

## **Norfolk and Suffolk: Summary and analysis of consultation responses and summary of representations from named consultees**

### **Introduction**

1. A statutory consultation on proposals for unitary local government in Norfolk and Suffolk was opened on 19 November and closed on 11 January 2025. We received a total of 3184 responses. 69 respondents provided a narrative response only.
2. The 5 proposals being consulted on were made by councils and submitted to the Government on 26 September 2025.
3. This document provides a summary of the 3184 responses received to the Government's consultation on the proposals for future unitary local government in Norfolk and Suffolk.
4. The Government announced to Parliament in March 2026 that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government had decided to implement, subject to Parliamentary approval
  - **Norfolk:** the proposal for 3 unitary councils submitted by Breckland District Council, Broadland District Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council, King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council, North Norfolk District Council, and Norwich City Council.
  - **Suffolk:** The proposal for 3 unitary councils submitted by Babergh District Council, East Suffolk District Council, Ipswich Borough Council, Mid Suffolk District Council, and West Suffolk District Council
5. **The consultation invited views on the proposals submitted by:**
6. **Norfolk County Council proposed one unitary council across the whole of the area of Norfolk comprising the current district areas of:**
  - Breckland, Broadland, Great Yarmouth, King's Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk, Norwich, and South Norfolk
7. From here this is referred to as the Norfolk 1 unitary proposal
8. **South Norfolk District Council proposed 2 unitary councils across the whole of the area of Norfolk comprising the current district areas of:**
  - East Norfolk: Broadland, Great Yarmouth, Norwich, and South Norfolk
  - West Norfolk: Breckland, King's Lynn and West Norfolk and North Norfolk.
9. From here this is referred to as the Norfolk 2 unitary proposal
10. **Breckland District Council, Broadland District Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council, King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council, North Norfolk District Council, and Norwich City Council, proposed 3 unitary councils across the whole of the area of Norfolk. This includes a request to**

**split existing district council areas between the proposed new councils. These would comprise the district areas of:**

- West: Breckland and King's Lynn and West Norfolk and 9 parishes from South Norfolk.
- Norwich: Norwich plus 19 parishes from Broadland and 16 parishes from South Norfolk.
- East: Broadland less 19 parishes, Great Yarmouth, North Norfolk, and South Norfolk less 25 parishes.

11. From here this is referred to as the Norfolk 3 unitary proposal

12. **Suffolk County Council proposed one unitary council across the whole of the area of Suffolk comprising the current district areas of:**

- Babergh, East Suffolk, Ipswich, Mid Suffolk, and West Suffolk

13. From here this is referred to as the Suffolk 1 unitary proposal

14. **Babergh District Council, East Suffolk District Council, Ipswich Borough Council, Mid Suffolk District Council, and West Suffolk District Council proposed 3 unitary councils across the whole of the area of Suffolk. This includes a request to split existing district council areas between the proposed new councils. These would comprise the current areas of:**

- **Western Suffolk:** West Suffolk plus 21 parishes from Mid Suffolk, and Babergh less 31 parishes.
- **Central and Eastern:** Mid Suffolk less 29 parishes, and East Suffolk less 25 parishes
- **Ipswich and Southern Suffolk:** Ipswich plus 31 parishes from Babergh, 8 parishes Mid Suffolk, and 25 parishes from East Suffolk.

15. From here this referred to as the Suffolk 3 unitary proposal

16. The consultation on these proposals has informed an assessment of the merits of each proposal. All the proposals have been considered carefully, alongside the responses received to this consultation, representations and any other relevant information, in assessing the proposals against the criteria before a judgement was taken on which proposal to implement.

17. The criteria by which proposals for local government reorganisation have been assessed are set out in the letter of invitation, sent to councils in area on 5 February 2025 [[Norfolk](#) and [Suffolk](#)]. The consultation asked questions relating to the criteria for each of the above proposals.

18. This consultation relates to the structure of local government in Norfolk and Suffolk. These proposals relate to England only.

