



Office for Local Government

Summary of engagement on tranche two metrics for the Local Authority Data Explorer

December 2023

Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Planning.....	2
Roads	4
Corporate and Finance	6
Business and Economic Growth.....	9
Fly-tipping	11
Annex A – List of local government organisations who attended a workshop	13
Annex B – List of local government organisations who provided written feedback.....	14

Executive Summary

The Office for Local Government (Oflog) is committed to ensuring the Local Authority Data Explorer presents a rounded set of themes and metrics which best reflect the roles and responsibilities of local authorities.

On 26 October 2023, Oflog set out its plans for current and future iterations of the Data Explorer.¹ To develop its next set of metrics, it proposed including new themes on the Data Explorer of business and economic growth, planning, and roads, and expanding the existing theme of finance to include both corporate and finance metrics and the inclusion of fly-tipping metrics in the waste management theme. Following the publication of the letter, Oflog invited written responses on the draft metrics and held workshops open to local government.

During the four-week engagement period, Oflog received feedback from nearly half of all local authorities and 10 local government sector organisations. Feedback was received on all proposed metrics and Oflog is grateful to all those who took the time to respond.

Since the conclusion of the engagement, Oflog has been considering the feedback. This report provides a summary of the feedback received, consideration of evidence presented and details on what metrics will be included in the Data Explorer.

Oflog is publishing 10 metrics on the [Data Explorer](#) now and is considering further the feedback received on the other proposed metrics, with the intention to respond in 2024.

As set out on 26 October, Oflog intends to expand the number of themes included in the Data Explorer in the future.¹ Oflog will again engage with local authorities and the local government sector as part of those plans. As previously stated, Oflog recognises that data alone is rarely enough to assess a local authority's performance and it often needs context, be it via further investigation, including talking to people who understand the local area.

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/office-for-local-government-next-steps-and-new-draft-metrics>

Introduction

1. On 26 October 2023, the Chief Executive of the Office for Local Government (Oflog) wrote to all local authority Chief Executives inviting feedback on the next set of themes and draft metrics to be published on the Local Authority Data Explorer (hereon referred to as the Data Explorer). The period for submissions closed on 22 November and this document provides an update on the assessment of the feedback.

Reviewing the feedback

2. In total, 106 pieces of written feedback were received, representing 99 local authorities (see Annex A). In addition, 120 local authorities attended one of the six Oflog workshops, one per theme and a specific workshop for mayoral combined authorities (see Annex B). Oflog reviewed all the written feedback on each theme and contributions made in the workshops. This assessment was underpinned by the principles laid out in the Chief Executive's letter. Data should exist and already be published England-wide. Metrics to be included in the Data Explorer should capture key elements of local authority responsibilities where local authorities have significant powers to influence outcomes, be measurable at a local authority level, and not significantly duplicate other metrics proposed for the Data Explorer. The metrics themselves should be measurable over time and show meaningful differences between authorities.

Responding to the feedback

3. As a result of this engagement, Oflog is today (19 December) publishing 10 metrics under three themes on the Data Explorer: Planning, Roads and Corporate and Finance. The feedback for these themes is summarised in the following sections.

No	Theme/metric
1	Planning - Percentage of major planning applications decided on time (district matters)
2	Planning - Percentage of non-major planning applications decided on time (district matters)
3	Planning - Percentage of major planning applications overturned on appeal (district matters)
4	Planning - Percentage of non-major planning applications overturned on appeal (district matters)
5	Planning - Date when a local plan was formally adopted by an authority
6	Roads - Percentage of local authority A roads that should be considered for maintenance
7	Roads - Percentage of local authority B and C roads that should be considered for maintenance
8	Corporate & Finance - Number of upheld Ombudsman complaints per 10,000 population
9	Corporate & Finance - Council Tax collection rates
10	Corporate & Finance - Non-domestic rates collection rates

4. For Business and Economic Growth and Fly-tipping, Oflog received feedback that requires further consideration. Oflog will respond on the final metrics for those themes in 2024.
5. Across the themes there were also suggestions of additional metrics for Oflog to consider. These will be reviewed against the principles above over the coming weeks.

