

Appendix 1**Background and Recommendation from Task and Finish Group****Background**

A CGR was conducted in 2021 for the whole of the Borough, however, there were elements of that review relating to the North of the Borough that could not be solved at that time due to tight time constraints of completing the Community Governance Review (CGR) and the need to fully consider the complex community relationships of these Parishes which bordered each other. The relevant Parishes were Brinsley, Eastwood, Greasley, Kimberley and Nuthall. The Council, therefore, agreed that no changes should be made to the boundaries of these Parishes to the North of the Borough at that time, but instead agreed a further CGR, limited to those areas be carried, so that further consultation could take place.

On 27 November 2023 the Governance, Audit and Standards Committee ('GAS') approved the Terms of Reference (ToR) for a CGR of the North of Borough, consultation proposals and approved the appointment of a Task and Finish Group (TFG) whose remit was to consider the responses received during the two consultation stages and to make recommendations in light of the responses.

The Terms of Reference were published on 1 December 2023, therefore the CGR would need to be completed within 12 months from this date. The review was to consider the following in relation to the North of the Borough:

- the creation, merger, alteration or abolition of Parishes;
- the naming of Parishes and the style of new Parishes;
- the electoral arrangements for Parishes (i.e. the ordinary year of election, Council size, number of Councillors to be elected to the Council, and Parish warding); and
- the grouping or de-grouping of Parishes

Two consultations took place, the first one took place between 1 January 2024 to 31 March 2024, the purpose of this consultation was to seek the residents/interested parties' views on which of the three options to proceed with.

The second consultation took place between 15 July 2024 to 6 October 2024 to seek the residents/interested parties' views on the Council's recommendations to proceed with Option 1.

Recommendation of the Task and Finish Group

The TFG met at each relevant stage of the process. On 11 November 2024 the TFG considered the second consultation responses in detail, received advice from Officers on the analysis of the consultation responses and received advice on key considerations.

The TFG were also informed of a legal letter which had been submitted on behalf of Greasley Parish Council challenging the process being followed.

The TFG having carefully considered the above information, unanimously recommend:

1. not to proceed with the Option 1 as set out in the second consultation and instead to leave the boundaries in the North of the Borough as they are. As it was evident to the TFG from the consultation responses that there was an overwhelming negative response to proceeding with Option 1.
2. not to proceed with any other element of Option 1 as there is insufficient support from the consultation responses to be able to deal with any boundary amendments to the North of the Borough. To conclude the CGR 2023 without making any changes to the community governance arrangements.
3. The TFG, therefore, recommend that a further CGR commence after May 2025, to deal with the outstanding boundary issues in the North of the Borough. Consultation to commence after engagement with all relevant stakeholders has taken place to assist with framing the scope of the CGR.

Appendix 2

Analysis of the Consultations

There were two consultation stages:

Stage 1 consultation

This took place between 1 January 2024 to 31 March 2024, three options were proposed, the purpose of this consultation was to seek views of residents/interested parties on which of the three options to proceed with.

The consultation method was by letter whereby comments could be submitted to an email address specific to the CGR, an online consultation form was available on the website.

The three options that were proposed at this stage were:

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. This was however, amended in the Draft Recommendations to only include Saint's Coppice Farm and the properties on Mansfield Road and to take a boundary including land accessed from Cordy Lane.
- 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.
- additionally, the return of Oldmoor Farmhouse and Turkey Fields Farm to Strelley Parish from Cossall was added to the Draft Recommendations following representations received on the basis of access.

Option 2 –Address boundary anomaly issues only as follows:

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

From	To	No of properties
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

From	To	4 on Coatsby Road
Greasley	Kimberley	11 on Gilt Hill
		2 properties on Nottingham Road

From	To	
Greasley	Nuthall	555 on the Larkfields Estate
Kimberley	Nuthall	3 properties on Woodside Avenue

From	To	
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

Summary of consultation responses

Consultation responses to Option 1

Residents Comments – 7 in support, can be summarised as:

- Improved community cohesion
- Felt more aligned with Kimberley not Greasley
- Abolish all Town and Parish Councils
- Use Kimberley more

Residents comments – 9 against, can be summarised as:

- No evidence of any benefit
- Destruction of local history
- Does nothing for community cohesion
- Does not resolve the boundary issues
- Will not resolve anything
- Bad for Kimberley Town Council
- Increase in costs
- If it is not broken leave it
- Financial burden
- Parish of Greasley is historic

Kimberley Town Council comments in support of Option 1 were:

‘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. 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:

- *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.*

Eastwood Town Council's comments in support of Option 1 were:

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. Option 1 – 19 Councillor combined Eastwood and Greasley Council. 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. 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 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. 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. Proposal regarding option 1 for stages 2 and 3 Community Governance Review 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 warded based on the current Borough Wards as set out below. Ward Number of Councillors Eastwood Hall 3 Eastwood Hilltop 5 Eastwood St Mary's 5 Greasley 6 Total 19.