## **Methodology**

19. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 states that the Secretary of State may not implement a proposal unless they have consulted with every authority affected by the proposal and other such other persons as they consider appropriate. Those councils and persons considered appropriate are hereafter referred to as 'named consultees'.
20. The list of named consultees is available on [gov.uk](http://gov.uk).
21. In addition, the Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government (the Ministry) welcomed the views of any other persons or bodies interested in these proposals, including local residents, town and parish councils, businesses and the voluntary and community sector.
22. The Ministry used Citizen Space, a third-party consultation programme to collect responses. Citizen Space was open to both named consultees and all other interested parties. Further information on the statutory basis for, and methodology of, the consultation is provided on the [publication page](#).
23. Responses to the consultation were also received by email and letter.
22. The Ministry used a tool named Consult AI to assist in the analysis of responses. The AI tool identified themes present in the responses which MHCLG officials have checked for accuracy. The tool did not have access to any personal data. All responses from named consultees were read by Ministry staff.
23. To evaluate Consult's performance, human reviewers independently checked the theme assignments Consult had produced, and these were compared against Consult's original outputs using an F1 score — a standard measure that penalises both over- and under-assignment of themes. Consult's theme mappings were consistent with people

### **Consultation Questions**

24. Respondents answered the questions below using a five-point agree–disagree scale, ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', with an additional 'don't know' option
25. The questions were as follows:

**Question 1:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

**Question 2:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

**Question3:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

**Question 4:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

**Question 5:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

**Question 6:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements, for example, the establishment of a strategic authority?

**Question 7:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

**Question 8:** If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on this proposal.

**Question 9:** This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary changes. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change?

**Question 10:** If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 9.

## Overarching summary of responses and findings

### Summary of responses to proposals in Norfolk

26. There were 3162 responses to this consultation, 42 from named consultees and 3120 from other respondents. Seven respondents sent in replies relevant to all six invitation areas. Not all respondents provided an answer to each question, please see analysis of responses by question below for individual response data.

#### Responses from named consultees

Named consultee respondents	Number of Responses
Principal councils	8
Neighbouring councils	8
Heath Bodies	4
Police and Fire	2
Education Bodies	6
Other Public Sector	4
Voluntary and Community Sector	1
Business Organisations	6
National Bodies	2
Other named consultees	1
<b>Total named consultees</b>	<b>42</b>

## Reponses from other respondents to Norfolk proposals

Other respondents	Number of responses
Individual living in Norfolk	1737
Individual not living in Norfolk	1251
Organisations	132
Total other respondents	<b>3120</b>
Total responses (including named consultees)	<b>3162</b>

## Summary of responses to proposals in Suffolk

27. There were 3153 responses to this consultation, 36 from named consultees and 3117 by other respondents. 7 respondents sent in replies relevant to all reorganisation areas. Not all respondents provided an answer to each question, please see analysis of responses by question below for individual response data.

## Responses from named consultees

Named consultee respondents	Number of Responses
Principal councils	6
Neighbouring councils	11
Heath Bodies	5
Police and Fire	1
Education Bodies	3
Other Public Sector	3
Voluntary and Community Sector	1
Business Organisations	4
National Bodies	1
Other named consultees	1
Total named consultees	<b>36</b>

## Reponses from other respondents in Suffolk.

Other respondents	Number of responses
Individual living in Suffolk	1226
Individual not living in Suffolk	1759
Organisations	132
Total other respondents	<b>3117</b>
Total responses	<b>3153</b>

## Summary of findings

28. Tables in this report included numbers rounded to the nearest whole number, and as such, not all cumulative scores will equal 100%.

29. Respondents were invited to respond to 9 multiple choice questions per proposal and could provide a rationale for their answers in a free text box. Where a proposal included boundary change, respondents were invited to answer an additional question and provide an additional free text response. The multiple choice questions invited respondents to state whether they strongly agreed, somewhat agreed/agreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, somewhat disagreed/disagreed, strongly disagreed, or did not know when responding to a statement.
30. For the purposes of this document we have classified positive responses as strongly agree, somewhat agreed or agree and negative responses as somewhat disagree or disagree and strongly disagree.

## Norfolk

### All Respondents

31. The table below takes the average response across the multiple choice questions to provide an overall view of whether consultees viewed a proposal positively or negatively.