Planning

Proposed draft metrics

<u>Percentage of major planning applications decided on time (district matters)</u>
This metric measures the percentage of decisions made for major development (district matters) made within agreed time frames. It is a proxy for the speed of decision making for applications.
<u>Percentage of major planning applications decided on time (county matters)</u>
This metric measures the percentage of decisions made for major development (county matters) made within agreed time frames. It is a proxy for the speed of decision making for applications.
<u>Percentage of non-major planning applications decided on time (district matters)</u>
This metric measures the percentage of decisions made for non-major development (district matters) made within agreed time frames. It is a proxy for the speed of decision making for applications.
<u>Percentage of major planning applications overturned on appeal (district matters)</u>
This metric measures the percentage of major planning applications (district matters) that have been overturned at appeal. It is a proxy for the quality of decision making for applications.
<u>Percentage of major planning applications overturned on appeal (county matters)</u>
The metric measures the percentage of major planning applications (county matters) that have been overturned at appeal. It is a proxy for the quality of decision making for applications.
<u>Percentage of non-major planning applications overturned on appeal (district matters)</u>
This metric measures the percentage of non-major planning applications (district matters) that have been overturned at appeal. It is a proxy for the quality of decision making for applications.
<u>Date when a local plan was formally adopted by an authority</u>
This shows the most recent date a local plan containing strategic policies was formally adopted by the relevant local planning authority. It presented for information only, there is no supporting analysis

Feedback on draft metrics

6. The feedback received on proposed planning performance metrics was largely accepting. There is an existing performance measurement regime (i.e. the Criteria for Designation) which Oflog were proposing to align the draft metrics to. There were some specific points raised in respect of the proposed metrics.
7. First, several local authorities considered that the two draft metrics on county matters did not necessarily fairly reflect local planning authority performance. The primary reason for this is that some authorities deal with very small volumes of county matter applications or appeals over the proposed time period. They said that one application or appeal could significantly impact the results, and thus not fairly reflect performance.
8. Secondly, several authorities observed that the wording of the metrics was unclear and different from the established performance framework. A number questioned whether

extensions of time (EoTs) were included in the metric, arguing that this was unclear in the material shared with them.

9. Thirdly, several local authorities emphasised the importance of including EoTs in the three metrics covering whether a planning application was or was not decided on time. They emphasised that extensions of time are often necessary due to factors outside a local planning authority's control and are used to improve outcomes.
10. On the proposal to add the date of adoption for local plans, several local authorities pointed out that they are not currently required to update local plans (only review them). They also said that the wider policy context is impacting their ability to update local plans due to a lack of certainty around future requirements.

Consideration of feedback

11. In response to comments regarding small volumes on the two county matters metrics, both metrics will be omitted from the Data Explorer at this time. According to Oflog analysis, around 80% of responsible local planning authorities have dealt with less than ten county matters applications in the last two years. However, Oflog intends to investigate how these metrics can be appropriately presented on the Data Explorer, with the intention of them being published in 2024.
12. In response to comments on the wording of metrics and the exclusion of EoTs, Oflog will revisit the metric definitions and explanation to ensure the wording is clear and accurate. At present, the metrics will remain consistent with the existing performance regime, including EoTs.
13. In response to comments on local plan adoption, the Data Explorer will be explicit that it is presented for information only. Additional commentary will be provided where there is no local plan 'in force' but Oflog data shows that (a) there has been a recent local planning authority reorganisation or (b) there is a plan at an advanced stage of preparation.
14. Oflog will continue to take an interest in planning policy developments on planning applications and local plan making. When policy changes are made in future Oflog will consider whether the current metrics need to change, to ensure performance measurement remains consistent with wider policy.