Greasley Parish Council comments objecting to Option 1 were:

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. 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.

Consultation response to Option 2:

Residents comments – 7 in support can be summarised:

- Logical in terms of joining properties would form a natural community
- Important that people within the area to continue to retain their sense of identity
- Prefer to move from Greasley to Nuthall
- Support for proposals as outlined, maintain the status quo
- Acceptable proposals suggested

Residents comments – 2 objections can be summarised:

- Makes no sense at all
- Residents overwhelmingly in favour of staying part of Kimberley

Kimberley Town Council – Comments in support of Option 2:

Kimberley Town Council: Option 2 – To make minor amendments to the existing Parishes. As pointed out during the 2022 review: • 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.

Eastwood Town Council – Comments in support of Option 2:

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 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 site 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. 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 southeast to run along the boundary of the Dovecote Road allotments and Hilltop Rise. The Parish boundary would 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 whilst 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.

Greasley Parish Council comments in support of Option 2:

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:

- 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 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.

- 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 on Mill Road and 15 on Dovecote Road remain in Greasley.

- 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. We do, however agree with your proposals on the following points:

- 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 neaten historical boundaries 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.

Nuthall Parish Council comments in support of Option 2:

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.

Consultation Responses to Option 3:

Residents - 12 comments in support can be summarised:

- Kimberley should remain as Kimberley
- Precept will rise so leave as it is
- No change with Greasley Parish Council
- No changes to be made
- In favour of retaining the current arrangements

Resident – 1 objection:

- Option 3 isn't sensible as it does not resolve any problems

Greasley Parish Council comment in support of this option:

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.

Kimberley Town Council comments objecting to Option 3:

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.

There were further suggestions made by residents which can be found in the GAS Committee report of 20 May 2024 on the following link:

www.broxtowe.gov.uk/cgr

Stage 2 consultation

Members were provided a copy of the full consultation responses in the report, it was recommended to consult on Option 1, as this was deemed the most appropriate way to deal with the boundary changes. This was to:

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. This was however, amended in the Draft Recommendations to only include Saint's Coppice Farm and the properties on Mansfield Road and to take a boundary including land accessed from Cordy Lane.
- 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.
- additionally, the return of Oldmoor Farmhouse and Turkey Fields Farm to Strelley Parish from Cossall was added to the Draft Recommendations following representations received on the basis of access.

Stage two consultation took place between 15 July 2024 to 6 October 2024 seeking views on the Council's recommendations of Option 1.

The consultation method was by letter whereby comments could be submitted to an email address specific to the CGR, in writing, or an online consultation form was available on the website. Greasley Parish Council also provided a form that residents were able to submit in response to the consultation.

In total the Council received 1028 responses to this consultation, 1010 were received from the members of the public. In terms of the response method, 612 were submitted in a paper format, 384 submitted electronically via an online form, 24 via email and 8 by letter.

All the responses were coded into themes to allow the responses to be quantified, to reflect how many responses supported the recommendation, how many were against the recommendation and to categorise the reasons given, to support Member consideration of the responses.

Consultation responses to Option 1:

Responses to the consultation were received on an online form, emails and letters to the Council, also on a form provided by Greasley Parish Council.

A summary of the responses is below

- 1010 from members of the Public


- 1 from a Parish Clerk in a private capacity
- 1 from Parish Councillor acting in private capacity
- 2 from Borough Councillors acting in official capacity
- 1 from County Council
- 13 categorised as other

Officer analysis in relation to whether the respondent objected or supported the boundary changes.


- 954 objected
- 42 supported
- 7 mixed responses
- 9 unsure
- 16 not stated

Support reasons:

● Access to properties	2
● Community Cohesion	10
● Effective Electoral Arrangement	5
● Sustainable Boundaries	3
● Split streets	0
● None of the above	14




Support reasons – other




Objection reasons

● Access to properties	1
● Community Cohesion	107
● Effective Electoral Arrangement	26
● Sustainable Boundaries	3
● Split streets	3
● None of the above	563



REFERENCE

Objection reasons – other



A link to all the consultation responses for both consultations has been provided below:

www.broxtowe.gov.uk/cgr

Appendix 3

Key Considerations

Key considerations Members should take into account in reaching a decision as to whether to proceed with the recommendation made at GAS Committee on 20 May 2024 and then full Council on 23 May 2024.

