of Greasley Church, the extensive footpath links that connect the residential areas, the D.H. Lawrence associations, the historical buildings and landscape that surrounds the demolished Watnall Hall and a history of coal mining, brewing and railways. For this reason I wish to object to the proposed boundary change and would like to see Watnall kept with Greasley and its associated historical Parish Council.

This is a ridiculous idea in my opinion and a total waste of money. Everyone knows this area as Erewash, why change it?

I object to the proposed alteration of the boundaries, which would result in Nuthall becoming part of the City of Nottingham and the formation of Nottingham North. I would prefer things to stay as they are. I feel we could loose our individuality and community.

I have no desire to become part of Nottingham City with all its own issues our local ones are enough to deal with

I object to Watnall being moved into Nottingham North. The A610 is very much a city boundary. Moving into Nuthall, Kimberley, Watnall, Underwood, moorgreen, the landscape becomes more rural and the are has a community feel, brought together by the primary schools and Kimberley Academy. Many people have moved to the area to escape the city boundaries. This area still has its farmland, small cafes, farm shop,local produce sold at the village pub, grown on allotments. The area joins together for several unique activities, that are not found elsewhere, charity cricket matches, summer jam (street music) outdoor theatre, we use the parks for children's events. We enjoy the level of service that Broxtowe council provides, if we were to be included with Nottingham city, the whole feel would begin to change and I'm afraid people would think about moving away. Beeston would be the obvious area to be moved into city boundary, but I suppose because the people current offices are there, that hasn't been considered.

I object to this proposed change which links Watnall with Nottingham city. It is plainly obvious to anyone with any local knowledge this is a grosly negligent proposal. We already suffer from neglect as part of a Broxstowe constituent dominated by Beeston. Beeston has clear links with Nottingham City and it is there that should form part of an enlarged Nottingham City constituency. In many respects it is already a suburb of Nottingham and it makes sense to incorporate Beeston into the city constituency.The communities of Nuthall, Kimberley, Strelley and Watnall are unique and this should be recognised and these proposals urgently reconsidered. In effect they will destroy any sense of identity and make our votes meaningless in a Nottingham City dominated constituency.

I AGREE with the proposed change that includes Kimberley, Watnall etc in a constituency that shares an MP with Nottingham North. It will have no effect on my relationship with Parish, Borough and County Councils but will create a constituency that requires its MP to consider the circumstances of people who live both inside and outside a city's boundary. That should result in a more balanced response to both local and national issues.

The communities of Nuthall, Kimberley, Strelley and Watnall have never been part of the City and don't want to be. They are separate independent communities and wish to remain so.

I don't agree with this proposed boundary change. Living in Watnall, our links are not with Nottingham City but more with the local towns that surround us. Our communities have a more rural base and so our needs and priorities differ to those of the city and suburbs. Given the relative size of population, our voice will be lost and I believe this will lead to the destruction of green space between us and the city as it expands into its new territory, destroying our identity in the process.

I am part of Broxtowe borough council and Nuthall parish, as a family we have been part of this council/parish for 40 years. I would be very unhappy to have to change to the city council which mean that an historical and well loved parish would disappear. I'm probably not the only resident that feels this way and I'm sure many residents in the borough would definitely not want to become part of the city council. Our area is very well established and run as a borough and don't see how we would benefit being part of a larger council area especially because we aren't actually connected only via a bypass. I hope this does not happen and feel that as residents of this parish our views and feelings are taken into consideration.

I totally oppose the proposed changes to incorporate Watnall, Kimberley and Nuthall into a new constituency with Nottingham City. We are totally different in terms of demographic and needs and should remain outside of the City as we are at present. I believe our needs would be overlooked by incorporating us into the City. We are well supported and served by our Parish Councils, and wish to retain our village and community way of life. We are part of separate, independent communities with a pedigree going back over 100 years. Please do not destroy that.

Kimberley is an integral town in Broxtowe Borough. It is a sister town to Eastwood and Giltbrook and has a lot in common with them being a small semi-rural town. For instance people from Kimberley do their shopping in Eastwood and use the facilities there, but have never even been to Nottingham North districts like Bulwell. Kimberley has no connections with Nottingham city, being separated by the M1 and fields, and has very different issues to urban built-up deprived areas like Bulwell and Top Valley. I believe the proposed boundary will mean Kimberley will get forgotten by the MP who will have to focus on the many issues facing the deprived urban city area of the constituency. Kimberley voters will feel their views are not being represented, feel disengaged from politics, and removed from the borough that they are proud to be a part of currently. It appears that Kimberley is being moved to Nottingham North just to make up the numbers of constituents, rather than having any connection to it. I would much rather be in a larger Broxtowe constituency than an adequately sized Nottingham North.

While I think everyone acknowledges that Broxtowe is not an ideal constituency due to the wide range of communities included within its boundaries, my comment relates to keeping communities together. Beeston is one of the largest towns in the constituency and for community cohesion it's incredibly important that Beeston remains within the same parliamentary constituency. If it is split there is a real danger of disenfranchising parts of the town.

While I think everyone acknowledges that Broxtowe is not an ideal constituency due to the wide range of communities included within its boundaries, my comment relates to keeping communities together. Beeston is one of the largest towns in the constituency and for community cohesion it's incredibly important that Beeston remains within the same parliamentary constituency - therefore I agree with the proposal here. If it is split there is a real danger of disenfranchising parts of the town which should be avoided at all costs. We should at all cost keep community's together, not split them for political gain.

I would like to protest vehemently against the proposed boundary changes. Watnall has little or no relationship with Nottingham City whatsoever. It is a well defined individual community populated by people who want to get away from city living. Unlike Beeston for example, with its tram link and proximity to the University, Watnall looks away from the city for its amenities. If we want to walk, we don't use Wollaton Park or The Arboretum, we use our surrounding countryside or nearby Derbyshire. If we want food we have Morrisons at Eastwood or Asda and Lidl at Langley Mill. If we want shopping we have Giltbrook Retail Park and other retail parks at Ilkeston and Junction 28. Our area is also well served with high quality pubs, cafes and restaurants. Why would we go into Nottingham for a coffee when we can go to Beauvale Priory Tea Room? Watnall Has never been part of the city and would never wish to be.

I strongly approve of these proposals. They solve the problems of constituency populations being skewed without breaking up towns. Broxtowe has always been an area of two distinct halves (north and south) so therefore moving the Kimberley and Nuthall area into the Nottingham North constituency does not change the feel of Broxtowe at all. The proposals make perfect sense and I hope that they are carried out.

Having read this proposal I cannot find any advantage to myself , my family or to my fellow Watnall occupants . We would be just swallowed up into the Nottingham city for their good and not ours . Watnall and the other named places have survived for many a year without belonging to Nottingham and will continue to survive without this change.

I am currently moving in to the area and the appeal of being in a small village type parish council was part of my reason for buying here. I do not want to be part of Nottingham city council. The rulings that would be put in place by the city council will not reflect the needs of my new neighbours and myself.

My wife and I moved into this area 2 years ago to get away from a City Parliamentary seat as where we previously lived was. We felt that in that small village community the City Seat was not looking after our best interests and we felt marginalised and forgotten about. We moved into this area because of the strong Parish Council element which means that community elements are strong and every person has a voice. If this area is moved into Nottingham City I feel that again we will have no say in how our community is used or functions. I think it is an abhorrent suggestion from parliament that these small villages and parish councils are so unimportant that they should be forced to become a number and not people.

I object to the proposed boundary changes for Nottingham north and Kimberley. Nuthall is not part of the city and should not be grouped as such.

I work in retail in the City of Nottingham and commute from Nuthall. Having seen the vast change in our customer profile over the last few years within the city i feel it bears no relation to our community of Nuthall and Kimberley. Beeston and its Student population would have a greater similarity in resident profiles. I feel Nottingham City Council has not got a great track record and its focus will be on the city centre rather than outer town suburbs. You only have to drive on the A610 into the city to see the amount of potholes and delays to the ring road roadworks that should of been completed at the beginning of June. I DO NOT wish the City Council to to move its boundaries to include Nuthall and Kimberley.

Strongly oppose to the boundary change in my area .I live in a semi -rural area and feel that I would not be properly represented by being aligned to a city area with their different issues. The proposal to include Nuthall in a new constituency of North Nottingham and kimberley is ludicrous. Everyone I know in Nuthall considers themselves a part of Nuthall and Nottinghamshire. Not a part of the city. And to strip our name from the constituency indicates that we are irrelevant. I do not consider the City of Nottingham to be a place to be proud of. Their MPs have no credibility in the county. We have nothing in common with the City and will never have anything in common with them. It is also illogical to have a part of the County administration under the City Council, a completely different authority.

We moved here 12 years ago to get away from the City influence, my view is that the proposals is all to do with the numbers and not our local identity with Nuthall, Kimberley, Watnall and Strelley. Our areas have nothing in common with the proposed City areas and our socio economic base is completely different, we look towards Kimbeley and Eastwood not Bulwll, Rise Park and Aspley. We would be the smaller player in this large Parliamentary Boundary and an MP serving the proposed area would probably have greater interest in the City and not the County/Broxtowe BC areas. We look away from the City for our services and facilities and I would suggest that this proposal is the begining of a process to create a Greater City of Nottingham conurbation, one which reidents would reject as we wich to remain part of the County and Broxtowe BC. Our community identity would be gone and the value of our properties would lower, we are seperate communities and wish to remain so and not be part of a City of Nottingham seat. I hope that all submissions will be considered and we remain part of a Nuthall, Kimberley, Watnall and Strelley constituency.

Totally opposed to being tied with Nottingham City Council. Nuthall and Watnall have historically been small villages enjoying a rich shared history amid rural locations with distinct boundaries between them and Nottingham. Indeed Nottingham is a place to be avoided with it's traffic and parking problems/policies, every effort being made to use local shire facilities at Kimberley, Giltbrook and Eastwood for shopping, leisure and medical facilities. More logical areas are available which make more sense to be included in the Nottingham City, Beeston for one, where the boundary between it and the City is very indistinct, being on the doorstep to Nottingham university and hosting a sizeable student population thereof. Some people choose an urban lifestyle while others prefer a more rural setting, the vast majority of people I know in this area are here due to it's rural nature and wouldn't want it to change; Beeston, on the other hand, is already what i would describe as urban therefore a much more suitable candidate to be included within the city.