Proposed planning metrics for inclusion in the Data Explorer in December

Having considered the feedback received, the following metrics will be included in the Data Explorer in December 2023:

- Percentage of major planning applications decided on time (district matters)
- Percentage of non-major planning applications decided on time (district matters)
- Percentage of major planning applications overturned on appeal (district matters)
- Percentage of non-major planning applications overturned on appeal (district matters)
- Date when a local plan was formally adopted by an authority

Roads

Proposed draft metrics

<p><u>Percentage of local authority motorways and A roads that should be considered for maintenance</u></p> <p>This metric is a measure of how well a local authority is maintaining its roads by presenting the percentage of roads in the worst state of repair. A roads are primary routes linking regional towns and cities. They can be single or dual carriage ways and therefore the composition of roads will vary between local authorities.</p>
<p><u>Percentage of local authority B and C roads that should be considered for maintenance</u></p> <p>This metric is a measure of how well a local authority is maintaining its roads by presenting the percentage of roads in the worst state of repair. B roads are roads intended to connect different areas, and to feed traffic between A roads and smaller roads on the network. C roads are smaller roads intended to connect unclassified roads with A and B roads, often linking a housing estate or a village to the rest of the network.</p>
<p><u>Number of casualties in reported road traffic collisions per billion vehicle miles</u></p> <p>This metric recognises local authority responsibilities under Section 39 of the 1988 Road Traffic Act to “take steps both to reduce and prevent accidents”. Damage-only collisions, with no human casualties, and collisions on private roads or car parks are not included.</p>

Feedback on draft metrics

15. Oflog received general agreement with the proposed road metrics across the majority of local authority responses. However, significant points of feedback were noted, including some amendments to the proposed metrics and suggestions for additional future metrics. These are presented below.
16. Regarding the road condition metrics, many local authorities suggested that Oflog include data for other road condition categories such as amber and green, rather than just red. There was also widespread feedback that collection methods are not consistent across all local authorities; that while most authorities use SCANNER, some do not. Local authorities argued that Oflog should not present a combined average of the road condition metrics, i.e. a combination of a metric showing the condition of A, B, and C roads. Local authorities cited the loss of granularity that this would involve, and the different condition standards for different categories of roads.
17. Regarding the casualties metric, local authorities suggested that this be updated to only present locally maintained roads, rather than all roads as currently calculated. Local authorities also suggested that Oflog use the figures for killed and seriously injured (KSI) rather than all casualties, as the reporting rate for minor casualties is low and potentially inconsistent between local authorities. Finally, local authorities suggested that the casualties metric could be presented as a three-year rolling average to mitigate the proposed impact of natural fluctuations in the casualty rate.
18. In terms of further suggestions, some local authorities suggested considering the interaction between this service area and road safety partnerships, and also the cross-cutting connection to net zero targets. Others recommended caution in this area due to the

risk of duplicative metrics. Local authorities suggested various additional/new metrics including on U road condition, footway and cycleway condition, street works, resilience to extreme weather, bus patronage and local authority spending.

19. Mayoral combined authorities agreed with Oflog's assessment that the draft metrics proposed for wider local authorities are not suitable for them.

Consideration of feedback

20. Regarding the road condition metrics, Oflog will present these metrics individually rather than as a combined average. Oflog recognises the potential value of presenting other condition categories, so will consider the opportunity to do so when the Department for Transport introduces its new standard for road condition data collection. However, since the existing mandatory road condition data collection only covers red-rated roads leaving other condition categories incomplete, Oflog will not include these on its initial list of Data Explorer metrics. Finally, with regard to the feedback about varying collection methodologies, Oflog will include a caveat alongside the road condition metrics to explain that not all authorities use SCANNER to collect road condition data, and the implications of this.
21. Regarding the proposed casualties metric, Oflog will work with the Department for Transport to explore developing a new version of the casualties data to cover only locally maintained roads. Oflog will also review the relative value of presenting all casualties versus only presenting killed and seriously injured (KSI), and whether these should be presented as a rolling average or annually. Oflog intends to respond with an update on these in 2024.
22. As part of ongoing work, Oflog will review the interaction with road safety partnerships and net zero targets when further developing the roads area, as well as the cross-cutting interactions with other future metric areas such as climate change.
23. Oflog will analyse each of the suggested additional metrics and consider which could be included in future. Where suggested metrics do not exist and present a significant data gap, Oflog will bring this to the attention of the Department for Transport.

