

Report of the Executive Director

Community Governance Review - Consideration of Final Recommendation
--

1. Purpose of Report

To ask the Committee to approve the draft recommendations to be put forward for consultation as part of the Community Governance Review (CGR) which started in January 2024.

2. Recommendation

The Committee is asked to CONSIDER the draft recommendations put forward by the Task and Finish Group and RECOMMEND to Council accordingly.

3. Detail

At its meeting on 27 November 2023, the Committee approved the Consultation Proposals for the Community Governance Review. Following a three-month consultation, the proposals were reviewed by a Task and Finish Group (TFG) in light of the comments received and alternative proposals put forward by Parish/Town Councils and members of the public. The original consultation options and comments received are attached at **Appendix 1**. The TFG's suggested draft recommendations, which include changes which the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) will be asked to make to ward boundaries, are included at **Appendix 2**, together with maps showing the suggested new boundaries.

Members need to be satisfied that the final draft recommendation will ensure that local governance continues to be effective and convenient and that it reflects the identities and interests of local communities. The recommendations arising from a Review should deliver improved community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and result in more efficient delivery of local services.

The next stages in the review process are:

Stage Three	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft recommendations published for consultation • Stakeholders notified 	Three months	1 June – 31 August 2024
Stage Four	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of submissions received • Final recommendations prepared 	Two months	1 September – 31 October 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final recommendations published concluding the review • Final recommendations considered by Council and decision made on arrangements with resolution to make a Reorganisation Order • Reorganisation Order made 	<p>One month later</p>	<p>November 2024 December 2024</p>
--	--	------------------------	--

As with the first consultation, a letter will be sent to Parish/Town Councils included in the Review, the County Council and all properties which could be affected by a boundary change, informing them of the proposals and the opportunity to submit comments.

If the recommendation of the TFG is approved and the proposals finally adopted by Council following the second consultation, there are a number of issues which will need to be considered including the transfer of Greasley Parish Council staff and transfer of resources. Consideration of the precept for the new Parish Council will also need to be considered prior to the 2027/28 financial year.

4. Financial Implications

The comments from the Head of Finance Services were as follows:

There are no additional financial implications to consider with activity being contained within existing budgets.

5. Legal Implications

The comments from the Monitoring Officer / Head of Legal Services were as follows:

The Council has responsibility for undertaking community governance reviews and are able to decide whether to give effect to recommendations made in those reviews. Chapter 3 of Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 is the overarching legislation that devolves the power to take decisions about matters such as the creation of parishes and their electoral arrangements to local government and local communities. In making decisions the Council are required to take account of the views of local people.

Community governance reviews provide the opportunity for the Council to review and make changes to community governance within their areas. The 2007 Act provisions are intended to improve the development and coordination of support for citizens and community groups so that they can make the best use of empowerment opportunities. The 2007 Act is intended to streamline the process

of taking decisions about giving effect to recommendations made in a community governance review.

6. Human Resources Implications

The comments from the Human Resources Manager were as follows:
Not required

7. Union Comments

The Union comments were as follows:
Not Required

8. Climate Change Implications

The climate change implications are contained within the report.

9. Data Protection Compliance Implications

This report does not contain any OFFICIAL(SENSITIVE) information and there are no Data Protection issues in relation to this report.

10. Equality Impact Assessment

As this is not a change to policy or a new policy there is not an equality impact assessment.

11. Background Papers

Nil.

Appendix 1

Stage 1 consultation options

1. Brinsley, Eastwood, Greasley, Kimberley and Nuthall

Option 1 – Dissolve Eastwood, Greasley and Kimberley Parish Councils to give effect to the following:

- the creation of a new Parish Council (name to be determined) comprising of all of Eastwood Parish area, Giltbrook, Newthorpe, Moorgreen and the outlying properties in Greasley Parish
- the inclusion in Brinsley Parish of 8 properties on Willey Lane, Saint’s Coppice Farm, Cordy Lane, Felley Mill Farm and Old Hags Farmhouse, Mill Lane and 2 properties on Mansfield Road from Greasley Parish
- the inclusion in Nuthall Parish of the 555 properties on the Larkfields estate currently in Greasley Parish and 3 properties on Woodside Avenue currently in Kimberley Parish
- the inclusion in Kimberley Parish of 879 properties currently in the Watnall Ward of Greasley Parish, 3 properties on Nottingham Road, 2 on Knowle Hill and 4 properties addressed to Swingate currently in Strelley Parish
- The transfer of a small piece of land from Trowell to Unparished at Balloon Woods, affecting no electors or properties.

Option 2 – Address boundary anomaly issues only

From	To	No of properties
Eastwood	Greasley	34 on Brandyline Gardens
		73 on Charles Avenue
		17 on Commons Close
		8 on Daisy Farm Road
		23 on Dovecote Road
		1 on Fairdale Drive
		9 on Halls Lane
		2 on Hilltop Rise
		4 on Lower Beauvale
		2 on Mary Road
		8 on Metcalfe Road
		43 on Mill Road
		85 on Newthorpe Common
		13 on Nottingham Road
		3 on Scargill Walk
		3 on Stanhope Close
		7 on Violet Avenue
9 on Wheeler Avenue		
28 on Wyvern Close		

From	To	No of properties
Greasley	Brinsley	Saints Coppice Farm
		2 properties on Mansfield Road
Greasley	Eastwood	81 on Beamlight Road
		53 on Braemar Avenue
		4 on Brookside
		15 on Butterfly Place
		48 on Coach Drive
		3 on Daniel's Court
		15 on Dovecote Road
		14 on Fryar Road
		23 on Garland Drive
		20 on Hewer Close
		11 on Jenkin Close
		1 property on Main Street
		1 property on Nether Green
		24 properties on Meadow Close
		7 properties on Mill Road
		6 properties on Nether Close
		54 properties on Park Crescent
		41 properties on Robey Drive
		46 properties on Thorn Tree Gardens
		15 properties on Thorpe Road
		8 properties on Vale Close
Greasley	Kimberley	4 on Coatsby Road
		11 on Gilt Hill
		2 properties on Nottingham Road
Greasley	Nuthall	555 on the Larkfields Estate
Kimberley	Nuthall	3 properties on Woodside Avenue
Kimberley	Greasley	13 properties on Chilton Drive
		32 properties on Cloverlands Drive
		31 properties on Hillcrest Close
Nuthall	Kimberley	3 Properties on Nottingham Road
		2 Properties on Knowle Hill
Strelley	Kimberley	4 Properties addressed Swingate
Trowell	Unparished	A small piece of land at Balloon Woods