I would like to register my support for the proposed parliamentary boundary changes for North Nottingham Kimberley and Nuthall. Nuthall and Kimberley residents when asked on holiday 'where do you come from'• are most likely to say Nottingham. Nuthall is adjacent to the current Nottingham North boundary and Kimberley is coterminous with Nuthall. One of Nottingham's main arterial routes, the A610, links residents and business from Kimberley and Nuthall into Nottingham City Centre through the Nottingham North constituency. Nottingham City tram route terminates at Nuthall and the local bus service (Rainbow One) travels along the A610 corridor. However there is more than just a geographical connection between Nuthall / Kimberley and Nottingham, there is a significant economic and social connection too. Bringing the areas together in line with the Boundary Commission proposal makes sense as it reflects a geographical area that reflect everyday life for Nuthall and Kimberley residents for jobs, learning, healthcare, retail, leisure and culture. Nottingham is an unbounded city and therefore its conurbation area isn't within the City boundary. Compared to other cities such as Sheffield, Liverpool, Leeds and Newcastle, Nuthall and Kimberley would already be located in the city area. Nottingham is the primary destination for Nuthall and Kimberley residents for work. Nuthall and Kimberley are within the official Nottingham travel to work area as well as the Greater Nottingham Housing Market area. 52% of the Nottingham City workforce aren't City residents with majority of these workers living in the conurbation. This is reflected in the commuting patterns of Nuthall and Kimberley residents. Similarly local Further Education provision for Nuthall and Kimberley residents is in Nottingham including the Nottingham City College campus located in the current Nottingham North constituency. Residents attending local Higher Education provision will travel into the City to attend either the University of Nottingham and Nottingham Trent University. While resident use various GPs surgeries for the primary healthcare care all secondary healthcare for residents is provided thorough hospitals in the Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust. These are the Queens Medical Centre and Nottingham City Hospital located in Nottingham North constituency. Nottingham is the main destination for retail and leisure for Nuthall and Kimberley residents, as highlighted by local retail and leisure studies. All national store chains as well as a breadth of independent shops are located in the City Centre. The night time economy of Nottingham is the key destination for

residents where 4 cinema complexes alongside a plethora of restaurants and bars are located. Nottingham is the number one destination for cultural experiences for Nuthall and Kimberley residents. Proportionately twice as many residents (1 in 10) from the conurbation use Nottingham Theatre Royal and Concert Hall compared to city residents (1 in 20). Likewise the Nottingham Motorpoint Arena is the top venue for concerts and entertainment for residents. I am aware that my local Parish Council based in Nuthall has objected to the proposed changes. However it should be noted that their response is not representative as they have failed to survey or consulted residents. The council in their response claim Nuthall and Kimberley have nothing in common with Nottingham, Clearly they have failed to consider the evidence outlined above which demonstrate a very clear connections between the areas. They also argue that because Nuthall and Kimberley are historical communities they are different to communities in Nottingham, this is untrue. Areas in North Nottingham including Bulwell, Basford, Aspley and Bilborough all have there own historical identity and are supported by Area based committees akin to the Parish and Town Councils in Nuthall and Kimberley.

The economic growth in conurbation areas as well as market towns surrounding cities is dependent on strong cities that attract investment. An MP that represents an area that is connected economically and socially should work with communities that ensures the benefits are realise across the area. Amalgamating Nuthall and Kimberley with the Nottingham North constituency therefore makes a compelling case for a future parliamentary constituency.

I am concerned about plans to split Beeston up into different constituencies. I do not believe that comments made by current MP that residents of Beeston consider themselves part of Nottingham City are true or reflective of actual public opinion. As a long term resident of Beeston I do not feel that we are part of the city and feel much more connection to areas currently in our constituency than the city. Beeston Rylands itself does not have a city feel and I definitely do not feel that separating up a smallish town would serve its residents well.

I do not wish for nuthall to become part of the Nottingham city constituency and wish it to remain as it is.

I am opposed to these boundary changes incorporating Nuthall into Nottingham North constituency. Nottingham City is a unitary authority served by 3 MP's and as Nuthall is outside of the City (and in the County) this does not make sense. I am not convinced any MP would be interested in our area in addition to the existing constituency and certainly wouldn't work across two local authority areas.

Unpaid carers have tremendous difficulty accessing support as it is without changing which council supports them. The support offer from city council is hugely different to the county.

I am not very happy that this proposal puts me in with the city of Nottingham. Nuthall and its surrounding village of Watnall and Kimberley are separate communities with different needs and values from the city of Nottingham. We have better services than Nottingham City. We have our own history going back many years. We are villages not a city. To be honest I do not want to be with Aspley, Bulwell, etc. If we have to be with someone Beeston is a better option as at least they are in Broxtowe and have similar values.

I strongly object to the proposed changes to my local area. The only thing linking our local areas to the city is the bus route and the A610. Nuthall has no links with the other areas you are proposing to join us up with and small outskirts towns and villages such as Nuthall, Kimberley etc would lose their identity and history by being lumped together in this way. I do not feel that any consideration has gone into trying to have regard to local ties, geographic factors, local government boundaries (as they were known at 1 December 2020), existing constituencies, and minimising disruption caused by proposed change as you state. Other areas such as Beeston would seem a better fit due to the proximity to the city and the University.

I strongly oppose the parliamentary boundary change for Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall & Kimberley. My reasons being:

1. This will be costly and guess who will be paying, the residents.
2. I have been under the Nottingham City Council in the past and moved to the County Council because I was unhappy with the way the City Council worked. This apparently has not changed as I have a friend who moved there two years ago and hates it.
3. I understand this is purely for the numbers, but the City does not have a Parish Council and therefore our local communities will not be represented as they are now as the MP covering these areas will have no great interest in them. They are only interested in votes and numbers. They do not live in the area so they do not understand.
4. This will bring to an end and destroy what has been in place for over 100 years, thriving individual communities, which whilst having grown and developed, have managed to retain that village and community way of life.
5. I think that the boundary proposal people have no idea about the communities and do not realise how aggrieved the local community will be. Surely this will be no benefit to anyone except the MPs and Councillors who will be looking at votes.

Peoples health and state of minds should come before politics.

I object strongly to the proposals to take Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley into the parliamentary seat of Nottingham. The labour controlled council are reckless in their spending and would relish having a huge chunk of our council tax to squander, what a disaster for us. We all have local parish councils that listen to our needs and have our best interests at heart whereas Nottingham City is a unitary authority and operates in an entirely different way, Our children attend local primary schools in Nuthall and Kimberley and the majority of secondary pupils attend Kimberley Academy. We have Kimberley Leisure Centre along with various parish halls for lots of other activities - we do not venture into the City for these activities, they are local to us. We have a great shopping centre in Kimberley for the majority of our everyday needs and also on our doorstep is Giltbrook Retail Park with M&S Food Hall plus many other businesses that we frequent regularly - not going into the city except occasionally to shop at John Lewis. Our nightlife is excellent. Beeston would be a more logical choice having a large student population more in touch with Nottingham University and looking more towards the City for its requirements. Leave us out of the equation. our issues are greatly different from those of the City and we would be forgotten as being peripheral to the rest of the proposed constituency. We do not want to become part of this proposed change, we would be swallowed up completely and lose our identity. NO THANK YOU

I support the Boundary Commission's Initial proposals as they affect Eastwood, Ashfield and Broxtowe, as the best arrangement that can be achieved on balance

I live in Giltbrook in the new Broxtowe ward and my son's school, and our local shops are all in the new Nottingham North. Having researched I believe that including Beeston or Hucknall in the city area would make more sense than Kimberley. Beeston has more links to the Nottingham city area than Kimberley who has more links with the Broxtowe area. Equally Hucknall has more in common with the suburbs of Nottingham North. An MP should represent the views of the people. Kimberley has very different needs compared to the areas of Aspley and Bulwell who are also in the Nottingham north area. In Aspley and Bulwell there are high levels of deprivation. They have different transport and local level needs. Kimberley would be forgotten as the MP would need to put my re energy in to city work. An MP needs to be representative of the views of the people. The views in general in the Kimberley area do not align with those of the people in Aspley and Bulwell. Evidence of this can be seen in voting patters in recent years.

We are totally opposed to including Watnall into the proposed Nottingham City Parliamentary seat (Nottingham North and Kimberley). Including us in a large area like this would leave us fearing that the requirements of Watnall would be completely overlooked. We also fear that funds earmarked for this area would be diverted to other city projects, leaving us underfunded. The communities in this area have specific needs and requirements. There is a good infrastructure in place in Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall & Kimberley which is supported by local people who use these services (schools, libraries, playing fields, leisure centres, and shopping centres). There is a real sense of community in these areas which would be lost by placing us on the outskirts of a large constituency which would struggle to cater for the needs of such large area. Watnall and their surrounding areas are village communities which are very different to Nottingham city and its suburbs. (Chalk and Cheese!) We feel these proposals have been made by drawing lines on a map and without any thought or consideration to the communities involved.

I am not sure that being part of Nottingham City Council would be in the best interests of Nuthall and Kimberley constituents. The area is quite rural. My experience of being part of city run councils would suggest they have an outlook that is to protect the interests of the city, they do not generally appreciate the more rural areas and what works for the city doesn't necessarily work in rural areas (and vice versa). A prime example would be the attitude to parking and parking spaces at work, where in the city they are sparse and can command a premium, but out in Strelley, Kimberley and Nuthall there are places aplenty yet a workforce can still have to pay for parking at work. Another example would be trials of these schemes like electric scooters which are now littering the pavements around the city causing all sorts of issues, they are just not required in the more rural areas and cause even more issues and to join us up to schemes like this with councils that don't seem to understand that cities and rural areas are different and have different requirements seems very unfair. The Government seem to have realised this and are devolving power, they seem to be appreciating that what is good for London is not necessarily good for the rest of the country, what is good for Nottingham city is not good for rural areas outside of Nottingham.

I love Broxtowe as it is but if it has to change I agree that the proposal is a good one and am happy to support it. Living in Beeston I understand how close a community we are and know that any plan to split Beeston or Chilwell would be worse. I also feel that with the Broxtowe council offices being in Beeston there would be too much confusion if Beeston were to be moved out of the Broxtowe constituency as many people don't understand the differences between the different boundaries and this would just add to the confusion.

I think the proposals for Broxtowe do not make much sense. The changes elongate the constituency to such an extent that it looks like one of those strange American gerrymandered counties. I disagree with the proposal

In response to a proposal to merge the county area into the city area. I can confirm that I am AGAINST this and ask that my opinion be given serious consideration. This is also the opinion of my wife. Some years ago my wife and I made a choice to live in a county area for a better, more relaxed (less stressful) way of life. So, I/we have absolutely NO desire to be part of the city of Nottingham.

I would like to explain why I do not support the current proposal that Nuthall will be moved into Nottingham North and Kimberley. I have been a resident of Nuthall for 40 years and I do not believe the change in this boundary will benefit our community. As a historical community we have many differences to the main area of Nottingham City. The main facilities we access are around the Nuthall and Kimberley areas and we do not use the city for these. The area is more of a village community which would be lost becoming part Nottingham City. There is no clear benefit shown to becoming part of the city boundary. We also have people that work to develop our local community and care for this area and put this area first - listening to the local people and acting on their feedback which in turn helps to improve the quality of the area - this would be lost if moving into the city.