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Norfolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	13658	43%	48%	7%	2%
<i>Norfolk 2 unitary proposal</i>	11621	19%	64%	15%	3%
<i>Norfolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	14404	41%	47%	10%	2%

32. Overall, the responses demonstrate a marginal preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 43% of respondents to the 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 48% of respondents provided negative responses. 9% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 3 unitary model was the second most popular with 41% of named consultees providing a positive response. The 2 unitary model was the least popular with 19% of named consultees providing a positive response.

### Named consultees

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Norfolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	245	45%	33%	22%	1%
<i>Norfolk 2 unitary proposal</i>	231	12%	51%	35%	3%
<i>Norfolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	277	49%	21%	28%	2%

33. The responses from the named consultees demonstrate a preference for the 3 unitary proposal. 45% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 33% of respondents provided negative responses. 22% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Of the 35 respondents, 12 were principal or neighbouring authorities that had submitted a 3 unitary proposal in Norfolk or Suffolk. The 1 unitary model was the second most popular with 45% of named consultees providing a positive response. The 2 unitary model was the least popular with 19% of named consultees providing a positive response.

### Individuals living in Norfolk

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Norfolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	11538	44%	49%	6%	1%
<i>Norfolk 2 unitary proposal</i>	9838	19%	66%	13%	2%
<i>Norfolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	12333	42%	48%	8%	2%

34. The responses from individuals living in Norfolk demonstrate a marginal preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 44% of respondents to the 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 49% of respondents provided negative responses. 7% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know.

### Individuals living outside Norfolk

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Norfolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	1436	34%	44%	13%	9%
<i>Norfolk 2 unitary proposal</i>	1160	19%	48%	23%	11%
<i>Norfolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	1347	32%	42%	17%	10%

35. The responses from individuals living out Norfolk demonstrate a marginal preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 34% of respondents to the Norfolk 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 44% of respondents provided negative responses. 22% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Preference in order is for 1 unitary, 3 unitary, 2 unitary.

### Organisations

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Norfolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	439	32%	54%	12%	2%
<i>Norfolk 2 unitary proposal</i>	392	16%	67%	14%	3%
<i>Norfolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	447	39%	48%	11%	2%

36. The responses from organisations demonstrate a preference among organisations for the 3 unitary proposal. 39% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 48% of respondents provided negative responses. 13% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Preference in order is for 3 unitary, 1 unitary, 2 unitary.

## Summary of findings Suffolk

### All respondents

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Suffolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	12925	29%	49%	13%	9%
<i>Suffolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	14696	46%	32%	13%	9%

### Named consultees

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Suffolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	193	28%	48%	23%	1%
<i>Suffolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	216	64%	14%	22%	0%

37. The responses from named consultees demonstrate a preference among named consultees for the 3 unitary proposal. 64% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 14% of respondents provided negative responses. 22% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Note that of the 27 responses, 12 were principal or neighbouring authorities that had submitted a 3 unitary proposal in Norfolk or Suffolk.

### Individuals living in Suffolk

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Suffolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	7549	31%	62%	6%	1%
<i>Suffolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	8733	63%	29%	7%	1%

38. The responses from individuals living in Suffolk demonstrate a preference for the 3 unitary proposal. 63% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 29% of respondents provided negative responses 7% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know.

### Individuals living outside Suffolk

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Suffolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	4660	28%	27%	23%	22%
<i>Suffolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	5153	18%	37%	22%	22%

39. The responses from individuals living out Suffolk demonstrate a marginal preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 28% of respondents to the Suffolk 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 27% of respondents provided negative respondents. 45% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know.

### Organisations

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Suffolk 1 unitary proposal</i>	523	20%	50%	15%	15%
<i>Suffolk 3 unitary proposal</i>	594	39%	30%	17%	14%

40. The responses from organisations demonstrate a preference for the 3 unitary proposal. 39% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 30% of respondents provided negative responses 31% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know.

