

Responses to Proposed Changes Relating to Trowell

Object ID 10 - From Stapleford Parish to Trowell Parish - Trowell Park Drive

Objections

We have been informed that the proposed changes to the Trowell / Stapleford boundary will incur additional ongoing annual costs to those who are moved from Stapleford into Trowell with no added benefits whatsoever. In fact we believe that we (currently in Stapleford) have been very well represented by the local Stapleford Councillor in the past and it isn't really a problem for us to vote in the Stapleford ward.

This boundary change makes absolutely no sense for those who choose a postal vote. The only benefit that has been given is to be able to vote locally on Trowell Park Estate which, in our opinion, is not a good enough reason to increase our Council Tax fees. On these grounds we must strongly object to the boundary change and would like our objection registering with the appropriate authorities involved with this change.

Within the important factors to be taken into consideration section, number 4 is most important to me as the boundary has always been determined where Boundary Brook flows through Broxtowe. More recently, Boundary Brook has been designated by the Environment Agency as a major river from where it passes under Stapleford Road, Trowell, to where it flows into the River Erewash. This is where the border between Stapleford and Trowell should remain.

An important factor which you also need to consider is any other changes which this proposal would bring to those residents which would be affected. It would also be appreciated if those changes can be highlighted to all residents that this change would lead to an increase in the amount of Council Tax of over 3.5%, even at current costs. Band D charges for the current year would be £73.88 higher, and that furthermore, this is an extra amount to pay EVERY YEAR, not a one-off cost. I feel that your communication should have made this very valid point loud and clear, rather than not mention any disadvantages of this proposal. Perhaps the council can provide information as to what benefits will be provided to homeowners affected ?

I recommend that an urgent further communication be provided to all homeowners, highlighting quite clearly this costly difference to our annual budgets, over and above any other cost increases which may be introduced due to the pandemic and the on-going repercussions.

Object ID 4 - From Trowell to Unparished: Trowell Moor

Objections

I wish to express the following: Living on the edge of Trowell Moor with the fields backing on to my garden, I confirm that I always use the facilities in Trowell. I vote there, I use the garden centre, I visit friends there, I walk through the moor most days and until recently I exercised there. I use the Ilkeston hospital rather than QMC where possible. Please do not waste council money, my money, on changing borders. I have the old cast iron bollard outside my garden showing the boundary - it is a piece of history!

The old E2 bus stop sign remains on this side of Bilborough Rd from years gone by, and the old bridlepath from Bilborough to Strelley (which is named in The Domesday Book) runs right near our home. Today, I am afraid, most people travel by car to appointments and schools, changing a boundary will not change that. It is a pointless time and money wasting exercise. Please fix the potholes and clear the litter instead! Get electric charging

Objections

points for cars, enhance cycle paths, have policemen patrolling in the dark so all feel safe to walk. In terms of Access, the main Bilborough Rd accesses Trowell, Wollaton and Bilborough, in terms of being isolated from the parish, Trowell always keeps us informed by newsletter of local news, which larger councils don't and with regards to cohesion, again, for the houses backing onto Trowel Moor, there is more togetherness with our Trowell neighbours.

My first observation after reading the four bull-it points at the beginning of your letter is that it seems to be changes for changes sake. Who are the beneficiaries? As my house is in the target group to be put into an unparished area then I am focused on the important factors being considered by the council and I respond accordingly.

There is no problem of access to my property. It is served from Bilborough Road which is the natural boundary of the parish and is maintained by the highways commission and does not fall within another parish. To the best of my knowledge that boundary has been in place for all the 47 years that I have lived here. There is perfectly adequate provision and access to a polling station via the main Nottingham/ Ilkeston Road that continues through Trowell and equally does not need to go through another parish.

I cannot see any justification to declare isolation from other properties as this can be determined as I have described previously or by perfectly adequate foot paths and bridleways. I see no reason why this would be improved by joining another parish or any community cohesion with another parish. It begs the question "is the underlying purpose of the consultation to do away with parish councils altogether?" The boundary is sustainable following the road and does not cut through other properties.

Any boundary changes identified because of potential development would be for the benefit of others, which goes back to my original question as to who are the beneficiaries of this proposed change which is currently under consultation because there is never any smoke without fire. I am at one with Trowell Parish Council who clearly state that this will result in or is already an intention to expand the Nottingham city boundary. This neither transfers nor extends any benefits to myself and opens to house building on Trowell moor which I object to, and which provides the natural barrier between the sprawling city of Nottingham and Ilkeston segregated only by the M1. I oppose the review wholeheartedly.