I have lived at the attached address since 1973. Having considered all available info. I cannot find any good reason for this aspect of the proposed boundary changes.

Nuthall is by nature a historic village with its own long established Parish Council. It has little in common with Nottingham city. We and others moved here to live in a more rural environment separate from the city and would prefer this to be preserved. Nuthall has much more in common with surrounding communities such as Kimberley and Watnall than with Nottingham, which understandably has a quite different outlook. It would seem more logical to include say Beeston, which has more in common with a city culture, than Nottingham in any change of boundary. This would be a much better way to achieve any numerical population requirement that the Boundary Commission has to meet.

Whilst your proposals initially looked fairly balanced I'm afraid on close inspection several of the constituencies could well become one party ones. A fairer approach in my view would be to try to create marginal constituencies. I wonder too as to why you are still proposing Broxtowe as the name of the western constituency when the area of Nottingham called Broxtowe is in fact in another constituency. May I suggest a name change to one which would better reflect the location of the constituency eg Nottinghamshire West or perhaps to Trentwood (or Trentwoods) given that Eastwood lies in the north of the constituency and the River Trent along the southern border.

Nuthall is a small Community that is not apart of the city of Nottingham in relation to its amenities. As a resident of Nuthall we have our own parish council and decisions are made based on being a small community outside of the larger city. The decisions are based around the needs of the local community. The proposed reason to consider moving to another council do not make sense and would take away the local voice of the residents.

I do not wish to move my constituency from Ashfield to Broxtowe. [RD:11] Lee Anderson to be my MP and do not wish to lose him. You are taking away my legal right for [RD:10] him, and surely this is against the law. Lee Anderson is the best MP we have ever had, and Broxtowe does absolutely nothing for Eastwood. I am absolutely AGAINST this change. You are not taking into consideration the rights of the people of Eastwood

I would like to express my support for the proposed boundary changes as they affect my own area of Watnall. I wouldn't normally express a view on this sort of thing but in this case the reason for responding is because a strong negative campaign is being carried out by a neighbouring Parish (Nuthall). This campaign:

a) misrepresents the view of the local area - no canvassing has taken place in our area/parish
b) is actively leafletting neighbouring areas in a manner similar to a political election campaign
c) is approaching people, unsolicited, at community events (e.g. outdoor theatre) in neighbouring areas to promote objections, and get people to sign petitions against the boundary changes.

The negative campaigning from Nuthall Parish is based on upon

1. The idea that the area north of the M1 (Watnall, Nuthall, Greasley) has little in common with Nottingham
2. The local MP would have no great interest in this area this is insulting to the future MP, and is no different to the current situation where Watnall, Nuthall, Greasley are an outpost of the Beeston/Stapleford area
3. The idea that people in Nuthall moved there to get away from Nottingham. This is ridiculous, and borders on plain prejudice rather than reason.
4. It would be better to carve Beeston in two rather than include Watnall, Nuthall, Greasley in Nottingham North. As a former Beeston resident I can't believe this makes sense to anyone. Beeston is a coherent community.

I feel that this sort of active negative campaigning is against the spirit of the process, and may even be against the rules. If so, please advise who this should be referred to. My positive support for the boundary changes are based on the fact that Watnall/Nuthall/Kimberley have their own strong identity but are very much connected to Nottingham, and look to it as their regional centre, much more so than Beeston/Stapleford in the current constituency so the proposed changes seem perfectly reasonable to me.

We refer your proposal to incorporate one of our parish wards into a new parliamentary constituency entitled Nottingham North and Kimberley. Greasley Parish Council has resolved to oppose this proposal and our detailed comments together with an alternative arrangement that we are prepared to support is attached herewith as a separate document

Broxtowe is a curious construct to start with, and the removal of a chunk of its middle to form the new constituency does nothing to help. The south of the constituency has much more in common with territory immediately to the west, and the north of the constituency similarly has more in common with territory to its immediate west.

I appreciate that this would involve crossing county boundaries, but would not redesigning constituency boundaries to reflect the natural associations of localities lead to better representation?

Response to boundary change - Historically, Kimberley and Nuthall have been linked to Eastwood through school catchment areas, local services and general community interaction, as well as having the same local council of Broxtowe Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. The local newspaper also reflects this, being called the Eastwood and Kimberley advertiser. Nottingham North area is controlled by Nottingham City Council, which would see an MP having to juggle different councils areas and services. Nottingham North and Nuthall / Kimberley is divided by the M1, which has acted and remains, as a barrier to community cohesion. The proposed boundary change would see Kimberley losing local connections and being isolated from the remaining services, which are controlled by a different council. The proposed change shows no local knowledge in the administration of the changes, and appears to mangle together the required headcount not taking into account of the local areas and how the change would impact in the future. A better solution would see Nuthall, Kimberley and Eastwood as a parliamentary boundary having the same local councils and retaining the community spirit.

I refer to your proposal to incorporate my Broxtowe Borough Council Ward into a new parliamentary constituency entitled Nottingham North and Kimberley to which I am opposed. Please find my detailed comments attached herewith (three pages)

I wish to comment and object to the currently published plan to include Kimberley and Watnall within the new proposed 'Nottingham North and Kimberley' parliamentary constituency on the following grounds.

1. Kimberley and Watnall are geographically separated from the city (and thus from Nottingham North) by the M1 motorway, which is a significant boundary, and which also creates a focus away from the city and westwards into the Broxtowe areas towards Eastwood. Travel from Nottingham city to Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley is not continuous through a built up area and this emphasises that this is a geographically separate area. Travel from Nuthall (west of the M1) to Eastwood is through an almost continuous built-up area, emphasising the connection and integration with the other 'settlements' of Giltbrook, Newthorpe, and Eastwood.
2. The social and demographic make-up of the two areas is totally different, and thus the focus and work of an MP representing the combined area is different. Nottingham North has substantially different demographic profile from Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley in all areas of measurement - housing, occupations, ethnic composition, etc, etc [Boundaries Commission website] - and thus Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley does not fit the same profile as Nottingham North. Many parts of the Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley have a rural aspect, with farming countryside and green belt being issues, these being almost unheard of in Nottingham North. This mismatch of Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley with Nottingham North will mean that the overwhelming work and areas of challenge for the MP are likely to be with Nottingham City, to the likely disadvantage of those in the peripheral area of Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley.

3. Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley have strong community ties within the current North Broxtowe area and away from the built-up area of the city. Within the north Broxtowe area there are strong ties between Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley and Giltbrook/Newthorpe/Eastwood, those six 'settlements' forming a very strong community. Travel is focussed east-west through these towns and villages, and shopping is in either Kimberley, Giltbrook (a large shopping centre), or Eastwood, all on the east-west axis within Broxtowe Borough. Leisure facilities for all these areas are focussed at Kimberley Leisure Centre. One indicator of the cohesion of the area is the local newspaper which is the Eastwood & Kimberley Advertiser and which covers the whole of the area from Nuthall through to Eastwood. To draw an arbitrary line is to pull these linked communities apart.

4. There is a danger that the strong local identity of Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley would be lost, and that eventually plans would be raised to absorb the area into Nottingham City, which is not wanted by residents, who have chosen to live in an area outside the city. These areas have a strong historical connection.

SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE PLANS

A. Move Beeston (or part of it) into the Nottingham constituency. Beeston shares many of the characteristics of the city in terms of housing and other demographic measures [Boundaries Commission website], has a large student population from Nottingham University (which is in the city) and is a substantial part of the Nottingham Tram network, giving a strong link to the city. Travel to Beeston from Nottingham is entirely through the built-up area with no obvious geographical boundaries - the casual visitor would not notice the change from Nottingham to Beeston. Residents of Broxtowe would undoubtedly see this as the most logical fit with Nottingham city. The number of voters required (roughly 13,000) could easily be achieved from the wards in the Beeston area.

B. Move part of Hucknall Town into Nottingham North constituency.

Hucknall (currently in Ashfield) shares many of the characteristics of the city in terms of housing and demographics, and is a part of the Nottingham Tram network. It is part of the continuous built-up area to the North of the city, and would fit well into Nottingham North. The number of voters required (roughly 13,000) could easily be achieved from a combination of the wards in the Hucknall area.

I have no wish to change constituencies. Everyone I know who is in the current one are quite happy with it and do not want to be taken into the City. We have no connection to the city and prefer our local communities. I believe the new proposal would not take into account any of our wishes as we would be on the periphery. Definitely do not want to change.

Having lived in the ancient peaceful village of Nuthall for many years & being fully satisfied with the amenities provided, I would not wish for any boundary changes. Nuthall has a wonderful community spirit which could be lost if it were amalgamated with parts of Nottingham. I think that it would be better for the Commission to include only Beeston rather than Nuthall & surrounding villages in any Boundary change, since Beeston has far more in common with the city. We

Nuthall, strelley, kimberley and watnall are functioning well as they are. Their identities would be swallowed up and disappear or be very largely destroyed if they were included in the vast greater Nottingham area. These smaller local areas have grown into the thriving areas they are gradually, naturally, smoothly, over time. They work very well for the people, in all aspects, from schools, leisure centres, shopping, night life etc etc and their parish councils without being too large. It would be dreadfully wrong to disrupt what has been put together with thought and experience over very many years. They adamantly do not want the proposed change of being joined with the City.

I and my wife do not want to become part of Nottingham North. We use the local facilities for all our needs and do not look to the city. We used to live within the city and deliberately moved away from it 22 years ago. We do not want to go backwards. We feel part of a community which we did not feel previously and enjoy living in a village and being part of a parish. We also feel that an MP for this 'new area' would have little interest in our village and would have no reason

to fight for what would be a minority in the constituency.

As Member of Parliament for the Broxtowe Constituency, I write to comment on the Commission's draft proposals for my constituency. I welcome the Commission's request for views on its initial proposals and thank it for its work. I acknowledge that there must be a link between Broxtowe and Nottingham City to prevent unnecessary disruption elsewhere. However, I believe that there is a better solution to where there is a Nottingham/Broxtowe link. I note that at the previous review the Commission accepted the overwhelming arguments made between the City and Beeston. However, it has chosen not to do so again at this review, which I think is a missed opportunity. I outline below my thoughts and attach details of a suggested alternative that addresses the concerns outlined below.