### Analysis of responses by question: Norfolk

**Question 1:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

## Named Consultees

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	8	25%	75%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	8	13%	88%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	67%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Health Bodies</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%

<i>Norfolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	50%	17%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	83%	0%	17%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	5	20%	60%	20%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	80%	0%	20%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Norfolk 2 unitary</i>					
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</b>	35	51%	31%	17%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</b>	33	12%	58%	30%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</b>	35	57%	20%	23%	0%

### Individuals and Organisations (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1652	50%	48%	2%	0%

<i>Individual living in Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1410	24%	67%	8%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1541	47%	49%	4%	0%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	206	39%	43%	9%	10%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	166	24%	46%	20%	10%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	169	34%	45%	12%	9%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	63	40%	49%	11%	0%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	56	23%	68%	9%	0%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	56	43%	50%	7%	0%

### Total Responses Question 1

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1956	48%	47%	4%	1%
<i>Total all responses</i>	1665	24%	65%	10%	2%

<i>Norfolk 2 unitary</i>					
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1801	46%	48%	5%	1%

**Question 2:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	8	25%	75%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	8	13%	75%	0%	13%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	33%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	67%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%

<i>Norfolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	50%	17%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	50%	50%	0%

<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	83%	0%	17%	0%
<i>Business Bodies</i>	5	20%	40%	20%	20%

<i>Norfolk 2 unitary</i>					
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	60%	20%	20%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</b>	35	51%	29%	20%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</b>	33	9%	52%	33%	6%
<b>Total Named Consultees</b>	35	51%	23%	26%	0%

<b>Norfolk 3 unitary</b>					
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

### Individuals and Organisations (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1651	45%	50%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1407	20%	67%	12%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1544	44%	50%	5%	1%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	205	36%	45%	10%	8%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	166	19%	52%	20%	9%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	169	32%	44%	15%	9%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	63	32%	52%	14%	2%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	56	18%	66%	13%	4%

<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	56	39%	52%	7%	2%
--	----	-----	-----	----	----

### Total Responses Question 2

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1954	44%	49%	5%	2%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1662	19%	65%	13%	2%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1804	43%	49%	7%	2%

**Question 3:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	8	25%	75%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	8	13%	88%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	63%	25%	0%	13%

<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	50%	17%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	83%	0%	17%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	5	20%	60%	20%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	20%	20%	40%	20%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</b>	35	54%	29%	17%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</b>	33	9%	52%	39%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</b>	35	40%	23%	31%	6%

**Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1648	47%	48%	4%	0%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1403	19%	69%	11%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1541	42%	52%	5%	0%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	205	36%	45%	11%	8%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	165	19%	52%	19%	10%
<i>Individual outside</i>	168	32%	45%	14%	8%

<i>Norfolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Organisations Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	63	35%	54%	11%	0%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	56	18%	63%	18%	2%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	55	44%	47%	7%	2%

### Total Responses Question 3

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1951	46%	48%	6%	1%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1657	19%	67%	13%	2%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1799	41%	51%	7%	1%

**Question 4:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	8	13%	75%	0%	13%

<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	8	13%	50%	25%	13%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	63%	25%	0%	13%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	67%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	50%	17%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Norfolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	33%	17%	33%	17%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	5	20%	40%	20%	20%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	20%	20%	40%	20%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Norfolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</b>	35	37%	31%	26%	6%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</b>	33	9%	45%	39%	6%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</b>	35	43%	23%	29%	6%

### Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1645	44%	50%	5%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1406	17%	66%	16%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1545	41%	49%	9%	1%

<i>Individual outside Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	205	33%	44%	13%	10%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	165	16%	48%	24%	11%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	166	30%	45%	17%	9%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	62	31%	56%	11%	2%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	56	13%	71%	14%	2%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	56	39%	46%	13%	2%

#### **Total Responses Question 4**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1947	42%	50%	7%	2%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1660	17%	64%	17%	2%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1802	40%	48%	10%	2%

**Question 5:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

**Summary of Named Consultee Responses**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	8	13%	88%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	8	13%	63%	25%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	67%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%

<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	50%	17%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	17%	17%	50%	17%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	33%	17%	33%	17%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

<i>Norfolk 2 unitary</i>					
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	5	20%	60%	20%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	20%	20%	60%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</b>	35	34%	40%	26%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</b>	33	12%	48%	36%	3%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</b>	35	51%	17%	29%	3%

**Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1646	39%	52%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1402	16%	65%	15%	3%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1541	42%	44%	11%	3%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	205	28%	46%	14%	12%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	166	16%	43%	27%	14%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	168	32%	33%	21%	14%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	62	27%	58%	10%	5%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	56	13%	64%	13%	11%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	56	36%	48%	11%	5%

**Total Responses Question 5**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1948	37%	52%	8%	3%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1657	16%	62%	17%	5%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1800	41%	43%	12%	4%

**Question 6:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements, for example, the establishment of a strategic authority?