Option 3 – Retain existing boundaries, no changes

2. Nuthall – NES3 polling district area

Option 1 – no change to existing arrangements whereby Strelley remains a Parish with a Parish Meeting, with the exception of any changes agreed in respect of 1. above

Option 2 – the Parish becomes a Parish Ward of Nuthall Parish Council

Option 3 – create a separate Parish Council for the area

Consultation Responses - Community Governance Review – All Parishes

Option 1 – Dissolve Eastwood, Greasley and Kimberley Parish Councils to give effect to the following:

- the creation of a new Parish Council (name to be determined) comprising of all of Eastwood Parish area, Giltbrook, Newthorpe, Moorgreen and the outlying properties in Greasley Parish
- the inclusion in Brinsley Parish of 8 properties on Willey Lane, Saint’s Coppice Farm, Cordy Lane, Felley Mill Farm and Old Hags Farmhouse, Mill Lane and 2 properties on Mansfield Road from Greasley Parish
- the inclusion in Nuthall Parish of the 555 properties on the Larkfields estate currently in Greasley Parish and 3 properties on Woodside Avenue currently in Kimberley Parish
- the inclusion in Kimberley Parish of 879 properties currently in the Watnall Ward of Greasley Parish, 3 properties on Nottingham Road, 2 on Knowle Hill and 4 properties addressed to Swingate currently in Strelley Parish
- The transfer of a small piece of land from Trowell to UnParished at Balloon Woods, affecting no electors or properties.

Comments in support of the option		Comments objecting to the option
1.	As residents of Watnall for the past 20 years, we feel more attached to Kimberley than Greasley. We shop and socialise in Kimberley and never interact with Greasley in any way. We therefore support the proposal that we move the boundary from Greasley to Kimberley and Watnall.	<p>Based on the information provided I see no evidence that Option 1 would have any benefit for me as a resident (of Newthorpe).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no information about potential improvements to services. • What the impact would be on the community • What would be the impact on the Parish precept. <p>As such, currently I do not support this proposal. However, I would be pleased to hear more of the benefits that this option could produce.</p>
2.	I would be in favour of a move from Greasley to Kimberley with Watnall on the grounds of improved community cohesion.	<p>The abolition or merging of Parishes is, regardless of what is included in the FAQ, a destruction of local history. Eastwood, Giltbrook, Newthorpe and Moorgreen each have their own storied backgrounds and to merge or abolish any of these is simply unacceptable. The important factors listed as part of the consultation criteria are poor:</p> <p>* Access will not change regardless of borders or Parish naming. Polling stations are assigned to voters by the Council, so if you're currently making citizens cross Parishes in order to vote then I'd suggest the fault</p>

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
	<p>is the number of polling stations provided, not the land borders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Property isolation (so in reality, farmhouses) is still a factor regardless of Parish. An isolated property will remain isolated regardless of Parish ownership. This is a nonsense reasoning. * Community cohesion doesn't currently exist in society and is a big problem. Changing Parish borders will not solve this. Societal funding, improved social and local services and improvements to our locality is the answer. For one, our roads are a disgrace! The money spent on this review would be better spent here and is again a nonsense reasoning. * Boundary sustainability. Boundaries have to end somewhere. Dovecote Road in Eastwood becomes Newthorpe at a point and then Moorgreen further on. This cannot be prevented in all cases. In addition, this has not caused an issue before so why now? What specific disadvantages does this cause? <p>There is no evidence to suggest that this review is either warranted or requested by the general public and as far as I can tell from the letter provided is nothing more than an attempt to amalgamate a selection of Parishes together (I suspect it's to cut costs, as it always is) as the other solutions available to this review are mind-bogglingly "No Change" and... "No Change".</p> <p>Say what you mean: You wish to merge all Parishes into one unless you get enough pushback to stop you. Please consider this e-mail as strong opposition to this proposal. If there are to be any meetings to discuss this further to which the public can attend, please do also let me know.</p>
<p>3. I live on Newdigate Road in Watnall and am in favour of Watnall being moved from Greasley to Kimberley. We have always felt part of Kimberley not Greasley. As a member of Watnall Allotments, we have received funding from Greasley Council for allotment maintenance, being the only allotment site in the Parish. I hope that the move would not affect the support we have received,</p>	<p>We would like no change to be made to the current arrangements for the Parish Boundaries please. (Option 1). We can see many problems Broxtowe Borough Council faces. We are, however, unsure that the Parish Councils and boundaries are in any way a priority.</p>

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>4. We would like to see Braemar Ave, Eastwood to become part of Eastwood Parish rather than remain under Greasley. We relate to Eastwood Town rather than the other villages that make up Greasley Parish. Being in a sort of no mans-land we received no local information, magazines from either Parish at the present time, being so far on the edge of Greasely but not under the umbrella of Eastwood. Referring to the letter we would suggest that for community cohesion this outer edge of Greasely would be better served by being part of Eastwood. If one was to take Parish Churches as a centre point, Greasley Church is at Moorgreen and is 2.5 miles away, whereas the Eastwood Parish Church is under 1 mile from Braemar Ave. At present we are out on a limb neither recognized or represented by properly by either Parish Council.</p>	<p>Kimberley Town Council has just circulated correspondence to all residents living within the boundary of Watnall. In my opinion it undermines any unbiased consultation put forward by Broxtowe Borough Council and simply represents a bid by Kimberley Town Council to increase its income and area of influence (much like Nuthall Parish Council in 2023). It is my belief that if Parish Councils are to have any value they must remain small and local. For this reason I strongly reject the recommendation put forward by Kimberley Town Council and urge Broxtowe Borough Council to retain Watnall within the Parish of Greasley.</p>
<p>5. 1. Abolish if permitted by law all the Town and Parish Councils completely. I see no benefit to the people of Eastwood and district in their existence, or what they do for the people they represent. I doubt if anyone would miss them. 2. Merge Greasley Parish Council with Eastwood. I see nothing that warrants Greasley being separate. I believe it is a throwback to a bye gone age, and as no relevance in 2024. Having said all that I give credit to the Council for building, maintaining, what I call the Parish Hall, Dovecote road. In addition, the keep fit centre is a jewel. It is a major asset to the area, shows what can be achieved by Councils if the will is there. The cost is modest and I understand it is very well patronised.</p>	<p>Firstly, if it isn't broken, don't fix it! Option one: I strongly oppose to the creation of a new Parish. Ecclesiastical Parishes have existed for years and Parishioners have made their choice through belief. We do not need to change, merge or create new boundaries to provide administration or cohesion. What are the costs and who pays for this consultation, I haven't asked for it? Will house prices will rise or fall? Will road maintenance be carried out and many other services currently being charged for through taxes? Rethink the proposals and make what we already have work better.</p>
<p>6. Option 1 is the most sensible option. I am a Watnall resident and use Kimberley for shopping and leisure activities. It's a vibrant community, the Kimberley boundary is about 200m</p>	<p>I wish to object to option 1, moving Greasley to Kimberley plus Watnall and fully support options 2 and 3 which are both no change. The reasons for this are as follows:</p>