1. I welcome the addition of the Broxtowe Borough wards that are currently located in the Ashfield constituency, as this unites communities in and around Eastwood at the northern end of the Borough council area that share common community and historical ties.
2. The Commission's proposed link with the City of Nottingham at the northern end of the Borough of Broxtowe (its proposed Nottingham North and Kimberley seat) sadly then breaks these community links by removing Kimberley, Nuthall, Strelley and Watnall from Broxtowe. All these areas look north to Eastwood and its environs for services and community links.
3. The Commission's proposals split the Parish of Greasley by placing Watnall in the Nottingham North and Kimberley seat.
4. The M1 is a strong boundary, which affectively splits the Commission's proposed Nottingham North and Kimberley seat into two.
5. The Broxtowe wards added to this constituency would see the creation of a semi-rural and urban constituency including areas of inner city Nottingham and more peripheral market towns such as Kimberley. If Broxtowe Borough is to be linked with the City, then a southern link would produce a more homogeneous urban cross-linked constituency.
6. There are poor transport links from the northern end of Broxtowe Borough into the City, as contrasted with the Borough's southern end. Whilst the Nottingham tram extends out of the City into Beeston, there is no link into Kimberley and the surrounding area. And local bus routes provide quick access into Eastwood, rather than the City.

A proposed Nottingham South and Beeston Constituency - This is what the Commission effectively proposed at the last review. The subsequent public hearings then confirmed that this had strong local support from both residents and from all political parties. This could be achieved again, by placing the following Broxtowe wards into a Nottingham South seat: Beeston North, Beeston Central and Beeston Rylands.

Although it would be desirable to also place the Beeston West ward into the Nottingham South seat, this isn't possible to do within the accepted range. However, removal from the rest of Beeston is justifiable as it is more suburban than the other wards, with links to Chilwell to its West. For example, Park Road, Grove Avenue and Cumberland Avenue were all in Chilwell until the last local boundary review placed them in Beeston West ward.

These changes would then allow the Bilborough ward to be retained in Nottingham North, alongside the Leen Valley ward, which would bring Nottingham North within the accepted range. It is worth noting that at the previous review there was substantial opposition to ending Bilborough's link with Nottingham North. Like the Commission's proposal, this proposal also places the Castle ward in the Nottingham East constituency. The advantage of these changes is that they work to keep existing links in place, whilst being less disruptive than the Commission's initial proposal, moving 1 fewer ward. It would mean that there would be no need for an exchange of wards between Nottingham North and Nottingham South (i.e. the Bilborough ward is retained in Nottingham North).

Comments on the links between Beeston and Nottingham

1. There is a natural merging of residential streets between Beeston and Nottingham. Unlike the areas in the northern end of the Borough, Beeston is not parished. The historic Beeston Parish contained areas which currently lie within the City.
2. There is a regular bus service into the City and the Nottingham tram extends into Beeston.

The City Centre is only 3.4 miles away.

3. Beeston is home to many University of Nottingham students including 254 halls of residence and 427 other accommodation occupied by students. With the University based just across the border, the Eastern edge of Beeston adjoins the University of Nottingham's main campus. The Broadgate Park Halls of residents is split between Nottingham and Beeston and would be united in one constituency under a Beeston/Nottingham South proposal.

4. The opening of a new road between Beeston and Lenton, which was needed due to the growing links between the two. The road goes through part of the Nottingham Enterprise Zone and links Humber Road in Beeston to Thane Road in Lenton. It is seen by the City Council as key to unlocking the full potential of the Enterprise Zone.

5. Boots is a major employer. Its site is currently divided between two constituencies. There is representative advantage to the whole site being represented by a single Member of Parliament.

Summary - The above counter proposal would be less disruptive for communities than the original Commission proposal, as it would not split a parish and moves 1 fewer wards within the City. Thus, allowing Billborough to retail its links with Nottingham North. It also avoids having a Nottingham/Broxtowe constituency that is split in half by the M1. It also establishes a more natural link with the City, building on Beeston's strong connections with the University of Nottingham and associated business and cultural links.

Appendix

Broxtowe

Bramcote 5838 Broxtowe

Attenborough and Chilwell East 5711 Broxtowe

Awsworth, Cossall and Trowell 4151 Broxtowe

Beeston West 4154 Broxtowe

Chilwell West 5783 Broxtowe

Greasley 5449 Broxtowe

Kimberley 5299 Broxtowe

Nuthall East and Strelley 4082 Broxtowe

Stapleford North 3557 Broxtowe

Stapleford South East 3968 Broxtowe

Stapleford South West 4035 Broxtowe

Toton and Chilwell Meadows 6349 Broxtowe

Watnall and Nuthall West 3660 Broxtowe

Eastwood Hilltop 3967 Ashfield

Eastwood St Mary's 3494 Ashfield

Eastwood Hall 1972 Ashfield

Brinsley 1909 Ashfield

TOTAL 73378

Nottingham South

Wollaton West 11153 Nottingham South

Lenton and Wollaton East 16041 Nottingham South

Meadows 6485 Nottingham South

Clifton East 12225 Nottingham South

Clifton West 7899 Nottingham South

Radford 10332 Nottingham South

Beeston Rylands 3538 Broxtowe

Beeston Central 4271 Broxtowe

Beeston North 4315 Broxtowe

76259

Nottingham East

Mapperley 10767 Nottingham East
Hyson Green and Arboretum 13302 Nottingham East
St Ann's 12264 Nottingham East
Sherwood 11074 Nottingham East
Berridge 10115 Nottingham East
Dales 10720 Nottingham East
Castle 7085 Nottingham South
75327

Nottingham North
Bilborough 11941 Nottingham North
Aspley 10759 Nottingham North
Basford 11200 Nottingham North
Bestwood 11554 Nottingham North
Bulwell 11106 Nottingham North
Bulwell Forest 10329 Nottingham North
Leen Valley 6526 Nottingham South
73415

I wish to record my objection to the proposed boundary change to include Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley into the Nottingham City Parliamentary seat.

I believe that moving Beeston/Broxtowe with Nottingham would be detrimental to all residents in my area. Enlarging the City boundaries we would lose our identity and become another piece of the already mismanaged City Council, it would be expected that the residents of Beeston/Broxtowe would be required to pay, by increased council tax and other revenue grabs to cover debts which have been run up in hair brained such as Robin Hood Power 52 million pounds, the folly which is called NET trams, losing more than 1 million pounds per week and countless other debts that have been accrued by the mismanagement run up over years of Criminal activities. Beeston/Broxtowe council has been sensibly managed for countless years and this should be allowed to continue as the Broxtowe Borough Council.

The name of Broxtowe CC has always been a little odd. No places in the constituency are called Broxtowe. In the local area-Nottingham City you have a "Broxtowe Estate" This area is a large suburban housing estate that sits outside Broxtowe CC. It causes confusion to people. A new name for Broxtowe should be thought about to reduce the confusion

I don't understand why the constituency in which I live is named Broxtowe. As far as I am aware Broxtowe is the name of a Nottingham City council estate.

I am writing in total support of the upcoming boundary review recommendations for the Parliamentary seats of Ashfield and Broxtowe. I believe geographically it does make more sense as Eastwood is in the Broxtowe region so the proposal to move Eastwood back to Broxtowe Parliamentary Constituency is a good decision. The two Mansfield wards of Brick Kiln and Grange farm should be assigned to the Ashfield Constituency again they share a similar demographic and form a seamless continuation from Ashfield District Council wards of Skegness and Harlow wood. I hope my support for the move can be discussed and taken into consideration.

I do not support nuthall and Kimberley being brought together either Nottingham. They are not similar and in different local authority areas

Nuthall is a community with its own parish council and many more local groups shops schools and parks. If it becomes swallowed up in Nottingham north and Kimberley it will surely lose its identity as a separate community and will become too big for any MP to be able to do their job to their or their constituents satisfaction. People move to these areas because of their individuality which they will certainly lose if they become part of a city boundary

Eastwood and surrounding urban developments have much more to do with Kimberley and North Nottingham than with Broxtowe Beeston and Chilwell.

I support the proposed changes to the Broxtowe constituency by the Boundary Commission. I am also aware of alternative proposals by my local MP Darren Henry. These proposals would split Beeston in two, which is completely illogical and would harm representation in the area. He has proposed this alternative purely for political reasons, in an attempt to remove an area that often votes Labour. I would encourage the Boundary Commission to reject these alternative proposal.

Firstly my postcode appears in a square white box which i assume should contain an area name - but doesn't? Secondly it would be useful to be able to see the current boundaries with the new ones superimposed over the top - so that we can see how the proposed changes impact us.

I have reviewed the proposed boundary change and wish to object to Nuthall being placed within the Nottingham North and Kimberley constituency. Nuthall, along with Kimberley and Watnall are not part of the city Nottingham and I feel that these areas would not be represented well if the boundary is changed. These areas have very different needs to the city and I feel would be neglected as priority would be given to the more inner city areas. I feel we are served well in the current Broxtowe constituency and would not like this to change.

We do not wish to be part of Nottingham City council for our rates and services as this would create to big an area as we are quite rural .

Looking at your proposals I feel the boundaries have been set to meet your prerequisites with no thought to the type of areas you are amalgamating. Your proposal has created corridors across the area and splits communities. It strikes me it is very much a political move with no thought to the community in the areas. Creating extra areas only increases the cost to the general public of supporting paid officials and creates more bureaucracy.

Broxtowe is an amalgamation of several, bland, small dormitory districts surrounding the City of Nottingham. It does not really have an identity of its own. Residents are concerned that the Boundary Commission may, under pressure from Nottingham City, be persuaded to incorporate Broxtowe into Nottingham to satisfy their demand for expansion and raise additional funds to pay off its £1billion debt incurred as a result of mismanagement. The Borough does not command any loyalty. It is recognised that about £30m pa could be saved if Broxtowe lost its identity and was absorbed into Nottinghamshire County Council. How this could be achieved I do not know but feel it would be a far better option from the residents viewpoint.

I understand that it is proposed to include Nuthall into the Nottingham City Parliamentary seat. I object to this in the strongest possible terms. I believe that the proposed change is just about numbers and has absolutely nothing to do with community or interest considerations. I, personally, have no desire to be considered a resident of Nottingham City. Nuthall has never been part of the City or part of a parliamentary seat including Nottingham and I would like to remain in the Broxtowe constituency. No changes please!!!!

As I now reside in a rural area and being totally satisfied with the present situation I see no need for any sort of reorganisation just to enlarge a city .