#### **Summary of Named Consultee Responses**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	8	25%	75%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	8	38%	63%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%

<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies</i>	6	50%	17%	33%	0%

<i>Norfolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	83%	0%	17%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	5	20%	60%	20%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	40%	20%	40%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</b>	35	51%	29%	20%	0%

<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</b>	33	18%	48%	33%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</b>	35	46%	23%	31%	0%

### Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1648	47%	39%	10%	4%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1404	17%	63%	15%	4%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1542	37%	48%	11%	4%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	205	36%	36%	19%	10%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	166	17%	48%	23%	12%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	169	32%	41%	17%	10%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	63	33%	51%	14%	2%

<i>Organisations Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	56	14%	68%	16%	2%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	56	41%	46%	11%	2%

### Total Responses Question 6

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1951	45%	39%	11%	4%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1659	17%	62%	16%	5%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1802	36%	47%	12%	5%

**Question 7:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	8	13%	88%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	8	13%	75%	0%	13%

<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	33%	50%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Norfolk 2 unitary</i>					
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	50%	17%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	6	17%	33%	50%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

<i>Sector Norfolk 2 unitary</i>					
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	6	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	5	0%	40%	40%	20%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	60%	0%	40%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 1 unitary</b>	35	34%	40%	26%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 2 unitary</b>	33	12%	52%	30%	6%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</b>	35	57%	17%	26%	0%

#### Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1648	38%	55%	6%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1406	20%	64%	14%	1%
<i>Individual living in Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1543	46%	42%	11%	1%
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	205	29%	47%	15%	9%
<i>Individual outside</i>	166	19%	44%	27%	11%

<i>Norfolk 2 unitary</i>					
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	169	36%	36%	19%	9%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	63	29%	56%	14%	2%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	56	16%	68%	14%	2%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	56	41%	46%	11%	2%

#### **Total Responses Question 7**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	1951	37%	54%	8%	2%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	1661	20%	62%	16%	2%
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1803	45%	41%	12%	2%

**Question 8:** If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on this proposal.

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 1 unitary</i>	32	1056	101	57
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 2 unitary</i>	28	779	71	44
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	30	953	76	51

## Summary of named consultee response

### Principal Authorities

41. Responses from principal councils supported the proposals that they put forward. There was concern about the 1 unitary proposal being too large, centralised, and remote to meet diverse local needs -weakening democracy and risking poorer services. There was concern about the 2 and 3 unitary proposals, regarding proposed geography, savings and the impact of disaggregation on service delivery. Respondees pointed to risks arising from boundary change, and set out their view that the a 3 unitary model, fragments communities, weakens Greater Norwich, lacks evidence and financial credibility, undermines public services, and creates artificial geographies.

### Neighbouring Principle Authorities

42. Responses from neighbouring authorities were varied. Support for proposals was consistent with the arguments made in those proposals, with councils that favoured smaller unitaries citing their proximity to communities, and those that favoured larger unitaries noting concerns about disaggregation and financial resilience.

### Health Bodies

43. Some health partners demonstrated no clear preference for any of the three options. Those that did demonstrate a preference favoured the single unitary option. Health partners noted that a single unitary would result in fewer transitions of an individual between authorities, decrease complexity in the system and enable streamlined multiagency working.

### Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies

44. Police and Fire Authorities demonstrated a preference for the single unitary proposal, citing concerns about the impact of disaggregation on service delivery, particularly the safeguarding of vulnerable people.

### Education Bodies

45. Responses from education bodies were varied. Those education bodies that favoured the 3 unitary model were concerned about the sizes of the 1 and 2 unitary proposals. Respondents that favoured the 1 unitary raised concerns

about the impact and risk of disaggregation on children's services, safeguarding and SEND.