The relevant legislation is set out in Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (“the 2007 Act”), which sets out the duties of a “principal authority” (Broxtowe Borough Council) when undertaking a CGR, in particular:

- Section 79 (1) - A CGR is a review of the whole or part of the Council's area, for the purpose of making recommendations of the kinds set out in sections 87 to 92.
- Section 79(2) - The Council must comply with the CGR's ToR.
- Section 79(3). - Before undertaking a CGR, the Council must notify the County Council for its area –that the review is to be undertaken and of the ToR of the review.
- Section 81(2) - the ToR of a CGR must specify the “area under review”.
- Section 81(5) - as soon as practicable after deciding the ToR, the Council must publish them.
- Section (82) - the Council may undertake a CGR.
- Section (93) - The Council must consult the following – a) the local government electors for the area under review; b) any other person or body (including a local authority) which appears to the Council to have an interest in the review.
- Section 93(4) - The Council must “have regard” to “the need to secure that community governance within the area under review: a) reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and b) is effective and convenient.
- Section 93(5) - In deciding what recommendations to make, the Council must take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to Parishes and their institutions) - a) that have already been made, or b) that could be made for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area under review.
- Section 93(6) - the Council “must take into account” any representations received in connection with the review.
- Section 93(7) - As soon as practicable after making any recommendations, the Council must - a) publish the recommendations; and b) take such steps as it considers sufficient to secure that persons who may be interested in the review are informed of those recommendations.

Guidance on Community Governance Reviews, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in March 2010 (“The Government Guidance”) recommends in making its final decision Members need to take into account their duty to secure that community governance within the area under review:

- a) reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and
- b) is effective and convenient

Relevant considerations which should influence the Council's judgement against these two principal criteria include the impact on community cohesion, and the size, population and boundaries of the proposed area.

The Government Guidance at paragraph 62 provided further criterion by *stating that the effectiveness and convenience of local government is best understood in the context of a local authority's ability to deliver quality services economically and efficiently, and give users of services a democratic voice in the decisions that affect them.*

The Council is required to consult with local government electors for the area under review and any other person or body which appears to have an interest in the review. It must take into account representations received in connection with the review. In making its final recommendations, the Council should consider the information it has received in the form of expressions of local opinion, representations made by local people and other interested persons, and also use its own knowledge of the local area.

The Council in accordance with the Government guidelines can determine whether a governance arrangement changes are in the interests of either the local community or surrounding communities, and whether changes the governance arrangements would affect community cohesion.

Conclusion

Having regard to the Guidance, the 2007 Act, and fully considered the two public consultation responses, the analysis of the responses is as follows:

- There is an overwhelming response from residents, interested parties which includes Greasley Parish Council not to dissolve Eastwood, Greasley and Kimberley Parish Councils and to create a new Parish Council comprising of all of Eastwood, Giltbrook, Newthorpe and Moorgreen and outlying properties in Greasley Parish.
- In relation to the remaining elements of Option 1 the consultation responses have not confirmed support or objections to these elements and as such it is not clear whether the requirements of the 2007 Act and Guidance have been met.

The TFG supported by Officer advice, considered the consultation responses overwhelmingly demonstrate that Option 1 is not considered to be in the interests of the community and reflects the community considers there will be a negative impact on community cohesion if the Council were to proceed with this Option. Furthermore, the Council could be at risk of legal challenge, and cost if they proceed. The TFG supported by Officer advice also consider there to be insufficient support to proceed with any other element of this Option, to be able to proceed with any other boundary changes to the North of the Borough.

Therefore, TFG's unanimous recommendation, which is supported by Officer advice is not to proceed with any of the elements of Option 1 and to make no changes to the existing Community Governance arrangements and to conclude this review. The TFG however, recognise that there are still outstanding issues that do need resolving in the North of the Borough, particularly in relation to boundaries in Greasley, Eastwood Brinsley, Nuthall, Strelley and Kimberley. The TFG, therefore, propose that a further CGR could reconsider how to deal with these issues and allow for residents to be consulted again, as there is insufficient time to re-consult under the current CGR.

REFERENCE