I am against the proposals for the new Broxtowe constituency because of the artificial separation of Kimberley, Nuthall, Watnall and Strelley from the rest of the Broxtowe Borough. It is an especially poor decision given that the transport links between Kimberley and Nottingham North is almost non-existent with only the Rainbow One bus going to Nottingham and even that, does not pass through Bulwell and Basford. Thus, the focus of any MP representing Nottingham North and Kimberley would be towards the Nottingham City part leaving many residents without a voice. For Broxtowe, if Kimberley is removed then the north of the constituency becomes much more weaker with only Eastwood being the main settlement of the north unlike Stapleford, Chilwell and Beeston in the south leaving Broxtowe to be an unbalanced constituency. This would leave north Broxtowe inevitably underrepresented by any MP. For a counterproposal, Beeston should be added to Nottingham South due to their better transport links with the City of Nottingham with the Tram and also a large student population residing in Beeston. Also, there are poor transport links from even Stapleford and Trowell to Beeston leaving Beeston isolated from the rest of Broxtowe. To get this new constituency to the required minimal electorate, the ward of Underwood should be added alongside all of Eastwood from Ashfield to Broxtowe alongside keeping the Kimberley, Watnall and Nuthall West and Nuthall East and Strelley wards

in Broxtowe. Underwood is just north of Eastwood and relies on the town so it would make sense to add Underwood to Broxtowe as well. If this suggestion is rejected, to make the Nottingham constituencies more even-sized, either add Hucknall to Nottingham North, West Bridgford to Nottingham South/East or add the west side of Gedling (Arnold and Carlton) to Nottingham East.

I am utterly opposed to the proposal to incorporate the parishes of Watnall, Strelley, Nuthall and Kimberley into the Nottingham City Council area. Our area is well served by the Borough council, and separate parish councils, which have a real interest in the locality. We are semi-rural parishes, looking more to Eastwood and Hucknall for shopping and facilities than to Nottingham, and we have nothing in common with the very urban areas of Aspley, Broxtowe Estate, and Bulwell. If this swathe of northern Broxtowe District is removed to the City, it will leave the remaining part of northern Broxtowe (Eastwood, Awsworth etc.) as a mere satellite to Beeston. We do not consider our area as being part of Greater Nottingham, as for instance Arnold or Beeston might be regarded. We are county/country communities, with a separate history and identity, and wish to remain so, and not be engulfed into a massive city council which will not serve our interests.

I live in the Nuthall Parish Council which comes under the authority of Broxtowe Borough Council. The proposal by parliament is to move Nuthall Parish Council to come under Nottingham City Council. In Nuthall we do not feel we are part of Nottingham city but an independent borough. We have a strong Parish council who represent the parish strongly regards policy decisions affecting the parish, a process that has been in place for over 100 years. If Nuthall was to be swallowed up into Nottingham City council, we would lose the identity and independence we have. We would simply be seen as greater Nottingham and become a forgotten element to the Nottingham City and as a such, lose the excellent standards that are in place to support the Parish. Please take this communication as an objection against the proposal to move Nuthall Parish Council within Nottingham City Council. Nuthall Parish council should stay as it is and under Broxtowe Borough Council.

The Broxtowe constituency is already quite varied going from Attenborough in the South up to Greasley in the North. The current proposal would stretch this northern border even further, making the constituency population even more diverse than most of current constituencies. The elected MP would have even more difficulties to represent the full gamut of view and expectations both for the local area as well as for regional/national debates. A redraw making sure the population of the constituency grouped around a couple of town rather than many smaller town and villages would help in that aspect.

This long narrow constituency means that the Southern and the Northern Wards DO NOT have ANY meaningful areas of joint contact/interest - especially as some of the Northern Wards have a long very troubled Coal Mining history .

I am against the current proposals to incorporate Kimberley Nuthall and Watnall into the city of Nottingham. I am not concerned about the political impact on voting but in the potential loss of our Parish Councils. At present Nuthall Parish Council does a wonderful job developing and supporting the community from a base of real knowledge and concern for the area. This would be lost and have a dreadful impact on the historical, and cultural identity of this area. Incorporating Beeston into the city instead would be more practical as it is already has an identity as a city area.

I approve of Eastwood going onto Broxtowe Constituency. Eastwood is currently within Broxtowe Borough Council for local government purposes, but within Ashfield for parliamentary purposes. This causes various problems at a political level and your proposal would resolve these problems.

I support the proposals for Broxtowe as I feel it is vital to keep the town of Beeston in one constituency, together with Chilwell and other neighbouring areas.

I have received a leaflet from Nuthall parish council regarding the changes which would put nuthall (along with other areas) into Nottingham North and Kimberley parliamentary seat. I object to this and entirely agree with the comments made by our parish council. We reside within the county boundary and not the city of Nottingham. Our interests and concerns also

include Kimberley watnall and greasley and these are the areas we frequent and use the facilities there. To reiterate myself and my family entirely agree with the Nuthall Parish council's views and wish to remain as we currently are.

I agree with the position taken by Broxtowe Borough Council, which has indicated to the Boundary Commission its support in principle for the changes to the Broxtowe Constituency boundaries they have proposed, and its strong opposition to any alternative proposal which would result in Beeston being split into two for parliamentary purposes. I moved into Beeston several years ago because of its distinctive character, its long history as a settlement, and its strong sense of local community. Attaching parts of it to Nottingham City or anywhere else would be show sad unawareness of local history and tradition, and flagrant disregard for the pride and affection Beestonians feel for their community. I strongly oppose any suggestion that Beeston should be split.

Nuthall is part of Broxtowe Borough Council and should remain so. We have no wish to become members of Nottingham City Council seat with its record of poor administration. Our local parish council is active on our behalf along with excellent schools and information facilities. Nuthall and Kimberly area have never been part of Nottingham City and value the benefits of Broxtowe Borough Council. If it is required to meet with a numbers requirement, then geographically other alternatives would appear to meet the requirements

Everyone we speak to, considers this proposal as mindless destruction of a community. We have a strong sense of place and are proud to be a separate entity in all its characteristic's from the City.

I strongly oppose the proposal to move Kimberley and watnall into the Nottingham boundary. I have lived in the Kimberley ward over 60 years .I admit it has grown over the years bit it still as a independent small community feel about it and doesn't feel connected to the City at all. We do not rely on Nottingham for most services having our own Doctors, dentists, solicitors, banks etc, As for shopping we have Kimberley Eastwood and Ilkeston all on our doorstep and 3 shopping Mals.I personally have not been to Nottingham (other than the hospital) in over 25 years. This area still as a strong farming link with 5 farms in the Kimberly ward and another in Watnall with a great farm shop.The area is rural and most residents have a rural outlook and dislike Cities so why would we want to become part of one, There as been a lot of new houses built in this area over the years and working in a local surgery i met a lot of new residents and i can say a lot of them moved here to get away from city life. Beeston with its high student population and being closer to the City would be a better option than our area.

I am not happy about the proposal to link the area I live in with Nottingham City and I can see no benefit to residents to do so. We intentionally moved away from the City environment a number of years ago for a reason. We are now in a rural area and our current councils are geared towards a rural way of life. There appears to be no explanation as to why your proposal was felt to be the most appropriate way forward. I feel there is no valid reason for your proposal as all you would need to do to meet the legal requirements of between 69,724 and 77,062 Parliamentary electors is to slightly adjust the boundaries between the 3 existing Nottingham City BC constituencies, e.g. reduce Nottingham South by 6500 and assign 3500 to Nottingham East and 3000 to Nottingham North. I appreciate this may be a simplistic view but sometimes, its best to not overcomplicate things and instead look for ways to reduce concerns and minimise disruption and impact on lives.

You propose a new constituency which combines Nuthall, Kimberley and Watnall (currently part of Broxtowe constituency) with part of north Nottingham. Like many local residents my immediate family have formed a close affinity with the two biggest towns in Broxtowe, namely Beeston and Eastwood. We have our banks and building societies in these towns and also do much of our shopping in them. We have no affinity with the area of north Nottingham which you propose to link us with. I also fear that the constituency that you are proposing would ultimately aid Nottingham City Council's desire to see its boundaries expanded to include part if not all of Nuthall. I would wish to see this resisted at all cost in view of the way in which that Council has run its services in recent years.

On behalf of the Nottinghamshire County Council Conservative Group, I submit for your consideration our agreed observations on the Boundary Commission for England's initial proposals for Parliamentary boundaries in the Nottinghamshire area of the East Midlands region. We support the Commission's proposals for most of the Nottinghamshire constituencies, but we object to the proposed boundary for the Broxtowe Constituency and to the creation of Nottingham North & Kimberley Borough Constituency. We also suggest alternative, more appropriate names for the proposed Sherwood and Worksop & Retford constituencies. As this is a submission on behalf of the Nottinghamshire County Conservative Group as a whole, the comments below are broad observations reflecting our thoughts on the characteristics of each of these areas of the County. We believe these are accurate reflections of local opinion as reported by our members, but we defer to individual councillors and residents to offer more specific and detailed observations relating to particular parts of these constituencies as they see fit.

Ashfield Constituency

We support the Boundary Commission's proposal for the Ashfield Constituency. We believe this will continue to reflect the identity of this part of Nottinghamshire.

Broxtowe Constituency & the Nottingham North & Kimberley Borough Constituency

We do not support the Commission's proposal to remove Kimberley, Nuthall, Strelley and Watnall from the existing Broxtowe constituency and incorporate them into a Nottingham North & Kimberley Borough Constituency. This would break long-standing community links where residents of these areas look north to Eastwood and its environs for their services and historic community identity. To do so would negate the Commission's welcome proposal to return Eastwood to the Broxtowe constituency where it is coterminous with the borough.

We believe the Commission's proposals are unwise to split the Parish of Greasley by placing Watnall in the Nottingham North & Kimberley Borough seat. The M1 motorway is a strong boundary which would effectively split the proposed Nottingham North & Kimberley Borough seat into two, creating an unnatural semi-rural and urban constituency with inconsistent characteristics. If any part of Broxtowe Borough must be linked with the City in order to preserve electoral equality, then a southern link would produce a more homogeneous cross-linked constituency. At the southern end of Broxtowe Borough, train and tram services out of the City travel through the centre of Beeston, while bus services between Nottingham and the Beeston area are more numerous than in the north, meaning there are far stronger business and community links with the City. A part of Beeston and Lenton Abbey north-east of Boundary Road is already contained within the current Nottingham South constituency. There are however comparatively poor transport and community links between the City and northern part of the borough, where more limited local bus routes prioritise access into Eastwood.

Here in Greasley we are very much akin to Kimberley, Watnall and Nuthall.

We are rural areas. And use doctors, schools, shops within all of these. All are easily accessible to us and should NOT be moved from Broxtowe.