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>from my house and it's only an 8-minute walk to the centre of Kimberley. Greasley is a 3-mile drive through countryside and has no facilities other than the leisure centre, which I don't use. Many of the people who use the cricket club, bowls club, football club and recreation park in Kimberley actually live in Watnall.</p> <p>I suggest that the boundary between the Option Parishes follows Gilt Brook to its end at Brook Breasting Farm so the farmland is more evenly split, and also to avoid a situation in the future where any developments between Watnall and Hucknall are part of 'Eastwood' but separated by fields and the same problem that exists now reoccurs.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Watnall has an existing historic link to Greasley Parish Council, which was formed in 1894. 2. Greasley Parish Council includes the villages of Giltbrook, Greasley, Moorgreen and Newthorpe. With the inclusion of Watnall the area encloses open fields that surround Greasley church. There is an extension network of footpaths within this area that link related historic sites. These include the Rolleston Family Cemetery, some remains of Watnall; Hall, the World War II bunker, Air Raid Shelters and ancient fishponds in Watnall Spinney, a famous spring and memorial on Trough Lane, disused railway lines, and the disused quarry in Watnall Wood. In Watnall there are also a number of historic buildings that are contemporary with the development of Greasley Parish area. 3. The whole of the Greasley Parish Council area is strongly associated with D H Lawrence. 4. There is a very clear change in the nature of the landscape and the housing as you cross the boundary from Watnall to Kimberley. Watnall is surrounded by countryside, has extensive greenspace, the housing is mostly detached and most houses have off-street parking. This is comparable to the residential development in the whole of the Greasley Parish Area. In contrast, Kimberley is concentrated around the shipping area, has a high proportion of terraced houses and is clearly separated from Watnall. 5. Greasley Parish Council has supported Watnall Allotments and this would not necessarily be the case with option 1. 6. For Band D properties the precept for Greasley is less than that for Kimberley. Option 1 would therefore probably impose a greater financial burden on Watnall residents.

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>7. Having attended the Kimberley Town Council consultation evening last Monday and seeing the plans, I am wholeheartedly behind the proposal to include Watnall in the Kimberley area - Option 1. It is so arbitrary that a line is drawn across Newdigate Road and houses within a stone's throw of the Town are in Greasley Parish! I've lived on * in Watnall alongside the old cutting for 23 years and have always thought of myself as a Kimberley area resident. It takes me just a few minutes to walk into the centre of the Town. I feel very connected to it. I have nothing to do with Greasley. It's really part of Eastwood. I have never received any known benefit from paying part of my Council tax to Greasley Parish Council. However, I've always been really impressed by the number of events that Kimberley Town Council have put on - food festivals, the Christmas lights and Christmas fair, Picnic on the Park, the events for youngsters for Halloween, the jubilee beacon with the piper at the Chapel on the Hill, the flowers and planting which make the Town look nice, litter picking to keep the Town tidy, the Remembrance Day parade to name some of them. I'd like my money to go to Kimberley Town Council please.</p>	<p>I wish to log my objection to the changes proposed. There should be no changes to the current Parish Boundary of Greasley. The Parish of Greasley is historic – recorded, apparently, in the Domesday Book – and certainly been in its current form since the 1800s. The rationale for the proposed changes is completely nonsensical as nothing of significance has occurred to warrant such proposals. The rationale appears to be a flimsy excuse to change our rural Parish into an urban Parish. The ramifications for such a change, for example, to our green belt land, would be significant. Please do not change Greasley Parish Boundary.</p>


	Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
8.		<p>The reasons for voting against option 1 are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The exercise is unnecessary. The civil Parish boundaries (which provide only a relatively small element of community governance) work adequately at the moment. 2. The proposed changes do not appear to add any quantifiable benefit, but will simply incur costs in the process of making the changes. Local authorities at all levels should be striving to reduce expenditure. 3. Watnall has always been a settlement quite separate from Kimberley, and as such has its own rich village history and its own clear identity. It would not be acceptable to combine the village of Watnall it into the Town of Kimberley. 4. Confusion will be created between the civil and ecclesiastical boundaries if this project goes ahead.
9.		<p>Kimberley Town Council has just circulated the attached correspondence to all residents living within the boundary of Watnall. In my opinion it undermines any unbiased consultation out forward by Broxtowe Borough Council and simply represents a bid by Kimberley Town Council to increase its income and area of influence (much like Nuthall Parish Council in 2023). It is my belief that if Parish Councils are to have any value they must remain small and local. For this reason I strongly reject the recommendation put forward by Kimberley Town Council to retain Watnall within the Parish of Greasley.</p>

