

COUNCIL

WEDNESDAY, 26 NOVEMBER 2025

Present: Councillor R Bullock, Mayor

Councillors: D Bagshaw
P J Bales
M Brown
G Bunn
B C Carr
C Carr
S J Carr
A Cooper
J Couch
T A Cullen
S Dannheimer
H J Faccio
K A Harlow
S P Jeremiah
H G Khaled MBE
A Kingdon
H Land
D L MacRae
R D MacRae
T J Marsh
G Marshall
J W McGrath
W Mee
J M Owen
P J Owen
S Paterson
D D Pringle
M Radulovic MBE
H E Skinner
P A Smith
V C Smith
A W G A Stockwell
C M Tideswell
D K Watts
S Webb

65 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S A Bagshaw, L A Ball BEM, H L Crosby, S Kerry, E Williamson, E Winfield and K Woodhead.

66 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

67 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION

Members considered information regarding Local Government Reorganisation prior to the requirement to submit proposals on the Council's preferred option to the Secretary of State on 28 November 2025, following a recommendation to Cabinet which would meet on 27 November 2025.

Members considered the information and discussion on the item included the following:

- Members were not opposed to local government reorganisation but wanted to see a service-led review. It was important to abide by the wishes of Broxtowe's residents who had made their opinions clear during the public consultation.
- The response to the consultation was low in percentage terms. This Council handled a small proportion of decisions made concerning residents. Proposal 1b would allow for growth of investment and jobs. There had not been a preferred option stated by the Council which would allow for a government-led decision. Many people in the Borough did not define themselves as being from Broxtowe and a single council would allow for unified decision-making.
- This Council supported many voluntary groups and organisations, many of which supported young people. Broxtowe Borough Council staff had acted professionally throughout a difficult period.
- Artificial Intelligence would solve many of the issues facing local government, but the outstanding debts would need to be paid for.
- It would be beneficial to support an option but each of the proposals negatively affects the people of Broxtowe. The residents do not want to be part of the City.
- Local government review was needed, but time was also needed to consider the subject properly. The people of Broxtowe did not agree with the plans. This needed to be stopped and more time be given to finding solutions.
- It would be difficult to have public representation with just two large authorities. It would result in a lack of democracy. More time was needed to consider reorganisation. There was no evidence to suggest the current proposals would save money.
- It would be an abdication of duty if these proposals were voted for knowing the financial concerns. Broxtowe is a successful Council according to the Local Government Association. The reorganisation should be paused until the proposals were right.
- The proposals had not been thought through, there should be aims to tackle homelessness. There was still too much to decide upon.
- It had been nine-months since the government's white paper but this Council could have offered alternative proposals, such as a greater Broxtowe option. The residents were not given an expanded City option to consider during the consultation. The government had provided information in its election manifesto by stating that local authorities would come together to take on new powers. Local government reorganisation was not of high priority for Broxtowe's residents.
- A message should be sent to the government that more time was needed.
- The proposals did not provide a beneficial outcome for the people of Broxtowe.

- The options are imperfect and we should not replace an imperfect system with another imperfect system. All the options include Broxtowe joining the City, the numbers dictate that the City would take over Broxtowe.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor P J Owen and seconded by D D Pringle:

“In the event that local government reorganisation proceeds this Council should support the two Unitary Council solution, namely one Unitary Council for the City and one for the rest of the County based on existing boundaries.”

On consideration of the proposed amendment, it was deemed unacceptable in terms of Constitutional rules as it negated the recommendation.

The debate continued and comments included:

- Historical backgrounds should be considered when grouping areas to form new councils and then alternative proposals should be submitted around service delivery.
- Needs based assessments should be based around people rather than finance and community cohesion should be promoted.

Officers stated that the Impact Assessment report only covered the City and Broxtowe and therefore was not complete in its nature.

A recorded vote for all the recommendations was called for by Councillor M Radulovic MBE and seconded by at least five other Councillors.

The first vote was for proposal 1b:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
D Bagshaw	M Brown	
P Bales	R Bullock	
A Cooper	G Bunn	
H J Faccio	B C Carr	
W Mee	C Carr	
	S J Carr	
	J Couch	
	T A Cullen	
	S Dannheimer	
	K A Harlow	
	S P Jeremiah	
	H G Khaled MBE	
	A Kingdon	
	H Land	
	D L MacRae	
	R D MacRae	
	T J Marsh	
	G Marshall	
	J W McGrath	
	J M Owen	
	P J Owen	
	S Paterson	

D D Pringle
M Radulovic MBE
H E Skinner
P A Smith
V C Smith
A W G A Stockwell
C M Tideswell
D K Watts
S Webb

The second vote was for proposal 1e:

For

Against

Abstain

D Bagshaw
P Bales
M Brown
R Bullock
G Bunn
B C Carr
C Carr
S J Carr
A Cooper
J Couch
T A Cullen
S Dannheimer
H J Faccio
K A Harlow
S P Jeremiah
H G Khaled MBE
A Kingdon
H Land
D L MacRae
R D MacRae
T J Marsh
G Marshall
J W McGrath
W Mee
J M Owen
P J Owen
S Paterson
D D Pringle
M Radulovic MBE
H E Skinner
P A Smith
V C Smith
A W G A Stockwell
C M Tideswell
D K Watts
S Webb

The third vote was for proposal Bii (Nottingham City expanded boundaries):

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
	M Brown	D Bagshaw
	R Bullock	P Bales
	G Bunn	A Cooper
	B C Carr	H J Faccio
	C Carr	W Mee
	S J Carr	
	J Couch	
	T A Cullen	
	S Dannheimer	
	K A Harlow	
	S P Jeremiah	
	H G Khaled MBE	
	A Kingdon	
	H Land	
	D L MacRae	
	R D MacRae	
	T J Marsh	
	G Marshall	
	J W McGrath	
	J M Owen	
	P J Owen	
	S Paterson	
	D D Pringle	
	M Radulovic MBE	
	H E Skinner	
	P A Smith	
	V C Smith	
	A W G A Stockwell	
	C M Tideswell	
	D K Watts	
	S Webb	

1. **RECOMMENDED to Cabinet that Proposals 1b, 1e and Bii (Nottingham City expanded boundaries) be rejected.**
2. **RECOMMENDED to Cabinet that the Impact Assessment Report be submitted to the Secretary of State by Broxtowe Borough Council as part of this process.**