We have no allegiance to Beston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Ryland, Beeston West. They are neither accessible to us, and are so close to city living, with the tram and students

I hope you will take this into consideration

I am writing to object to the proposed parliamentary boundary changes that would move Kimberley, Nuthall, and Watnall from the constituency of Broxtowe to the newly created Nottingham North and Kimberley constituency. I note that the The proposed boundary changes include Strelley, but as my residence lies in the Kimberley/ Nuthall/Watnall part of the area, I will limit my comments to the part which affects my household and community specifically. Watnall, Nuthall, and Kimberley are not Nottingham. Nottingham might as well be half a world away as far as many of the residents are concerned. And indeed on the west side of the M1 (where all of Kimberley and Watnall and much of Nuthall lie), with no natural connecting urban sprawl, the distance feels even greater. The naming of the constituency (Nottingham North and Kimberley) is telling, as if the area of Kimberley was clearly part of Nottingham, it would not require its own name in the title. Likewise, the hammerhead pattern of the new boundary gives a clear visual

demonstration of its inappropriateness. I am concerned that the disparate communities of Kimberley, Nuthall, and Watnall would be rendered voiceless by being swallowed up by the larger (and demographically different) Nottingham city population. For example, ONS data suggests the average age of a Broxtowe resident is more than 10 years older than a Nottingham City resident. With investigation, I am sure you would find that residents of this area rarely need or want to travel even to the other side of the M1 (let alone all the way to the city), despite it being very close, as all the facilities (healthcare, shopping, schools) used lie very much within the local area. If the Kimberley area was truly a part of greater Nottingham, it would have been included in the tram network and e-scooter scheme. The exclusion suggests that it isn't considered a part of the city, and/or that the layout, facilities, habits, and population of the areas are completely different to the urban area of Nottingham.

If changes need to be made to the parliamentary boundary, there are more compelling areas in Nottinghamshire to consider, both for demographic and geographic reasons. Places such as Beeston may be more suitable. I accept that old boundaries *may* need updating, and I am very invested in ensuring parliamentary seats are fairly distributed, but community and history should not be eschewed in favour of a simple mathematical split. Furthermore, I am sceptical of the reasons for these specific proposed changes.

So where is the justification for the proposal? If the Boundary Commission has conducted an analysis, then they must have solid logical reasons for the changes. It should be incumbent upon the Boundary Commission to write to every (affected) household and explain what they propose to change and why, given that it will affect elections and day-to-day matters.

Relying on the public to discover the proposals and then making them available only online with interactive maps raises many accessibility issues. Indeed, using the search function on the website to find the relevant area does not actually show the user what is being changed (as you will be aware, this is done by selecting various filters on the map labels). If the changes are not to the benefit of the local population (which they would not be in this case), then what are they for? Several sources calculate that, overall, the Conservative party will gain approximately 10 extra seats from these changes. Gerrymandering (clearly demonstrated here by the hammerhead) is a completely unacceptable practice, and must have no place in modern democracies. No boundary changes should be done with the aim or result of increasing the power of the current administration. Again, if the Boundary Commission thinks this is *not* what they have done, I invite you to provide evidence - to the public - to the contrary.

If the goal here is parliamentary fairness, then a fairer thing to do would be to introduce proportional representation into our electoral system. May I suggest the Boundary Commission takes that back to the government as a more sensible suggestion?

Greasley Parish within the Broxtowe Boundary

Eastwood Kimberley, Watnall and Nuthall, are in the same area, which we use for shopping, schools, doctors etc We are all rural area's. All are easily accessible to us and should NOT be moved from Broxtowe. Beston Central, Beeston North, Beeston Ryland, Beeston West, should be within the city boundary as they are closely aligned. They are neither easily accessible to us, and are so close to city living, with the tram and students I hope you will take this into consideration

I would like to register my views to agree with my local parish council proposal 2

The Commission's proposed link with the City of Nottingham at the northern end of the Borough of Broxtowe (the Nottingham North and Kimberley seat) sadly then breaks these community links by removing Kimberley, Nuthall, Strelley and Watnall from Broxtowe. These areas look north to Eastwood and its environs for services and community links. The Commission's proposals split the Parish of Greasley by placing Watnall in the Nottingham North and Kimberley seat. The M1 is a strong boundary, which affectively splits the Commission's proposed Nottingham North and Kimberley seat into two. It would be more appropriate to add the seats in the south of the Borough to Nottingham South, ie. Beeston North, Beeston Central, Beeston West and Beeston Rylands who all have a much closer link to Nottingham, with the University on our doorstep. There is a very large number of Halls of Residence on the edge of Beeston

and a much better bus service to Nottingham than could be found in the North of the Borough. There are poor transport links from the northern end of the Borough into the City, as contrasted with that of the southern end which has a good tram service from Nottingham City.

I do not wish the changes of the parliamentary boundary of Watnall to be changed into the seat of the city of Nottingham. Watnall has nothing in common with the city of Nottingham. We moved away into this area to escape the influence with the City. Watnall is a historical community based on well established Parish Council which act as cohesive cement ensuring that the community they represent is well represented. An MP covering this area is unlikely to have any great interest in this community as the overwhelming components for the constituency will be formed from Nottingham City. The issues of our community is far different from those of the City and we would be forgotten as being peripheral to the rest of the proposed constituency. There are more logical places such as Beeston which has a large student population that looks obviously to Nottingham University and the City for its requirements. This is in sharp contrast to Watnall who look away from the City for its facilities. The proposals would obliterate the identities of our local communities as they would simply become part of great Nottingham. We have never been part of the City and do not wish to be.

I think the proposal is good. Combining the two areas will facilitate growth in the area.

Pleased to see that the southern part of Broxtowe is kept as at present. In particular, Beeston (inc Rylands)/Chilwell/Toton/Attenborough has a strong local identity and it would be a mistake to try and split Beeston. The suggestion from the previous review which would have put my address (Chilwell, despite the postal address of Beeston) in a different constituency to Beeston was a ridiculously arbitrary division, as is the suggestion current in some quarters that some wards of Beeston should move to a city constituency. It's also good to see that the suggestion made in a previous review of combining this area with parts of Rushcliffe e.g. East Leake seems no longer on the table: while demographically similar, the river Trent divides these areas and means there is little contact between them. In the north of Broxtowe, keeping as closely as possible to the borough council boundary is sensible. However the constituency is already long and narrow and my feeling is that it makes the northern parts feel a little cut off from the main focus of the council and MP which tends to be in Beeston/Stapleford. Stretching the constituency even more doesn't seem helpful in this respect.

I am concerned to hear that the Council proposes merging such distinct, separate areas together, for no real benefit to any of those areas. Nuthall, Kimberley and Watnall are separate, distinct towns with their own personalities and priorities, I believe these proposed changes are for the benefit and convenience of local administrators, and not the benefit of the greater population.

Having read the information regarding re-imagining of boundaries I was surprised and concerned to find us within Nottingham City control rather than the County Council. I believe that the areas proposed are disparate entities with differing needs. I worry that the needs of the individual areas will be overlooked or over-powered by those with most need. It seems that the areas have been drawn up solely for the purpose of 'evening up numbers' rather than the needs of the communities. I would ask that these are re-visited before this proceeds further.

Myself, wife and family are completely against the inclusion of the area within the City boundaries. We chose to live in the county as it has a different outlook to life than the City and agree with all the comments already given by our local councils. Question - has any changes been proposed to other areas to the south, north and east of the City i.e. Beeston, Attenborough, Edwalton, Papplewick, Newstead etc.? This manoeuvre is not in the interest of the local people or area and would appear to have been put together and proposed by persons who have no knowledge of the people or local area. What benefit has being in and part of the city, got to offer the residents that could improve their way of life?

I am giving my support to the proposals for Broxtowe Borough which includes removing Kimberley and Nuthall from the Borough and putting in a new City Ward. I also support Eastwood moving from Ashfield to Broxtowe as well.

My family are completely against including the area within the City boundaries. We chose to live in the county as it has a different outlook to life than the City and agree with all the reasons already given by our local councils. This manoeuvre is not in the local people's interest and has been proposed by people who have no knowledge of the people or the local area

I do not wish my village of Watnall to become part of Nottingham City. The local villages of Nuthall, Watnall and Kimberley have well established Parish Councils with Strelley having regular Parish meetings. We have excellent relationships with them representing our communities in a very approachable way. We have excellent local schools and shopping areas with the Kimberley Leisure Centre on our doorstep providing wonderful local facilities. Our Parish Halls provide great focal points for community based activities and the Kimberley Library is an amazing place for books, information, Internet use and a meeting place for children's groups. These proposals would be very detrimental to our village life, breaking down our individual communities which have been in place for over 100 years. We do not want to be part of the huge Nottingham City Parliamentary seat, we need to keep our independent communities and retain our village and community life.

Myself,wife and family are completely against the inclusion of this area within the City boundaries. We chose to live in the county as it has a different outlook to life than the city and agree with all the reasons already given by our local councils. Question - have any changes been proposed in other areas to the south, north and east of the city ie. Beeston, Attenborough, Edwalton, Papplewick , Newstead etc.? This manoeuvre is not in the local people's interest and has been proposed by persons who have no knowledge of the people or our local area.

I do not wish for Nuthall to become part of the city council.

I do not wish for Kimberley to become part of Nottingham city council

I object strongly to the Parliamentary Boundary encompassing Kimberley and becoming part of Nottingham City. Kimberley is a rural community and has no association with a city environment.

I live in the village of Watnall. This is a semi rural community which with Nuthall west has about 4,500 residents. The constituency you are planning to put us in consists of council estates in Aspley, Bestwood and Bulwell. These areas have nothing in common with the village I live in. As we will be in the minority, how are our interests going to be served by an MP who will (and rightly) have to concentrate on the densely populated suburbs of Nottingham? Suburbs such as Aspley have their own issues (does it still have the highest teenage pregnancy rate in Europe?) which do not resemble those of the towns and villages the other side of Cinderhill island (Nuthall, Kimberley and Watnall). We are often forgotten in the North of Broxtowe as the Mp focuses on the more densely populated area around Beaton and we would certainly be forgotten in this new constituency. The review might be intended to even up the number of constituents in each area but it does not even up the number of issues? Do you have statistics on how many cases the current MP for Nottingham North and Broxtowe deal with? Surely this is a better way of dividing up constituencies? Finally, given all the local children in Awsorth, Kimberley, Nuthall and Watnall go to the Kimberley school, why divide Awsorth out from the rest? These seem to be political manoeuvrings at their best and will only be to the detriment of the people of Kimberley, Nuthall and Watnall who pay their taxes to support this system and will have little voice going forward.

I strongly object to the proposed new boundaries. I left Nottingham City area to live within an independent community, as Broxtowe has been for many years. I see absolutely no reason for change. Nottingham City have wasted millions of pounds over the years under an unfit for purpose Labour team. Labour councillors have totally mis-managed public funds, ie the Nottingham City utility provider, Broadmarsh Shopping Centre to name a few. A council should spend the valuable funds from Government and our Council Tax to improve the living conditions of the local people, there is more chance of that happening outside the Nottingham City control. Do not change the boundaries.