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>10. <u>Kimberley Town Council:</u> The Council strongly supports Option 1 with one minor amendment, to extend the boundary line between the new “Eastwood” Parish and Kimberley Parish from IKEA Island directly along Gilt Brook to Brook Breasting Farm, and then continues to the M1 (see attached map – page 11). This amendment has no bearing on existing properties but the Council believes this forms a stronger, future-proof boundary, and follows a geographic feature (as recommended in the review Terms of Reference) rather than an arbitrary division. Kimberley Town Council reached this conclusion based on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical and demonstrated Community links between Watnall & Kimberley, including schools, leisure, hospitality, recreational facilities, sporting club memberships/activities, community events and more. • The proximity of Watnall to Kimberley, in comparison to its current Parish of Greasley, where all other services/provision lie 3 miles away by car. There is a clear and indisputable community divide currently, which this Option addresses. • Previous survey results submitted at the last CGR from residents of Greasley Parish within the current affected area all positively indicate residents own view of being closely linked to Kimberley as a community. These results are attached. 	<p><u>Greasley Parish Council:</u> We do not believe that Option 1 is a viable option under any circumstances. Greasley Parish Council and Eastwood Town Council currently serve very different communities with contrasting requirements, views and needs. To merge the two would only be of detriment to both area’s residents. By keeping these two areas independent of each other, both the historical identities and community values of Greasley and Eastwood would be preserved.</p> <p>Greasley Parish Council is dedicated to efficiently delivering essential services and ensuring accurate representation for its semi-rural residents. Among these services are the maintenance of two parks, management of 36 allotments, and operation of the Greasley Sports and Community Centre. Serving as the sole remaining Council-owned and supported gym and fitness centre after the closure of Kimberley Leisure Centre, the Greasley Sports and Community Centre offers a diverse range of classes, a well-equipped fitness suite, and extensive sports facilities including a sizeable sports hall and a multi-use games area installed in partnership with the local primary school. Additionally, it accommodates a Parish Hall and Committee Room, regularly used by various community groups, social clubs, and healthcare providers such as the NHS. Through these vital amenities and services, the Parish Council significantly contributes to the physical, mental, and overall well-being of our community, extending its benefits not only to Greasley but also to neighbouring areas including Kimberley, Nuthall, Eastwood, Jacksdale, and Selston.</p>

<p>11.</p>	<p><u>Eastwood Town Council:</u> Eastwood Town Council welcomes the Community Governance Review for the north of the Borough (deferred from the 2021 review). We offer the following comments to form stage two of the review.</p> <p>Option 1 – 19 Councillor combined Eastwood and Greasley Council</p> <p>Eastwood Town Council welcomes the proposals for a combined Council covering the north of the Borough (excluding Brinsley and Kimberley, Watnall and Nuthall areas), but feel that the proposals are currently undefined and vague. We note that the proposal would create a new Parish Council covering primarily the Borough Wards of Eastwood Hall, Eastwood St Mary’s, Eastwood Hilltop and Greasley Borough Ward; such a Council is forecast to encompass a population of 15,338 after 5 years.</p> <p>We suggest that the name of the new Parish should keep the name of the two existing Parishes and be called Eastwood and Greasley Town Council or alternatively Eastwood, Newthorpe and Giltbrook Town Council to reflect the principal settlements. The Eastwood Hall Ward of Eastwood Town Council currently includes Mansfield Road, Greenhills Road, Garden Road, Mill Road and associated side streets. Under the new Council this should be expanded to include the Coach Drive estate and the Brunel Avenue and Engine Lane area from the Greasley Parish Ward of Lower 2 Eastwood Town Council Community Governance Review 14th March 2024 Beauvale so that it becomes contemporaneous with the Borough Ward; it is our view that it should be represented by 3 Parish Councillors. Eastwood St Mary’s and Eastwood Hilltop Wards are currently contemporaneous with the Borough Wards and it is Eastwood Town Council’s view that they should remain so with exception of the Beamlight estate and Braemer Avenue which are currently part of Greasley but are disconnected from the rest of</p>	
------------	---	--

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option										
<p>the Ward; these streets should become part of St Mary's Ward. Both Wards are of a similar size and should be represented by 5 Parish Councillors each.</p> <p>Greasley Ward at Parish level is currently represented by 9 Councillors, under our revised proposals this would be reduced to 6 although we note not all positions on Greasley Parish Council were filled at the recent elections.</p> <p>Proposal regarding option 1 for stages 2 and 3 Community Governance review</p> <p>Eastwood Town Council formally proposes that for stages 2 and 3 of the review that option 1 should consist of a combined Council of 19 Councillors covering the Eastwood and Greasley areas, this new Council should be aWarded based on the current Borough Wards as set out below.</p> <p>Ward</p> <table> <tr> <td>Eastwood Hall</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastwood Hilltop</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastwood St Mary's</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greasley</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </table>	Eastwood Hall	3	Eastwood Hilltop	5	Eastwood St Mary's	5	Greasley	6	Total	19	
Eastwood Hall	3										
Eastwood Hilltop	5										
Eastwood St Mary's	5										
Greasley	6										
Total	19										

Map submitted by Kimberley Town Council



Issues identified by Officers for consideration:

1. Parish Ward boundaries should be in line with current Borough Wards to avoid any complications with future Borough Ward reviews required by the Local Government Boundary Commission (expected within the next 2 years). However, to retain community identity, rather than having 1 Ward for Greasley, the area of Greasley Parish which would be included could be split into 2 Parish Wards to give:

Parish Ward	No of Councillors
Eastwood Hall	2
Eastwood Hilltop	5
Eastwood St Mary's	5
Smithurst – suggested name incorporating GRE2 and GRE3 polling districts	4
Greasley Castle– suggested name incorporating GRE1, GRE4 and GRE5 polling districts	3

Suggested names for a new Parish/Town Council

- Beauvale Town Council
- Eastwood and Greasley Town Council
- Eastwood and Beauvale Town Council
- Eastwood and Greasley Beauvale Town Council
- Eastwood, Giltbrook and Newthorpe Town Council

2. Kimberley and Watnall – should the boundary be moved to align with the new parliamentary constituency?
 - Should Reckoning House Farm, Watnall be in the new parliamentary constituency as it accesses onto Church Road?
 - Should properties on Gilt Hill be in the new parliamentary constituency
 - If the boundaries are aligned, this would create a small polling district (not ideal from an administrative point but could be accommodated – precedence GRE5). However, not aligning would give more options for any future review.

3. Boundary between “new” Parish area and Brinsley
 To address concerns raised by electors regarding access to polling stations, Willey Lane could remain in the new Parish area. The boundary could run along the rear of the ponds between the A608 and Willey Lane.