Proposed roads metrics for inclusion in the Data Explorer in December

Having considered the feedback received, the following metrics will be included in the Data Explorer in December 2023:

- Percentage of local authority A roads that should be considered for maintenance
- Percentage of local authority B and C roads that should be considered for maintenance

Corporate and Finance

24. The feedback on the proposed Corporate and Finance metrics was largely accepting. The feedback specific to the two pairs of proposed metrics is set out below.

Proposed draft metrics

Percentage of Ombudsman complaints upheld

This metrics is the percentage of complaints upheld by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman. Complaints are upheld when fault is found with an organisation's actions, including where the organisation accepted fault before they investigated. The uphold rate is expressed as a percentage of the completed investigations.

Number of upheld Ombudsman complaints per 10,000

This metrics is the percentage of complaints upheld by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman. Complaints are upheld when fault is found with an organisation's actions, including where the organisation accepted fault before they investigated. This is then divided by the number of people within an area.

Feedback on draft metrics

25. First, several local authorities considered that the low volume of complaints escalated to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO) may mean these were not the best comparators.
26. Some local authorities considered that the LGSCO may be selective on what complaints it accepts and/or investigates, focusing on specific topics or prioritising complaints more likely to be upheld. This influences the uphold rate, which therefore may not be reflective of the totality of complaints.
27. A consistent theme was the importance of the contextual information that supports the data in the Data Explorer. This included that different tiers and sizes of local authority would receive different types and volume of complaint based on statutory duties and service delivery models. The profile of the local population may influence the type of complaint, likelihood of submitting a complaint and expectation around complaint handling. Local authorities have internal complaint processes that differ across local authorities and the complaints dealt with through those are not reflected in the LGSCO data. Some local authorities said there was a risk that presenting the LGSCO data may make a local authority with low complaints look bad, because one complaint upheld would show as 100% upheld, whereas they may have effectively handled many more complaints through an internal complaints system without need for escalation.
28. Several local authorities signposted that the LGSCO and Housing Ombudsman recently conducted a consultation on a joint complaints code, which closed on 23 November. They were unclear how this may affect data on complaints going forward and suggested Oflog consider this.
29. As part of the engagement, Oflog also sought views on other metrics that might best reflect local authority performance at the corporate level. Some suggestions of additional metrics or data sources were received which will be explored in the coming weeks.

Consideration of feedback

30. Having considered the response to comments regarding the small sample size, the 'percentage of Ombudsman complaints upheld' metric will not be released onto the Data Explorer.
31. In response to comments about multiple aspects of context, within the contextual information in the Data Explorer, Oflog will note the potential influence of demographics, citizen expectations, local conditions and the tier structure of local government. The Data Explorer also separates out tiers of local government with different responsibilities when presenting metrics to avoid that particular concern.
32. In response to comments about how the LGSCO may handle complaints, in the contextual information in the Data Explorer, Oflog will reference how a recent review of their processes may affect the data. In their annual letter in July, the LGSCO communicated with local authorities about a recent review they conducted of their processes to ensure they do the most with the resources available. One outcome is that they may be selective about which complaints they investigate, prioritising where it may be in the public interest. They acknowledge this has meant changes in the uphold rate are not solely down to the nature of the cases. Their advice is to compare with a similar organisation to understand performance, rather than with previous years. Within the Data Explorer, this is enabled through the CIPFA Nearest Neighbour model.
33. Oflog have had initial engagement with the LGSCO's office regarding their recently closed consultation. Once a response has been published, Oflog will consider whether the recommendations affect the metrics on the Data Explorer.
34. In response to suggestions to include Housing Ombudsman complaint data, Oflog will consider whether this would be appropriate within a future publication.