I have lived in the constituency of Broxtowe for approximately 30 years. I recognise that the job of the Boundary Commission is a difficult but essential one. Assuming that for the foreseeable future we will continue with the badly flawed FPTP system, then I am content with the job you have done. In some ways elements of the north and south of the constituency do not form a coherent whole, however, I personally would be unhappy to find I had moved into a nearby constituency. I am particularly concerned at concerted efforts by one political party locally to muster support for an alternative outcome. I am sure that you will recognise this organised campaign and that, conversely, those like myself who are content with the changes will not comment. Please do not be browbeaten!

Here are my comments on the plan to include Kimberley and Watnall within the new proposed 'Nottingham North and Kimberley' parliamentary constituency:

COMMENTS ON CURRENT PLAN

1. Kimberley and Watnall are geographically separated from the city of Nottingham by the M1 motorway, which is a major boundary, and which also creates a focus of the community away from the city and westwards into Broxtowe and towards Eastwood. Travel from Nottingham city to Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley is not through a continuous built up area, which demonstrates the geographical separation. Travel from Nuthall (west of the M1) to Eastwood is through an almost continuous built-up area, emphasising the connection and integration with the other parts of Broxtowe, particularly Giltbrook, Newthorpe, and Eastwood.
2. The social make-up of the two areas is totally different, and so work of an MP representing the combined area is different. According to the Boundaries Commission website, Nottingham North has a very different profile from Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley in terms of housing, employment, industry, ethnic composition, etc, etc. Many parts of the Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley are rural or semi-rural aspect, with farming countryside and green belt issues being high on the agenda, whereas these are not issues in Nottingham North. This mismatch of Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley with Nottingham North will mean that the overwhelming work and areas of challenge for the MP are likely to be with Nottingham City, meaning that the peripheral area of Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley will receive less attention.
3. Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley have strong community ties within the current north Broxtowe area. Within the north Broxtowe area there are strong ties between Nuthall/Watnall/Kimberley and Giltbrook/Newthorpe/Eastwood, those six 'settlements' forming a very strong community with common interests and a strong historical linkage. Travel is generally east-west through these towns and villages, and shopping is in either Kimberley, Giltbrook (a large shopping centre), or Eastwood, all on the east-west axis within Broxtowe Borough and not into the Nottingham North area at all. Leisure facilities for the whole of the area are provided at Kimberley Leisure Centre. One indicator of the cohesion of the area is the local newspaper which is the Eastwood & Kimberley Advertiser and which covers the whole of the area from Nuthall through to Eastwood. The Nottingham Post is not the newspaper of choice here. If an arbitrary line is drawn to including the Nuthall/Kimberley/Watnall area in with the city. it will fragment what are currently and historically areas with strong connections and a shared local identity.
4. There is a danger that eventually plans would be raised to absorb the area into Nottingham City, which is not wanted by residents, who have chosen to live in an area outside the city, and benefit from living in the rural area outside the city.

SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE PLANS

A. Move Beeston (or part of it) into the Nottingham constituency. Beeston shares many of the characteristics of the city in terms of housing and other measures, has a large student population from Nottingham University (which is in the city) and is a substantial part of the Nottingham Tram network, giving a strong travel links to the city. Travel to Beeston from Nottingham is entirely through the built-up area with no obvious geographical boundaries - the casual visitor would not notice the change from Nottingham to Beeston. Residents of Broxtowe would undoubtedly see moving part (or all) of Beeston into the proposed constituency as the most logical fit with Nottingham city. The number of voters required (roughly 13,000) could

easily be achieved from the wards in the Beeston area.

B. Move part of Hucknall Town into Nottingham North constituency. Hucknall (currently in Ashfield) shares many of the characteristics of the city in terms of housing and demographics, and is a connected part of the Nottingham Tram network. It is part of the continuous built-up area to the North of the city, and would fit very well into Nottingham North. The number of voters required (roughly 13,000) could easily be achieved from a combination of the wards in the Hucknall area.

As a resident of Kimberley I do not wish to be part of the city of Nottingham. Please leave the boundary as it is.

We understand this is the Parliamentary boundary only, not Nottinghamshire County Council, Broxtowe Council or Nuthall Parish Council boundaries. The proposal is to transfer the four villages of Kimberley, Watnall, Nuthall and Strelley from the Broxtowe constituency to a new expanded North Nottingham and Kimberley constituency.

We object to the proposal because of the following reasons:

1. Not enough notice has been given to electors to consider and research the proposal. We heard from a neighbour about 15 July 2021 who was informed by a Nuthall Parish Councillor. We received a letter on 19 July 2021 from Nuthall Parish Council. The response deadline is 2 August 2021, which is far too short and extension should be granted to give a better response.
2. Nuthall Parish Council is against the proposals and we agree with the them, together with their reasons, we have added our own below.
3. The present Broxtowe Parliamentary Area is a long length of land that is shorter in width than its length is to the west of Nottingham centre following the M1 Motorway, with its centre about four miles from Nottingham centre. The existing Nottingham North parliamentary area is east of Broxtowe and north of Nottingham City Centre. The proposed new enlarged area of Nottingham North would arc around and cut into the old Broxtowe area like an outcrop. This would cause a number of difficulties not least public transport access to MP meetings. This odd size of the transferred four villages would be totally un-natural and out of place in the new constituency. No consideration has been made of this or local ties such as cultural and sport club membership and social and family catchment ties.
4. Our counter-proposal is that Broxtowe parliamentary constituency should be reduced on the western or southern boundaries instead, near Ilkeston or Chilwell.
5. It is unclear to us as electors from the maps online, if the existing parliamentary ward boundaries have been split in the new proposed area. Surely some explanatory text should accompany the maps to better understand if wards have been split, a complex situation? Also, explanatory text should be provided which parts of the Nottinghamshire County council, Broxtowe council and Nottingham City Council are to be altered the BCE proposal to enable us electors have a clearer picture of what is happening.
6. Our present area is Broxtowe both for Broxtowe Council and the present Parliamentary area. Should the proposal come into effect, we would have one of the three Nottingham City MP areas (Nottingham North and Kimberley) together with Broxtowe Council, a cause for great confusion. Keeping to existing local authority boundaries has not been adhered to, some latitude would have been acceptable but this is excessive.
7. The Parliamentary and Local Government Areas would become more mixed and complicated. Most of Nottinghamshire Local Government is made of two or three council providing services to the population, except Nottingham City Council which is a unitary council providing all services, meaning the new area MP would deal with a mixture of a unitary council and the County, Broxtowe and a parish council in Nuthall. This would not be an optimum situation.
8. The four villages are rural whereas appending them onto proposed existing predominantly urban Nottingham North would result in having a mixed minority rural and major urban constituency of Nottingham North and Kimberley. The present MP's for the two affected constituencies are used to the features of their areas. With the new area the numbers may be optimised but the problems and workload would increase for the new incumbent. Most of the time attention would be given to the urban inner-city areas leaving the new rural areas mostly

overlooked.

9. At the 2019 election the electorate in the two proposed affected parliamentary areas voted for two different parties, the new proposal means the transferred electorate would be outnumbered. BCE say they will not impact future election results, this proposal will impose a different party on the four displaced villages.

10. The new parliamentary area would cross Broxtowe Council and Nottingham City Council Borders which we believe it had not done before. Also, there is a combination of a unitary authority and non-unitary authority for the parliament area to straddle and cause unforeseen problems. This will cause much confusion, which should be avoided.

11. It is not clear if the affected wards of councils would also be transferred or not to the new parliamentary area or remain as they are? More clarity would be appreciated, please!

12. Bus, train and tram links at the moment radiate from Nottingham Centre outwards to the suburbs. The proposed new area is not served directly by public transport except expensive taxis between the four villages without traveling via the city centre, making for long duration's to meet our MP at surgeries. Electors with Bus passes would be priced out of attending surgeries or have to make long journeys into town and back out again.

13. For the past seven years the four village residents have been engaged in disputes with HS2 Limited to tunnel and other issues with the new railway line that runs adjacent to the four villages, Anna Soubery MP and then Darren Henry MP have spent much of their time taking up problems on electors' behalf. To change to a new MP would mean a new learning curve to be gone through losing much valuable time, at a time when new reports and decisions are being made, leaving no time for a new MP to prepare.

14. Major problems in Nottingham City Council are related to the financial problems of their energy supply company which are involving the three Nottingham MP's and taking up a lot of their time. The local press has referred to the near bankruptcy of the council (<https://www.nottinghampost.com/news/local-news/nottingham-city-council-verge-bankruptcy-4774551>). This is unrelated to our four villages and would leave the proposed new MP with little time to attend to our problems.

15. The maps showing the existing and proposed constituencies are difficult to understand and see what is going on, especially overlaying them.

16. No data is shown on how the decision was reached on the proposals. Data such as links, public transport routes, unifying rural and urban areas. Altering the parliamentary boundary without electors having the opportunity of examining the reasons for these changes and other options were considered and how the conclusions were reached.

As a resident of Nuthall I feel that we should not be included within Nottingham City. We understand the need to create constituencies of equal sizes but feel that Beeston area has more in common and is already more closely aligned with the city of Nottingham than Nuthall. As such that would be a more appropriate change. Thank you.

I support the boundary commission's proposal to move Eastwood from Ashfield constituency to Broxtowe constituency. I believe the commission's proposed constituency of Broxtowe including Eastwood is the best that can be achieved as it keeps communities together. I acknowledge the work the commission has done to keep communities together and avoid spiriting communities between different constituencies. Pairing Kimberley, Watnall and Nuthall with Nottingham North keeps those communities together as a whole , the alternative proposals but forward to divide Beeston would involve splitting the town and dividing communities. .I would suggest that the commission use the community governance review of parish boundaries currently being undertaken by Broxtowe Borough Council. This is due to complete in June next year and if adopted a reorganisation order would be made and the ward boundaries changed ahead of local elections in 2023. Community Governance Review : Broxtowe Borough Council
The community governance review proposals would produce a better boundary between Broxtowe and Nottingham North and Kimberley with the boundary between the two constituencies running along the A610 before tuning south around Swingate then running down the M1 motorway, (attached maps uploaded as files). The areas shown in green would move from Broxtowe to Nottingham North and the areas in orange would remain in Broxtowe. The

overall number of changes would be minor with around a dozen properties on Gilt Hill moving into Kimberley parish from Greasley and therefore into the proposed Nottingham North and Kimberley Constituency. Similarly the hamlet of Babbington containing around 30 properties, which is currently proposed to move into Nottingham North and Kimberley, would instead remain in Broxtowe as its only road link is via Awsworth and has no direct road links (beyond minor farm tracks) to Kimberley and therefore the proposed Nottingham North and Kimberley constituency.