Option 2 –Address boundary anomaly issues only

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>1. This would seem logical in terms of joining together properties that would form a natural community and as such this would be my preferred option unless it would mean fewer properties in the Parrish than now as this would then lead to a disproportionate rise in precept to maintain services. So, if the numbers of properties in each band are maintained then this would be my preferred option.</p>	<p>I write to make observations on proposals outlined in Map 2 which, being entirely negative, lead me to object to the proposed transfer of eight households on Willey Lane from Greasley Parish to Brinsley.</p> <p>As a lifelong resident of Greasley and former pupil of Greasley Beauvale Infant and Junior Schools I have established strong links in the Parish, reinforced by involvement with Moorgreen Residents Association, nineteen years' service as a Parish Councillor and, of course, working here for over fifty years</p> <p>The boundary with Brinsley Parish is Brinsley Brook. This is a natural feature which has provided an easily identifiable and defensible boundary since the Township of Brinsley within we live in giltbrook gained Parish status in the late nineteenth century. It has no inadequacies requiring remedy.</p> <p>Communications with Brinsley are poor. Access to Brinsley Parish Hall involves walking along footpath 7 (Greasley). In 2020 this footpath was heavily used during the COVID-19 lockdown, resulting in the turf being destroyed in the wetter parts which now readily turn to a morass at the slightest provocation. Although it eventually becomes passable in the summer, the grass is then longer and either wet with rain or, in the better weather, with dew. Whilst we are able to cope with this in our hiking gear, if in receipt of an invitation to a social engagement, I would have to decline. Similarly, poor access to the polling station would be a deterrent to voting, which is unacceptable. The alternative is to walk along</p>

	<p>Willey Lane. Despite the road being closed recently for resurfacing no attempt was made to improve the footpath. The surface was re-laid in 1975 when the kerb was raised, the formerly tarmacadammed surface becoming a rolled aggregate surface. Despite no maintenance being carried out, this remains good in places, however, where standing water has splashed onto the footpath the surface has been eroded leaving deep puddles, whilst elsewhere the finer surface aggregate has been completely washed away leaving the base layer which is difficult to negotiate in the daytime, and, since there is no lighting, very dangerous in the dark. Please bear in mind that the National Speed Limit applies here. The end section of Willey Lane has an excellent footpath, being in Selston Parish in Ashfield District. Unfortunately, it is on the opposite side of the road and crossing the road on the bend is dangerous owing to poor visibility with traffic already speeding up in anticipation of leaving the 30 mph zone. Turning onto Cordy Lane, Underwood, this route is in excess of a Kilometre before returning to Brinsley.</p> <p>The first of the important factors which the Council will take into account in considering any changes to Parish arrangements concerns access, is access to the polling station, for example, possible without the need to go through another Parish? There is no access by road to the polling station which does not go through another Parish.</p> <p>The present polling arrangements within Greasley has our polling station at the Parish Hall on Dovecote Road. This is readily accessible in all-weather along the bridleway and Mill Road on foot or via Willey Lane, Moorgreen and Dovecote</p>
--	---

	<p>Road by car or on foot, both routes being wholly within the Parish.</p> <p>The above comments about polling arrangements assumes that we would be required to vote at Brinsley Parish Hall if your proposals are implemented. Is it possible that you would provide a new polling station for us? In response to a proposal to expand polling district GRE5 to include Moorgreen, Church Road and New Road the Acting Returning Officer commented that “The current polling district covers a large rural area but has very few electors”, even with the extra streets suggested this would only be 81 polling station voters. With so few electors it is not a viable polling district so it seems unlikely.</p> <p>The footpaths will need to be re-numbered.</p>
--	--

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>2. We do not support a move from Greasley to Brinsley Parish. Access to our property is within our current Parish of Greasley and this gives us easy access to the polling station at Greasley, with no need to cross into another Parish area, both by road and by foot. Moving us into Brinsley Parish would mean we would have to cross into at least one, if not two other Parishes to travel by road to a polling station there. If we were to walk it would mean using footpaths which have not been maintained for a number of years and are overgrown, unlevel and often very muddy and slippery. We are somewhat isolated either way so changing Parish would not benefit us in terms of community cohesion or in any other way. In actual fact we tend to go to Underwood or Selston for local amenities and rarely visit Brinsley at all. We fully support Map 5 as detailed in the review.</p>	<p>Option 2 makes no sense at all. The Cloverlands and Hillcrest areas are right in the middle of Kimberley, moving them to Greasley doesn't comply with the terms of reference published by Broxtowe in relation to Community, and I understand that when surveyed during the previous review the residents were overwhelmingly in favour of staying part of Kimberley.</p>

<p>3. The options that I feel best represent my views are either option 2 or 3, both of which would leave Watnall still part of Greasley. I feel that Watnall is separate from Kimberley, it is a small village type area, surrounded by green belt and has its own small community, ie Playgroup, walking groups WI, allotments. People here tend to shop in all directions, making use of Eastwood, Hucknall and Giltbrook. Many of the residents have their doctor's surgery in Giltbrook or Hucknall. Greasley Church, the coffee shops at Moorgreen and Beauvale are widely used as is the farm shop. I feel it's important for people within this area to continue to retain their sense of identity. The community is not transient and many that move also move within the boundary. If a change is to take place, then a small adjustment of using south of the old rail track would seem a ready formed boundary.</p> <p>Also applies to option 3 – no change.</p>	
--	--