### **Other public Sector bodies**

46. Responses from other public bodies noted concerns about the impact of service disaggregation on children's and adult social care services. Other respondents provided no overall preference and signalled a willingness to work with councils regardless of the outcomes.

### **Voluntary and community sector**

47. Responses from the Voluntary and Community Sector favoured the single unitary proposal, taking the view that it was the most financially resilient. Responses noted the benefits of locality resulting from the 3 unitary model; they were overall not convinced by the case for the 2 unitary model.

### **Business Bodies**

48. Businesses were generally positive in their responses to all proposals, however, more respondents favoured the 1 unitary, citing concerns about consistency across the area, efficiency, and the preservation of the social care market in relation to the 2 and 3 unitary proposals.

### **Other named consultees**

49. Responses favoured the 1 unitary proposal noting it offered the best chance of efficiency savings and financial resilience. Responses were critical of the 2 and 3 unitary proposals and did not recognise the logic used to determine the new boundaries.

### **Comments against the criteria**

50. **For criteria 1: A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government:** There was concern that the 1 unitary area would be too large and too remote from the communities the council would serve. Support for the 1 unitary agreed that Norfolk has a single economic area and strong county wide identity. There was concern that the 2 and the 3 unitary models suggested arbitrary boundaries and councils that were too small. Support for the 2 and 3 unitary models focussed on the proximity of the proposed councils to local communities and economies.
51. **For criteria 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:** There was concern that the 1 unitary proposal would result in a council with too great a population. Support for the proposed efficiencies, economies of scale, and the financial resilience of the model. Some responses noted the significant savings predicted in the two unitary model though there was concern they would be realised. There was concern that the 3 unitary model would be inefficient and financial vulnerable.
52. **For criteria 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:** There was concern that the 1 unitary model would be too large to delivery services locally. Support for the economies of scale that would support service procurement and the absence of

disaggregation. There was support for the smaller local councils proposed by the 2 and the 3 models, and some belief this would result in improved service provision. There was concern on the impact of disaggregation on adult and children's social care services and the provision of safeguarding.

53. **For criteria 4: Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views:** Principal authorities justified their own models and there was concern that the models in other proposals were not properly informed by local engagement, or selectively chose outcomes from that engagement that aligned with their proposed model. Less commentary was provided on this criteria from named consultees outside the principal and neighbouring authorities.
54. **For criteria 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:** Principal authorities justified their own models and there was concern that the models in other proposals would not align with devolution ambitions. Less commentary was provided on this criteria from named consultees outside the principal and neighbouring authorities.
55. **For criteria 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:** Principal authorities justified their own models and there was concern that the models in other proposals would not provide a platform for community engagement and empowerment. Less commentary was provided on this criteria from named consultees outside the principal and neighbouring authorities.

**The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:**

#### **Local Democratic Representation**

56. Respondents raised concerns about the loss of local representation, identity and democracy due to larger authorities. There was a perception that decision making made further away from the community would not reflect needs across the local community and that some areas would be neglected.

#### **Geographical Split and Size**

57. There was concern about geographical split of areas. Feedback was provided around distinct geographic divided and needs, including representation, cultural considerations and community impacts, and remoteness and access.

#### **Financial Stability and Efficiencies of New Unitaries**

58. There was concern that smaller unitaries would not be financially resilient, adding financial risk and inefficiency. In addition, there were concerns raised regarding the cost of reorganisation and the disruption of the change, increased council tax, and risks to service provision.

#### **Support for Proposal**

59. Support for the single unitary proposal included cost savings, improved local governance, coherent strategic planning and avoiding service disaggregation.

The three unitary proposal received support including a balanced approach to scale and local responsiveness which considers the local geography.

### Impact on Public Services and Governance

60. Positive feedback was provided on improved service delivery and efficiency, eliminating duplication and clear leadership. There was concern about implementation cost, disruption to services through implementation, and bureaucracy associated with larger councils.

### Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

61. Emailed and written responses from non-named consultees were broadly consistent with the responses received on Citizen Space. Responses that favoured the 1 unitary model referenced financial resilience and the avoidance of service disaggregation. Responses that favoured the two or the three unitary models observed that a single unitary may be too large to represent the communities and places within Norfolk.