With regards to the proposed Ashfield constituency I note the commission have proposed to include two wards from Mansfield into Ashfield but have sought alternative views to be put forward. One option would be for Brinsley ward to remain in Ashfield instead of moving onto Broxtowe constituency. Although Brinsley is part of Broxtowe district it has close links with the neighbouring villages of Underwood and Jacksdale which are part of Ashfield district. Keeping Brinsley would allow one of the Mansfield wards to remain in Mansfield however this would not be enough as the electorate for Ashfield constituency without the two Mansfield wards but including Brinsley would be 68,999 which is around 750 short of the minimum number of 69,724 voters.

If possible one option would be to split the ward of Newstead (part of Gedling District and Sherwood constituency). The actual village of Newstead is just over the district boundary from Ashfield but it has no road links to the wider Gedling district or Sherwood Constituency (attached map). If the boundary between Sherwood and Ashfield constituencies was moved East to follow the Robin Hood rail line south to the current Ashfield/Gedling boundary on the B6011 road north of Hucknall then Newstead village along with new houses that have been built between the A611, B6011 and the Robin Hood railway line would become part of the proposed Ashfield constituency which may bring in enough voters to hit the minimum threshold. There are also plans to build another 800 houses in this area which would allow the voter base in Ashfield to grow. If the above is not possible then I do not see any other option that does not involve splitting Mansfield or Hucknall.

The Boundary Commission is to be commended for the proposals they have formulated in relation to Broxtowe and the surrounding constituencies, particularly in respect of the following points

1 the territorial integrity of Nottinghamshire county has been protected in this Review. and the proposed constituency covers one Borough Council and belongs to one County Council

2 Broxtowe is in reality south west Nottinghamshire constituency: whatever constitutes the best formula for allocating sufficient voters to it should be paramount- in this case swapping (and bringing in) the less populous Eastwood/Brinsley for Nuthall/Kimberley makes numeric sense in making up the quota in the most practical way

3 beyond their being in Broxtowe Council there is little relationship between the main Borough areas of Beeston/Chilwell, Stapleford, Nuthall/Kimberley, and Eastwood/Brinsley: but each of these does constitute an organic community and should be packaged in to the same constituency

I am opposed to the changes. The proposals would merge very different communities and demographics. Changing the boundaries would also break up some of those existing communities. The existing boundaries cater for those variances - which have very different needs, both in terms of the service priorities, dependancies and budgetary needs. There are no similarities between Watnall/Kimberley/Nuthall and inner city Bulwell/Strelley/Broxtowe which in the revised would be merged. Having lived in both areas, I do not see the benefit of merging a mainly rural district with that which is mainly inner city. Indeed I was careful when choosing the area move to get away from The City and their very different budget priorities and waste. I would very much see this as a dilution of the focus and services provided for this area.

Living in Watnall we have no affiliation to the areas within the city of Nottingham boundary. Incorporating our area into the city will be of no benefit to us, our community needs would be lost amongst the wider needs of the city areas. We have always considered Watnall to be a

county area with links to Kimberley and Nuthall. We are against the proposed changes and wish to remain in the Broxtowe constituency.

I do not agree with the proposed boundary move which would include Nuthall in the Nottingham City Parliamentary seat. Nuthall has nothing in common with the City of Nottingham. Nuthall has a well established Parish Council as do Kimberley and Watnall, (Strelley has regular Parish meetings). I feel that this move is not considering communities but just concerns numbers. The issues in our communities are very different to those of the City.

Having been made aware by my local Parish and Borough Councillors of the proposed parliamentary boundary changes I can confirm that I do not support them. Having been born, bred and lived in Nottingham all my life I have, during that time, been a resident in both the city and Broxtowe boroughs and know that they are not one and the same. For the last 21 years I have lived in Watnall and have felt part of the local community along with the surrounding areas of Nuthall, Strelley and Kimberley. Although I am very proud to come from Nottingham and Nottinghamshire, I no longer feel part of the City of Nottingham given where I live and would not wish to move back within its boundary. Therefore the proposal to incorporate my area within the city boundary feels totally wrong. Looking at the proposed changes it would make far greater sense to include an area like Beeston within the new boundary which is closer by distance and has far greater ties with the city such as through the high proportion of students who go to the various universities. I would ask, therefore, that you reconsider the proposed changes to reflect mine and I am sure other similar opinions from residents in my area.

As the primary purpose of the BC is to maintain the number of electors in a constituency to be in the range 69,724 to 77,062 as well as maintaining the cohesion of constituencies and to support 'local areas' I cannot support the creation of Nottingham North and Kimberley. The proposed areas to be added to Nottingham City are NOT urban areas. They are well catered for by the Broxtowe constituency. The work of an MP is difficult enough without increasing the variety of needs, concerns and expectations of electors by trying to represent both urban and rural areas. As Nottingham South has 79,684 electors at the last count, it is outside the accepted range. I would suggest that the boundary be changed to take the areas around Aspley into Nottingham North - this would bring both constituencies into the required range and also keep the cohesion of both city constituencies without adding a rural area into the mix. Let Broxtowe keep its villages and small towns and let Nottingham keep its sections of the city.

Having become aware of the changes intended to the parliamentary boundaries to include Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley into the Parliamentary seat of Nottingham, as residents of Nuthall we would express our views on this proposal as follows:

We very strongly do not wish to become part of a Nottingham based parliamentary seat under a new name of Nottingham North and Kimberley. We feel the proposal does not take into account the requirements of the people living within the areas of Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley but is in fact merely an exercise to increase the number of eligible voters in a new Nottingham parliamentary seat. We strongly feel this should not be allowed to happen, especially when there are other areas close to Nottingham that would appear to be more suitable given their demographic make up and proximity to the City eg:: Beeston, with its large student population and proximity to high quality post compulsory education facilities. In our opinion Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley have nothing in common with Nottingham. We have our own well established communities encompassing all age ranges, we have a good choice of local shopping facilities and retail parks that cover our everyday needs with the choice of travelling into the City if necessary and we also have strong, well established local Parish Councils that ensure the communities they serve are well represented. In our opinion these communities have nothing in common with Nottingham city and our community issues are totally different. We feel N/S/W&K would be on the periphery of interest to an MP for a new constituency of Nottingham North and Kimberley and feel the identity of our communities would become submerged and lost within the proposed new Parliamentary constituency with the centre of interest being Nottingham itself. To conclude, we have never been part of the City of Nottingham or part of its parliamentary representation and we do not wish to become so now.

Why I do not support the proposed changes for Kimberley:-

Most Kimberley residents use health services in Eastwood. The proposals will break those ties. This makes no practical sense. Kimberley children generally do not attend schools outside of Kimberley, Nuthall and Watnall. The Kimberley School also serves the local areas of Awsworth and Giltbrook. It therefore makes no sense to lump Kimberley in with what would be a city constituency. The Nuthall roundabout is a clear boundary mark that divides the communities of Kimberley, Watnall and Nuthall from the city. Those living in these communities look to Kimberley as its town centre and not to the city centre of Nottingham. This is a thriving community in its own right. Kimberley, Nuthall and Watnall retain large swathes of green belt that link these communities and link them together with other parts of Broxtowe e.g. Cossall and Trowell. It again makes no practical sense to sever these community links. Kimberley is steeped in its own heritage as a former coal mining and brewing town. This is part of its identity and if it is swallowed up into a city constituency it will lose its individual identity.

Why I do not support the proposed changes for Kimberley:-

Many people, myself included, have moved out of the city and chosen Kimberley because it is not linked with the city areas. Kimberley is its own community with its own Town Council, own secondary school and own town centre. It doesn't look to the city for its services. It would make no sense to place it in to a constituency with which it doesn't share natural boundaries or key services e.g. education, health and recreation. The Nuthall roundabout defines the boundary of the communities of Kimberley, Watnall and Nuthall from the city. There are currently no public transport options that enable you to travel directly from Kimberley to the areas with which it is proposed it is now placed into a constituency with. This serves to demonstrate the lack of a common sense approach to this proposal. Kimberley, Nuthall and Watnall link naturally through their greenbelt and green corridors with other parts of the Broxtowe constituency e.g. Cossall, Trowell through to Stapleford. It again makes no practical sense to sever these ties, particularly at a time when Broxtowe Borough Council are looking to increase the use of these green corridors. Kimberley would be at serious risk of losing its identity under the proposed changes and as a town with significant heritage this could impact on the long term sustainability of its town centre. Parts of Beeston could much more practically move in to a new constituency. Many students at Nottingham University are already housed in the neighbouring city areas of Lenton and Wollaton. Beeston is already serviced by city transport links.

I do not agree with the new boundaries. Please leave them as they are.

Nuthall is a village community that has already been split during the construction of the M1 motorway to; recover its community spirit and has been serviced very well by Broxtowe Borough Council. If we, the village, is swallowed up into the City Council we will lose this and our independent voice to be heard in the Houses of Parliament. The housing, school and services are something we are proud of and we do not want to lose this village identity. Nuthall, Watnall & Kimberley use the local facilities supported very well through Broxtowe BC. Families attend the local schools, shop within Nuthall & Kimberley and support the local public houses and restaurants. Beeston with the large student population would be a better fit as these are the public that use the city facilities. Nuthall, Kimberley & Watnall should keep their individual community voice within Broxtowe BC. Being part of this borough council we continue to thrive, grow & develop whilst retaining the community and village way of life that residents take pride in. Many of the residents have lived in these areas for generations and some who have specifically moved from the city areas because of the village and community way of life. We do not want to be part of the city or part of a parliamentary seat that includes Nottingham. We are and should remain separate independent communities, who are looked after by our Parish Councils and Borough Council. We have our voice and want to ensure that our local services are provided by and are for the support of our communities.

Kimberley should remain in Broxtowe BC. Nottingham City Council are desperate to amalgamate Broxtowe South into Greater Nottingham and the residents of Broxtowe South are determined to prevent this happening.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed change in Parliamentary boundary for Nuthall, Strelley, Watnall and Kimberley.

The proposed change would involve these Parishes becoming part of a Nottingham City seat with which they have nothing in common. I fail to see how any MP would have any significant interest in the above areas which would be relegated to becoming an appendage of the City. As a resident of Nuthall, I do not consider myself a city resident. The facilities I use are predominantly within the local community and the change would inevitably result in the loss of identity of this community. The proposal is simply an easy way to balance the numbers of Parliamentary electors, which, at a stroke, would wipe out these separate communities.

I have in favour of the proposed recommendations for Broxtowe CC. I believe to comply with the Boundary Commission rules on the size of constituencies this is the best way to form such a constituency. As a resident of Beeston I am pleased that all Beeston will be kept together, there is a real community feel to the area and we are all very much part of Broxtowe rather than the city.

We object very strongly and want Watnall to remain a village will you please make our wishes known.