Comments in support of the option		Comments objecting to the option
4.	As we live in Watnall (NG16 1LG) the option my wife and myself would prefer is to move from Greasley to Nuthall.	
5.	I am writing to express my support for your proposals outlined in Map 5. As a lifelong resident of Greasley Parish and former pupil of Greasley Beauvale Infant and Junior Schools I have strong links within the present boundary, enhanced by nineteen years' service as a Parish Councillor and involvement with the Moorgreen Residents Association. Our polling station, most recently at Greasley Parish Hall, but previously at the former United Reform Church on Mill Road and Durban House, is within easy walking distance without leaving the Parish though Durban House was in Eastwood. The proposed boundary change near Saint's Coppice from Brinsley Brook to the disused railway would be somewhat less sustainable than at present, however, I would support whatever views are expressed by the one household affected regarding that particular boundary change. The proposals in Map 5 maintain the status quo and have my full support.	
6.	Option 2 : Make minor changes to boundaries, not affecting Watnall - acceptable	
7.	We live in Giltbrook, in Greasley Parish , some distance from the existing Parish boundary and it appears that we will not be affected by the proposed changes, and we are happy with this.	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>We have also looked at the map showing the proposed changes to Greasley boundaries and it seems to us that they are generally quite sensible and helpful to rationalise some of the boundaries relative to the recent building developments in the area.</p>	
<p>8. <u>Kimberley Town Council:</u> Option 2 – To make minor amendments to the existing Parishes. As pointed out during the 2022 review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The built-up areas of Watnall and Kimberley are a continuous community centred around Kimberley Town centre and are heavily socially integrated as outlined above. • The Cloverlands and Hillcrest areas are less than 300m from the central square in Kimberley. There is no justification under the guidelines of the CGR for those areas being within Greasley Parish, the centre of which is 3 miles away. The Option actually splits the Cloverland estate in half. 	
<p>9. <u>Eastwood Town Council:</u> Eastwood Town Council welcomes proposals to address issues with the current boundary where it cuts across streets and through properties. We welcome the proposed inclusion of Coach Drive and Beamlight estates into Eastwood Parish. We note that these areas, although currently part of Greasley Parish, are</p>	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>disconnected from the rest of Greasley; it is only possible to access these areas by traveling through Eastwood and many residents in these areas often contact Eastwood Town Council regarding local issues. Eastwood Town Council also notes the proposals to run the revised boundary along the middle of Mill Road, Dovecote Road and Newthorpe Common which would divide streets between Eastwood Parish and Greasley Parish where no such division currently exists. We note we raised objections previously to these proposals and have a particular concern with regards to the proposals in the Dovecote Road and Charles Avenue areas and the impact this would have on the allotment stie owned and managed by Eastwood Town Council. The allotment site itself is currently in Greasley Parish but the access from the site off Charles Avenue is currently in Eastwood, the revised proposals to run the boundary between the properties on Charles Avenue and Nottingham Road would remove the access from Eastwood Parish.</p> <p>In the 2021 review we objected to these proposals and made representations that the Parish boundary should continue to cut across Dovecote Road at its current location and be amended to include all the properties on Stanhope Close. We propose it should then continue along the rear of the properties on Dovecote Road (with minor revisions to remove the odd two properties on Fairdale Drive and Hilltop Rise) before turning south-east to run along the boundary of the Dovecote Road allotments and Hilltop Rise. The Parish boundary would</p>	


Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>then follow the boundary of the allotments and properties on Mary Road to its south -western corner. The boundary would then follow the rear property boundaries on Charles Avenue to Wheeler Avenue cutting across Mary Road slightly further to the west than the current alignment. The revised boundary would then cut across Wheeler Avenue to follow the property boundary of 82 Charles Avenue and 2 Wheeler Avenue to connect with the new proposed boundary on the footpath between Nottingham Road and Wheeler Avenue, (see map - page 21). This revised proposal would keep all of Charles Avenue in Eastwood Parish whist resolving the issue of the current boundary cutting across, Stanhope Close, Mary Road, Wheeler Avenue and Scargill Avenue leading to odd properties on those streets being in Eastwood while the rest of the streets are in Greasley Parish.</p>	
<p>10. <u>Greasley Parish Council:</u> However, we acknowledge the validity of your suggestion regarding Option 2, provided that some changes are made to the proposal. After further examination, we find the following amendments to be reasonable and aligned with the best interests of our community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Coach Drive Area Stays in Greasley: Retaining the Coach Drive area within Greasley Parish ensures continuity and cohesion for residents in that locality. Residents from this area regularly attend Greasley Parish Council meetings and have voiced to us that they feel more aligned with Greasley Parish than Eastwood Town. We do, however, acknowledge that 	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>the public opinion in this area is divided. We understand that access to the Coach Drive area is currently an issue as the boundary follows the historical line of Beauvale Brook rather than an access road. Whilst there are many footpaths which lead to this area, we suggest that the boundary follows the line of Greenhills Road if access via vehicle is required to satisfy the terms of the Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lower Beauvale fields and recreation ground remain in Greasley: Greasley Parish Council owns and maintains Greenhills/Lower Beauvale Park which would become Eastwood under the current Option 2 proposal and have recently entered a contract with the Greenwood Community Forest Initiative to maintain trees on this park for 15 years. This is a valuable green space within the Greasley community. ● Mill Road, Dovecote Road and Vale Close stay in Greasley: Maintaining Mill Road and Vale Close within Greasley Parish ensures consistency and community identity. During our consultation, residents in this area were particularly aggrieved by the proposal to shift the boundary to include them in Eastwood. These residents live in close proximity to Greasley Sports and Community Centre, use our services and facilities very regularly, and feel that they would be segregated by the proposal as it stands. They would also have trouble accessing their new polling station, and feel this may impact on residents' ability to vote. We suggest Vale Close, 7 properties 	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>on Mill Road and 15 on Dovecote Road remain in Greasley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Newthorpe Common, Chewton Street, and access to the area known as “Matkins Tip” enter Greasley: Inclusion of these areas into Greasley Parish fosters unity and shared community values. Residents from this area regularly attend Greasley Parish Council meetings and involve themselves in Parish life. To solve the issue of access, we propose the boundary extends down the centre of Chewton Street, Main Street, and Newmanleys Road. <p>We do, however agree with your proposals on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hilltop and Newthorpe Common move to Greasley: Altering the boundary to include Charles Avenue and eastern side of Newthorpe Common neatens up a currently impractical layout. ● Giltbrook area is incorporated into Kimberley: Transitioning Giltbrook, north of Gilt Hill, to Kimberley aligns with geographical and community ties. ● Larkfields area enter Nuthall: Integrating Larkfields into Nuthall facilitates cohesive governance and service provision. Our consultation responses agree that residents in Larkfields feel closer to Nuthall Parish Council than to Greasley Parish Council. ● Brinsley Brook and Saints Coppice area move to Brinsley: This proposal seems reasonable and will further neatens historical boundaries. 	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>Should these conditions be met, Greasley Parish Council would be amenable to considering Option 2 as a viable alternative. We believe that such adjustments would promote harmony and efficiency within our community while ensuring that the interests of all residents are adequately represented.</p>	
<p>11. <u>Nuthall Parish Council:</u> Nuthall Parish Council, at its February meeting supported the proposal that the whole of Larkfield Estate, plus Little Holland Gardens plus the 'bakery estate should be part of Nuthall Parish Council.</p>	