Proposed draft metrics

<u>Council Tax collection rates</u>
This metric shows in-year rates of council tax collection.
<u>Non-domestic rates collection rates</u>
This metric covers local authority collection rates for non-domestic properties – better known as business rates.

Feedback on draft metrics

35. Several local authorities highlighted the link between collection rates and areas of deprivation. They considered that overlaying deprivation data may help to illustrate this, particularly when comparing between authorities.
36. Again, a consistent theme was the importance of the context statements that support the data in the Data Explorer. Collection rates can be affected by factors outside the control of a local authority, such as changes in legislation, demographics, local challenges and national economic conditions. Local authorities may have different approaches to collection and to show the full picture metrics on arrears, debt recovery and debt write-off would also need to be included. Local authorities have council tax reduction schemes that respond to the needs of their local population, which makes comparison difficult without understanding each of these in more detail.

37. Oflog had proposed to exclude data for financial years 20/21 and 21/22 because of the potential effect of COVID-19. Several local authorities said this data should be included and supported by contextual information about how the temporary pauses, reductions in recovery or enforcement action and/or relief grants may have affected the data.

Consideration of feedback

38. Oflog uses the CIPFA Nearest Neighbour model to enable comparison between authorities that are statistically similar. Nearest Neighbour groupings are based on a range of variables about each authority's area of administration, including those related to demographics of a local authority. Therefore, currently there is no intention to include a standalone indicator of deprivation. Oflog will continue to revisit this as the Data Explorer develops.
39. In response to comments about multiple aspects of context, within the contextual information in the Data Explorer, Oflog will look to note the potential influence of demographics, different local authority approaches to collection, local council tax support and local economic conditions.
40. In response to comments, data for financial years 2020/21 and 2021/22 will be included in the Data Explorer. Within the contextual information in the Data Explorer, Oflog will note the effect of COVID-19 on this data.

Proposed Corporate and Finance metrics for inclusion in the Data Explorer

Having considered the feedback received, the following metrics will be included in the Data Explorer in December 2023:

- Number of upheld Ombudsman complaints per 10,000
- Council Tax collection rates
- Non-domestic rates collection rates

Current financial indicators on the Data Explorer

41. As set out in the Chief Executive's letter of 26 October, once the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill Capital Risks Metrics Consultation Response is published, Oflog will consider whether to change or add to the current finance metrics on the Data Explorer.

Business and Economic Growth

Proposed draft metrics

<u>Births of new enterprises</u> A business birth is identified as a business that was present in-year, but did not exist in year t-1 or t-2.
<u>Deaths of enterprises</u> A business death is defined as a business that was on the active file in-year, but was no longer present in the active file in t+1 and t+2.
<u>Number of high growth enterprises</u> High growth enterprises are defined as all enterprises with average annualised growth greater than 20% per annum, over a three-year period.
<u>Gross Value Added (GVA) per hour worked</u> This metric is a measure of economic performance of a local area. It is a measure of productivity, that is the quantity of goods and services produced per unit of labour input.
<u>Gross median weekly pay (£)</u> This metric is a measure of economic performance of a local area. It is a measure of typical weekly pay for a full-time employed worker. The metric reflects jobs geographically present in the area rather area of residence of the worker.
<u>Employment rate for 16-64 years olds</u> This metric is a measure of economic activity of residents in a local area. It is a measure of number of people in paid employment (employees, self-employed and training) out of total population of working age.

