

**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
CABINET  
TUESDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 2025**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber Area B, Rushcliffe Arena,  
Rugby Road, West Bridgford  
and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

**PRESENT:**

Councillors N Clarke (Chair), A Brennan (Vice-Chair), R Inglis, D Virdi and J Wheeler

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
R Clack	Deputy Monitoring Officer
A Hill	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

**34 Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Clarke, Upton and J Wheeler declared an interest, as dual hatted members of both Rushcliffe Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council, stating that although the County Council had considered this matter, they were here this evening to consider the item afresh, and with the interests of Rushcliffe Borough Council in mind.

**35 Local Government Reorganisation in Greater Nottinghamshire**

The Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke presented the report of the Chief Executive detailing the draft Greater Nottinghamshire Proposal for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR).

The Leader referred to the extensive engagement between councils across the County and the considerable work undertaken since February, and he thanked officers, in particular from Rushcliffe for all their hard work throughout this process. He stated that public engagement had taken various forms to ensure that all views were considered, and it had been scrutinised by the Corporate Overview Group, as well as being fully debated last week at the Extraordinary Council meeting, to ensure that all Councillors were involved. The Leader reminded Cabinet that Rushcliffe's priority was its residents and businesses. The Council delivered outstanding services and was held in high esteem by residents and it was vital to take their interests into account.

The Leader referred to the various options proposed around the County, with three coming to the fore, with 1b being Rushcliffe's preferred option to submit

to Government by 28 November. This option would consist of two new Unitary Authorities, Nottingham City and Nottingham County, with Rushcliffe part of the latter. The Leader referred to the two other main options, and stated that Rushcliffe could not support those, as it was important that any new council maintained the highest standards of service and financial stability. The Leader confirmed that Option 1b had been fully financially analysed.

The Leader referred to recommendation e) and the establishment of a cross-party Task and Finish Group and stated that initially the Terms of Reference proposed a membership of nine Councillors. However, to ensure that everyone had the opportunity to be involved in the process, he felt that the membership should be expanded, with the Chief Executive being granted delegated authority to finalise those numbers to ensure that all parties were represented.

The Leader concluded by reminding Cabinet about the process and timelines following the submission, and that further work would be taking place.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Brennan referred to the huge amount of discussion and work, which had taken place, and given Rushcliffe's position as an efficient and debt free Council, it had been a challenge to put in place proposals that would benefit residents. She felt that this process had shown that people did care about their geography and that the Council was efficient, not wasteful and spent Council Tax funds responsibly. Councillor Brennan believed that people were passionate about this because they cared, and despite differing views, she genuinely believed that everyone wanted the best for local residents. She agreed that the Council had remained focused on the needs of residents and businesses and given that the only choice was to go forward with this process, it had responded positively, and the report outlined the best option for Rushcliffe, which she hoped the Government would give serious consideration to.

Councillor Inglis noted that there was no reference to the impact on staff and it should be recognised that LGR could lead to job losses, with many of those officers working hard to put this proposal together. He stated that the number of Councillors across the County would be more than halved and referred to the massive human toll, which would be caused by this process.

Councillor Virdi echoed thanks to officers and agreed with Councillor Inglis that the impact on staff should be recognised. He referred to the insightful discussion at Full Council and felt that everyone wanted to achieve the same goals, despite the very challenging circumstances being faced. Councillor Virdi confirmed that the process had focused on the six criteria set out by the Government to ensure that this option met those requirements. He stated that financially, Option 1b was stable and sustainable, with the scale of the proposed authorities creating opportunities for efficiencies and shared capacity. The financial modelling also indicated a credible pathway through the transition period. He believed that creating the two authorities would reflect how communities and services naturally functioned, giving residents a clearer and more consistent offer, and that Option 1b was the best option.

Whilst noting potential future cost savings, Councillor J Wheeler referred to the time and money spent on this process and that officers had been focused on

this rather than day to day tasks. He stated that no one had voted for LGR, the process had been confused and it was a testament to officers that a credible option was being put forward. Councillor Wheeler hoped that the Government would see that this was the best option for residents, and whatever happened residents should know that their taxes would increase, and this option would hopefully limit those increases, whilst protecting services.

Councillor Upton reiterated thanks to officers and was reminded of the same process when Rushcliffe was established 50 years ago and acknowledged that officers would be concerned about the future. He agreed that the Council had been given no choice, with LGR imposed by the Government, he would prefer to stay the same, as Rushcliffe was a good place to live, with the Council providing excellent services, and he was concerned that any changes would not be for the better. Councillor Upton referred to the loss of Councillors, which would result in less local contact and democracy. He believed that Option 1b was the best one available and he hoped that the government would give it serious consideration.

The Leader agreed that the loss of so many Councillors would be very detrimental. He stated that he would not have started the process from here; however, this was the situation and he reiterated that Option 1b was the best option available.

**It was RESOLVED that:**

- a) the recommendations of Corporate Overview Group and Council in relation to the approval of the Greater Nottinghamshire Proposal for Local Government Reorganisation be considered;
- b) the edits made be accepted and the submission of the Proposal by the deadline of 28 November 2025 be approved;
- c) authority be delegated to the Chief Executive to approve the final design and any necessary minor editing revisions of the Proposal document and submit it to the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 28 November 2025;
- d) it be acknowledged that this decision of Cabinet is exempt from Call-In pursuant to the Urgency provisions in the Council's Constitution for the reasons stated in this report; and
- e) a cross-party Task and Finish Group be established to provide oversight of Local Government Reorganisation on the basis of the draft Terms of Reference at Appendix One, amendments to which are to be delegated to the Chief Executive, to increase the membership to such a number as is sufficient to ensure representation from all parts of the Council.

The meeting closed at 7.29 pm.

CHAIR