Map submitted by Eastwood Town Council



Option 3 – Retain existing boundaries, no changes

Comments in support of the option		Comments objecting to the option
1.	I live in Kimberley and am on the border of Kimberley/Nuthall, the sign saying "Nuthall" is only 4 doors from my home. I see no point in aligning Kimberley with Watnall. Kimberley should remain as Kimberley.	Option 3 isn't sensible as it doesn't resolve any problems.
2.	If there would be fewer properties than now and the precept would need to rise to maintain services in option 2 then I would support this option.	Kimberley Town Council: This option is not suited to the current urban environment of Kimberley and Watnall, there are very little, if any, social or economic links between these areas and as such this proposal does not meet the criteria laid down in the goals of the CGR guidelines.
3.	No change i.e. stay within Greasley Parish	
4.	With regards the proposed changes to Watnall I am of the opinion that no changes should be made. We should remain in Greasley and not move to Kimberley.	
5.	I do not want to incur more costs so want to leave things as they are.	
6.	I wish to voice my opinion and I would like to state that I am in favour of retaining the current arrangements and object to other arrangements, especially as the cost of living is too high and most people are struggling to pay	

Comments in support of the option		Comments objecting to the option
	bills already, it would be extremely insensitive and unrealistic to ask for additional payments to be made on households. I would like to retain the current arrangements and object to any changes.	
7.	I would like the Coach Drive area of Greasley to stay in the Greasley Parish - the Parish works well without changing the boundaries in anyway, I do not wish to be part of a Eastwood Parish, this area is down as Beauvale and therefore part of the Greasley Parish. I believe by staying in the Greasley Parish we have more chance of keeping the existing Green Belt - as Green Belt and not eating into it in any way. Let us keep the present boundary as it is for Greasley Parish.	
8.	I would like to say that I would prefer that "NO CHANGE" be made to Greasley Parish.	
9.	I live at *, Coach Drive, Eastwood and we currently come under <u>GREASLEY PARISH COUNCIL. I would like to register my preference for Option 3, which is to remain in Greasley Parish with NO CHANGES</u>	
10.	After reviewing your recent letter about changing Greasley Parish Council to become Eastwood Council, our position still hasn't changed, from what we sent to you in 2021. We are perfectly happy remaining in Greasley Parish Council, as they have for many years resisted attempts to build on Green Belt land which we totally support. Greasley Parish Council have served us well for	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>almost 40 years and we know that we wouldn't get the same service and protection from Eastwood Council. So we're quite happy to go for option 3 which is no change.</p>	
<p>11. Having lived in Tiptree Close since * I feel well placed to comment on the options. I have never felt any affinity to Watnall since all my connections are with Kimberley and all exits from Tiptree lead directly or indirectly to Kimberley not Watnall. In fact, the estate planners saw no reason to link Tiptree to Coatsby Road; in fact, they went as far as to make Tiptree a cul dio sac with forested land blocking access to Watnall. I cannot see any good reason to move Tiptree in to Kimberley plus Watnall unless you are gerrymandering or hoping to justify an increase in the rateable value of Tiptree properties and thus increase our rates so my vote goes for no change.</p>	
<p>12. Option 3 : To remain as at present - preferred</p>	
<p>13. <u>Greasley Parish Council</u>: After consulting our residents on the proposed options, the Parish Council is inclined to favour Option 3, which suggests no changes to the current boundaries of Greasley Parish. We believe that maintaining the status quo will uphold the continuity and stability of our community.</p>	

Individual	See separate documents.
Individual	<p>Supporting proposal set out in appendix 1:</p> <p>I am a resident of Greasley Parish Council although thanks to Post Office changes my postal address is Eastwood. The deeds to my property state my address at the time of purchase was * Newthorpe Grange Greasley and strangely enough the Royal Mail can still find my letterbox even with only the latter address on.</p> <p>I am also a former * Councillor representing the Parish of Greasley I spoke about the review at Governance Audit and Standards when the proposed Boundary reviews came up in 2023. At that time obviously I spoke strongly in favour of Greasley one of the largest Parishes in Nottinghamshire with great historic significance keeping its current identity. At the time it concerned me when members of the task and finish group admitted they knew very little about the northern Parishes. It was good therefore that sorting the northern issue was delayed.</p> <p>The current review offers 3 options and whilst my normal preference would be to favour option 3 to retain existing boundaries with no change I am not convinced that this option will prove to be an acceptable or viable option.</p> <p>Option 2 appears to continue to continue the dismantling of the Parish of Greasley and I am aware that many people on this estate have voiced their concerns re being moved into Eastwood. I also wonder if GPC will continue to have sufficient precept to continue to run their Sports and Community centre though I confess I have not had the time and inclination to look in detail at figures.</p> <p>That leaves me with Option One to Dissolve Eastwood, Greasley and Kimberley Parish Councils to give effect to...</p> <p>I can see the attraction in a combined Parish to serve the Eastwood and Greasley areas but have concerns. In order to fulfil your statement as above the new Parish should have a totally new name and stating it serves the communities of Eastwood Beauvale, Newthorpe, Giltbrook etc.</p> <p>I would expect appropriate Wards to serve rural and urban areas probably with some adjustments based on existing Polling stations.</p>

Governance, Audit and Standards Committee**20 May 2024**

Individual	See separate documents.
	I have had many discussions with * who I know has spent many hours working on a detailed response having taken the time and trouble to work the statistics and agree with the idea of option 1 as outlined by him in his report .

Other comment

Kimberley Town Council notes that the Terms of Reference for the review does not state using history or tradition as a means for maintaining or implementing Parish boundaries and request that any submissions based on these criteria are not taken into account when making a final recommendation to Members.

Consultation Responses - Community Governance Review – Strelley Only

Option 1 – no change to existing arrangements whereby Strelley remains a Parish with a Parish Meeting, with the exception of any changes agreed in respect of 1. above