Feedback on draft metrics

42. The feedback from local authorities strongly expressed the view that these draft metrics were not ideal measures of local authority performance given that they are influenced by a wide range of contributory factors outside of local authorities' scope of responsibility. Further context was needed alongside the data in order for it to represent meaningful insight to their role in fostering business and economic growth. A number of additional and alternative metrics were suggested, along with views on specific contextual needs. It was also a widely expressed view that more tiers of local government should be included in the published data, ideally to District level, to reflect all layers of local decision-making.
43. Local authorities were concerned about the conclusions that could be drawn from changes to birth and death rates of enterprises, as in isolation these were not necessarily a clear measure of economic growth. Suggestions for additional or alternative metrics included business survival rates and business density, to provide a more representative view. There were also concerns over whether the data provides an accurate reflection of the business landscape at local level, for example businesses might be registered in one area but operate in another.
44. Feedback on the Gross Value Added per hour and Gross Median weekly pay were that these should ideally be presented alongside contextual data related to the standard of living. In terms of the employment rate metric, there were many factors beyond the scope of local authorities that influence this measure. Local authorities were also keen to see district level data represented throughout this theme.

Consideration of feedback

45. Following this feedback, Oflog will consider what changes can be made to the suite of metrics so that they are better able to represent local authority performance. Oflog will respond with an update on plans for business and economic growth metrics in 2024.

Fly-tipping

Draft metrics

<u>Incidents per 1,000 population</u>
This measure is taken from the fly-tipping statistics published annually by Defra
<u>Fixed Penalty Notices issued per incident</u>
This measure is taken from the recently published league tables by Defra and takes total Fixed Penalty Notices issued within a year, standardised by the number of incidents
<u>Fixed Penalty Notices issued per 1,000 population</u>
This is an alternative standardisation, using the same method as the incidents data.
<u>Percentage of Fixed Penalty Notices paid</u>
This metric would take the proportion of Fixed Penalty Notices paid divided by those issued within each year.
<u>Fixed Penalty Notices paid per incident</u>
This metric would standardise Fixed Penalty Notices paid by the number of incidents.
<u>Enforcement actions per incident</u>
This metric would combine all enforcement actions, as reported to Defra, standardised by the number of incidents

Feedback on draft metrics

46. The feedback received on the proposed fly-tipping metrics raised several concerns about their proposed inclusion on the Data Explorer. Whilst there were examples of local authorities supporting the principle of including fly-tipping metrics on the Data Explorer, many outlined issues with the accuracy of data and questioned whether the proposed metrics captured the range of methods for dealing with fly-tipping or the range of factors which determine the scale of fly-tipping locally.
47. Several local authorities raised concerns about the measure of incidents, saying that interpretation of relevant definitions is inconsistent, which in turn makes comparisons of local authority reported data unreliable. Others raised concerns that contextual factors would not be taken account of adequately in proposed measures. They said that bulky waste charges, size of enforcement teams, deprivation, prevalence of CCTV and proximity to urban centres could all determine the prevalence of fly-tipping locally. Oflog recognises that some of these matters might provide useful context, however, also notes that some are within the remit of local authorities to determine. Many local authorities claimed that they have limited influence over the true prevalence of fly-tipping incidents.
48. Some local authorities criticised the excessive focus on Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs), saying that they have a range of methods for dealing with fly-tipping, ranging from soft interventions (education, prevention) to hard interventions (prosecution). It was considered by some respondents that an excessive focus on FPNs does not take adequate account of these actions and could even incentivise the misuse of FPNs. Others questioned whether the practise of issuing FPNs is consistent across local authorities – whether all are issuing FPNs underpinned by evidence and with a reasonable prospect that they are is paid.
49. A range of further points were also raised. Some local authorities questioned the relevance of metrics to a “waste management” page, considering it may better fit with a theme of anti-

social behaviour. Some suggested the number of metrics suggested were excessive (with some being duplicative of others). Some raised concerns about the prospect of Oflog introducing league tables on metrics.

Consideration of feedback

50. The feedback provided on fly-tipping has led to a number of questions that require further investigation. Oflog will respond with an update on plans for fly-tipping metrics in 2024.

Annex A – List of local government organisations who attended a workshop

To note, where an organisation attended multiple workshops, they are only shown once.