Comments in support of the option		Comments objecting to the option
1.	I am in favour of no change to the current arrangements and wish to retain Parish meeting.	
2.	We live in Strelley Village, and would very much not want to become a Parish Ward of Nuthall Parish Council, nor would I want the creation of a Parish Council for Strelley. Therefore, as residents of Strelley Village, I would like to retain the present arrangements concerning the Parish boundaries and Parish Council arrangements.	
3.	I am a resident of Strelly Parish. I do not believe this review to be a response to the wants, demands or preferences of local residents. Perhaps you could look into how many residents asked for it. I do not need a change to the current arrangements and have not asked for one. This review is a misguided use of tax payers money, particularly in the current economic climate, and should be shut down forthwith. You might like to use the time and money saved to deal with issues that residents really want tackling e.g. a) Repairing the roads; b) Making schools places where teachers want to stay and teach so we can retain them, rather than just keep recruiting and losing them. This is not just a remuneration issue, reasonable pay, although helpful, does not make	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>up for an unreasonable working environment; c) Ensuring residents have reasonable access to doctors and dentists. I ask for a review of Council priorities in this regard. I ask for a review of Council priorities in this regard.</p>	
<p>4. I would like to state as a member of the Strelley that I wish for the arrangements to stay the same, I do not want the change to go forward.</p>	
<p>5. THERE ARE THREE OPTIONS TO CHOOSE FROM AND I HAVE CHOSEN OPTION 1. {STAY AS WE ARE}.</p>	
<p>6. Both occupiers living at NG8 *** would prefer option 1. This means that we would not want to see any changes to Strelley Parish, and we certainly would not welcome any extra costs incurred as a result of any boundary changes.</p>	
<p>7. We wish to request that there is no change to the current arrangement and would like to retain our Parish group meetings independently of Nuthall. A full Parish Council for Strelley is not required.</p>	
<p>8. I have served my turn as Chair of the Strelley Village Parish Group (I was nominated and then elected at a meeting I had not attended, to resolve a squabble between various villagers!). Our daughter was born in our house, * years ago. I wish you to know that I am very happy with the present arrangements. We have a robust Village Group which meets regularly and is attended by Philip Owen as County Councillor, and we have a regular</p>	

Comments in support of the option	Comments objecting to the option
<p>attendance of Borough Councillors as well. We have good links with the local Police Force, who attend when we invite them. The owners of Strelley Hall kindly allow us to meet there, which is a great venue for such a meeting. The Strelley Village community is strong and vibrant, and we have occasional but memorable village events, most recently marking the Jubilee and the Coronation. We should retain the present arrangements.</p>	
<p>9. I live on Main Street in Strelley village. I have lived here for nearly * years. During this time, I have regularly attended village meetings and taken an active role in those meetings and with the organisation of village events. I am perfectly satisfied with the current arrangement and would ask that there is no change to current arrangements i.e retain Parish meetings. My husband is also of the same view.</p>	
<p>10. I request for the present arrangement to be retained, which is Option 1 in your letter, that is, no change to the current arrangement.</p>	
<p>11. I do request for the present arrangement to be retained, which is Option 1 in your letter, that is, no change to the current arrangement.</p>	
<p>12. We wish to request that there is no change to the current arrangement and would like to retain our Parish Group meetings independently of Nuthall. A full Parish Council for Strelley is not required.</p>	

Comments in support of the option		Comments objecting to the option
13.	As residents of Strelley Village, both my wife and myself have considered the proposed options under review and we would like to express our strong preference that no changes are made to the current status.	

Option 2 – the Parish becomes a Parish Ward of Nuthall Parish Council - no comments

Option 3 – create a separate Parish Council for the area – no comments

Officer comments

Given that only comments have been submitted to support the retention of the existing arrangements in Strelley as a Parish with a Parish meeting, it is **recommended** that this option is put forward as the final recommendation.

Reconsideration of Parish Boundary – Strelley

Part of the review in 2022 included moving 4 properties from Strelley to Cossall on the basis that the four properties are addressed to Robinettes Lane on the west of the M1. It was considered that the M1 formed the sustainable boundary to Cossall Parish before following field boundaries to encompass the four rural properties. No comments or objections were received to this change during the review, although comments have since been submitted which were apparently sent at that time. However, representations have since been made on the grounds that there is no vehicular access from 2 of those properties to Cossall. This was not identified as being the case at the time of the previous review.

Officer comments

No comments have been received from 2 properties. Lack of vehicular access for Oldmoor Farm has been confirmed. However, it is questionable whether vehicular access is available to Turkey Fields Farm. In light of that, members are asked to consider whether the 2 properties who have not submitted any comments should remain Cossall, and the boundary between Strelley and Cossall is moved back to as it was before the review in 2022 in respect of the other 2 properties, or just the one where lack of vehicular access has been confirmed.

Community Governance Review – Suggested Draft Recommendations

The Task & Finish Group agreed that the following be submitted to the Governance, Audit and Standards Committee to be approved as the draft recommendation:

That:

1. In line with consultation option 1 and subject to the amendment to the proposal in respect of Brinsley as set out in (iii) below, Greasley Parish Council be dissolved and the Greasley Parish area be dealt with as follows:
 - (i). the creation of a new parish (**see Map 1**) comprising of all of the current Eastwood Parish area, Giltbrook, Newthorpe, Moorgreen and the outlying properties in Greasley Parish, comprising the 5 Parish Wards of:


Parish Ward	No of Councillors
Eastwood Hall	2
Eastwood Hilltop	5
Eastwood St Mary's	5
Greasley Castle	3
Smithurst	4

- (ii). the new Parish Council in (i) above be named Eastwood and Greasley Town Council;
 - (iii). the inclusion in Brinsley Parish of Saint's Coppice Farm, Cordy Lane, Felley Mill Farm and Old Hags Farmhouse, Mill Lane and 2 properties on Mansfield Road from – **see Map 2**;
 - (iv). the inclusion in Nuthall Parish of the 555 properties on the Larkfields estate currently in Greasley Parish and 3 properties on Woodside Avenue currently in Kimberley Parish – **see Map 3**;
 - (v). the inclusion in Kimberley Parish of – **see Map 4**:
 - (a) 879 properties currently in the Watnall Ward of Greasley Parish, 2 properties on Nottingham Road Giltbrook, and 11 on Gilt Hill from Greasley Parish
 - (b) 3 properties on Nottingham Road Kimberley, 2 on Knowle Hill currently in Nuthall Parish
 - (c) 4 properties addressed to Swingate currently in Strelley Parish to create a new Kimberley and Watnall Town Council;
2. No changes be made in respect of the NES3 polling district so that Strelley remains a parish with a Parish Meeting.
3. The boundary of Strelley Parish be amended to include Oldmoor Farm and Turkey Fields Farm – **see Map 5**.
4. It is noted that the area of land east of Coventry Lane which Council agreed should be transferred to the unparished area from Trowell on 11 May 2022 was omitted in error from the Broxtowe (Re-organisation of Community


Governance) Order 2022 and will be included in the Order made to bring the changes approved through this review into effect.

5. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England be asked to make the following related alterations to align the new Parish and borough ward boundaries:
- Brinsley
 - Kimberley
 - Nuthall East and Strelley
 - Watnall and Nuthall West


Map 1




Map 2



Map 3



Map 4



Map 5