Ashfield	Hartlepool	South Cambridgeshire
Barking and Dagenham	Herefordshire, County of	South Gloucestershire
Barnsley	Hertfordshire	South Staffordshire
Basildon	Hillingdon	South Tyneside
Basingstoke and Deane	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England & Wales	Southwest Integrated Service Company
Bassetlaw	Isle of Wight	South Yorkshire
Bedford	Islington	Southwark
Bexley	Kingston upon Hull, City of	St Albans
Blaby	Kirklees	St. Helens
Blackburn with Darwen	Knowsley	Suffolk
Bolsover	Leeds	Surrey
Bolton	Leicester	Tandridge
Braintree	Lewisham	Tees Valley
Brighton and Hove	Lichfield	Telford and Wrekin
Buckinghamshire	Liverpool	Tendring
Buckinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership	Liverpool City Region	Thanet
Burnley	Local Government Association	Torbay
Calderdale	Maidstone	Tower Hamlets
Cambridge	Maldon	Trafford
Cambridgeshire	Manchester	Uttlesford
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough	Mansfield	Warrington
Camden	Melton	Watford
Castle Point	Mid Devon	Wealden
Chelmsford	Newcastle-under-Lyme	West Berkshire
Cherwell	Norfolk	West Devon
Cheshire East	North East Derbyshire	West Lindsey
Cheshire West and Chester	North Northamptonshire	West Midlands
Colchester	North of Tyne	West Northamptonshire
Cornwall	North Tyneside	West of England
County Durham	North West Leicestershire	West Suffolk
Dacorum	North Yorkshire	West Yorkshire
Derby	Oxford	Westminster
Devon	Oxfordshire	Westmorland and Furness
Dorset	Pendle	Wigan
Eastleigh	Plymouth	Wiltshire
Enfield	Portsmouth	Wirral
Fylde	Ribble Valley	What works centre for Local Economic Growth
Gateshead	Rochdale	Wolverhampton
Great Yarmouth	Rotherham	Wyre Forest
Hackney	Salford	
Hammersmith and Fulham	Sevenoaks	
Hampshire	Sheffield	
Harrow	Solihull	

Annex B – List of local government organisations who provided written feedback

To note, where an organisation sent multiple responses, they are only shown once.

Ashfield	Islington	St. Helens
Barking and Dagenham	Kensington and Chelsea	Staffordshire
Barnet	Kingston upon Thames	Stevenage
Barnsley	Kirklees	Stratford-on-Avon
Basildon	Knowsley	Suffolk
Basingstoke and Deane	Lancashire	Surrey
Bedford	Leeds	Tandridge
Bexley	Leicestershire	Telford and Wrekin
Blackburn with Darwen	Lewisham	Wandsworth
Blackpool	Liverpool City Region	Warwickshire
Bolton	Local Government Association	Watford
Boston	London Councils	West Devon
Bracknell Forest	Maidstone	West Lindsey
Braintree	Maldon	West Midlands
Brent	Manchester	West of England
Bristol, City of	Melton	West Suffolk
Buckinghamshire	National Association of Local Councils	West Yorkshire
Burnley	Newport Pagnell Town Council	Wiltshire
Cambridgeshire	Newark and Sherwood	Wokingham
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough	Newham	Wolverhampton
Castle Point	Norfolk	Wyre Forest
Cheshire East	North East Derbyshire	
Cheshire West and Chester	North Northamptonshire	
Cornwall	North of Tyne	
County Durham	North West Leicestershire	
Dacorum	Oxford	
Derbyshire Dales	Plymouth	
District Council Network	Portsmouth	
Dorset	Richmond upon Thames	
Ealing	Runnymede	
East Lindsey	Salford	
East Riding of Yorkshire	Solihull	
Elmbridge	South Cambridgeshire	
Fylde	South Gloucestershire	
Great Yarmouth	South Hams	
Greater Manchester	South Holland	
Hammersmith and Fulham	South Staffordshire	
Harrow	South Tyneside	
Havering	South Yorkshire	
Hillingdon	Southwark	
Horsham	St Albans	
Hounslow	Special Interest Group of Municipal Authorities	