**Question 9:** This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary changes. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change? This question and question 10 were asked in relation to proposal the Norfolk 3 unitary proposal.

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	8	63%	25%	13%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	67%	17%	17%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Norfolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Education Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	6	17%	50%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	5	20%	20%	60%	0%
<i>National Bodies Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Norfolk 3 unitary</b>	32	44%	25%	31%	0%

#### Individuals and Organisations (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in</i>	1536	36%	51%	10%	3%

<i>Norfolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Individual outside Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	169	27%	44%	18%	11%
<i>Organisations Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	56	30%	46%	20%	4%

### Total Responses Question 9

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	1793	35%	50%	12%	4%

**Question 10:** If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 9

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
<i>Total all responses Norfolk 3 unitary</i>	20	556	46	29

### Summary of Local Government Boundary Commission for England (The Commission) Response

62. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England provided observations on the evidence provided to support the boundary change request within the 3 unitary proposal, drawing on their Principal Area Boundary Review expertise. They observed that the evidence to support the expansion of Norwich was more detailed than that provided to support the other two proposed authorities of East and West Norfolk, and that relatively little data was used to support specifically the proposed boundary change rather than the case for three unitary councils.

### Summary of named consultee response

#### Principal Authorities

63. Principal authorities that supported the 3 unitary proposal reiterated the arguments set out in the overall proposal, and set out how the proposed boundary change was necessary to reflect the economic and social areas within Norfolk. Councils that did not support this proposal made the case that there was no strong justification, that the proposed boundaries remained arbitrary and that changes were of limited purpose beyond the balancing of populations between the 3 areas.

#### **Neighbouring Principal Authorities**

64. Neighbouring authorities that agreed with the 3 unitary proposal reflected the same arguments as set out in that proposal, and agreed that the boundary change was justified. Councils that did not agree with the proposed changes suggested that even with the proposed changes the boundaries of the proposed unitaries remained arbitrary and at odds with economic and social areas.

#### **Health Bodies**

65. Health bodies that supported the 3 unitary proposal noted that the changes enabled balance between the three unitaries. Those that did not agree with the proposal suggested that even with the boundaries proposed by the modification, their preference remained the single unitary as it avoided disaggregation.

#### **Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies**

66. Police and Fire Authorities commented that the unitary council for Norwich set out in the 3 unitary proposal was largely supported and reflected the growth of Norwich into surrounding areas. They suggested that Wymondham should be included within the Greater Norwich area. They did not comment on the changes to East and West Norfolk.

#### **Education Bodies**

67. Education bodies referenced their overall concern about the disaggregation of services when considering the proposed boundary change.

#### **Other public bodies**

68. Respondees that supported the 3 unitary proposal noted that the boundary changes were a logical consequence in the adoption of this proposal.

#### **Voluntary and community sector**

69. Respondents suggested that the 3 unitary proposal, with boundary change was more sustainable than the 2 unitary proposal.

#### **Business Bodies**

70. Where business respondents commented on the proposed boundary change, there was concern that the changes may compound the challenge of disaggregating services in the area.

#### **Other named consultees**

71. Comments did not directly address the proposed boundary change, while indicating an overall preference for the single unitary model.

## Summary of named consultee responses

### Comments against the criteria

72. **For criteria 1: A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government:** Where responses were positive about the proposed boundary changes they referenced how the changed unitaries would better reflect economic and social areas within Norfolk. Where responses disagreed with the proposed boundary changes it was suggested that the new boundaries were arbitrary and designed to balance populations between the three unitaries and not the economic and social areas within them. Some respondents made the case that Wymondham could have been included in the Greater Norwich Unitary.
73. **For criteria 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:** Responses that agreed with the proposed changes agreed that they would make each of the three unitaries more financial resilient. Responses that disagreed with the proposed changes referred to overall concerns about the viability of 3 unitaries for the area.
74. **For criteria 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:** Responses that agreed with the proposed changes set out how the three areas would better reflect local communities and therefore enable new councils to deliver better services. Responses that were critical of the proposed changes tended to restate their overall concerns about the impact of disaggregation, and how boundary change may compound this complication.
75. **For criteria 4: Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views:** Responses that agreed with the proposed boundary change referenced how they reflected the engagement undertaken during the development of the proposal.
76. **For criteria 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:** Neither responses agreeing with, or disagreeing with, the proposed boundary change made strong arguments in relation to the impact of the proposed boundary changes on devolution.
77. **For criteria 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:** Arguments made for and against the merits of the proposed boundary change in relation to criteria 6 were consistent with those set out in respondents assessments of the overall business cases.

Themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

### **Boundaries and communities**

78. Responses opposing boundary change cited increased complexity, costs, disruption to services, and loss of community identity. Some responses suggested that the 3 unitary proposal would impose artificial boundaries, centralise power in Norwich, and fragment services, making them less efficient and more costly. There were some views that the changes would result in higher salaries for council employees.

### **Financial Resilience and Efficiency**

79. There was concern about increased costs, waste of taxpayer money, and lack of financial savings with boundary changes. Boundary changes may reduce the impact of local democracy by moving residents into different constituencies.

### **Geographies and service footprint alignment**

80. Responses supporting boundary change cited better representation, efficiency, improved services, financial stability and strategic planning. They suggested that proposed boundary changes reflected sensible geographic boundaries and natural geographies and aligned with fire and police. There were some views that existing boundaries are outdated and that there was a sound business case for boundary changes, aligning service delivery with boundaries.

### **Accountability and democratic representation**

81. Respondents stated that boundary changes could improve local accountability and tailored services for communities. The boundary changes offer a stronger framework for empowering neighbourhoods and local communities.

### **Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses**

82. Paper and emailed responses mirrored online responses. Many responses did not directly engage with the proposed boundary change, engaging instead with the proposal as a whole. Where responses agreed with the changes they referenced how the expansion of Norwich would align with the geographic extent of the city, and how it was right that government should make exemption for the use of existing districts as building blocks if the new boundaries were right for the communities they served.

## Analysis of responses by question Suffolk

**Question 1:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	11	18%	73%	9%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	70%	20%	10%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%

<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</b>	27	26%	56%	19%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	67%	15%	19%	0%

### Individuals and Organisations (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1081	35%	62%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1095	67%	29%	3%	0%

<i>Individual outside Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	668	30%	27%	21%	22%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	647	20%	37%	20%	22%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	74	23%	50%	14%	14%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	75	43%	33%	12%	12%

### Total Responses Question 1

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1850	33%	48%	10%	8%
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1844	50%	32%	10%	9%

**Question 2:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%

<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	11	18%	45%	36%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	70%	10%	20%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%

<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Suffolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</b>	27	26%	44%	30%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	63%	11%	26%	0%

#### Individuals and Organisations (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1078	32%	64%	4%	0%
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1094	65%	31%	4%	0%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	668	28%	27%	22%	23%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	646	18%	37%	22%	23%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	75	21%	52%	13%	13%

<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	75	39%	33%	15%	13%
--	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

### Total Responses Question 2

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1848	30%	50%	11%	9%
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1842	47%	33%	11%	9%

**Question 3:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority</i>	11	18%	64%	18%	0%

<i>Suffolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	70%	20%	10%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%

<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees</b>	27	30%	48%	22%	0%

<b>Suffolk 1 unitary</b>					
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	63%	15%	22%	0%

### Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1080	34%	61%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1089	63%	32%	5%	1%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	667	30%	28%	20%	22%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	644	18%	39%	21%	22%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	75	25%	51%	11%	13%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	73	40%	29%	18%	14%

### Total Responses Question 3

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
------------------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------

<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1849	32%	49%	10%	9%
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1833	46%	34%	12%	9%

**Question 4:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	11	18%	64%	18%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	70%	20%	10%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</b>	28	32%	46%	21%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	67%	15%	19%	0%

**Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1078	29%	63%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1093	63%	29%	7%	1%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	666	27%	28%	24%	21%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	642	18%	37%	23%	22%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	75	19%	51%	16%	15%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	75	39%	33%	15%	13%

#### **Total Responses Question 4**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1847	28%	50%	14%	9%
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1837	46%	32%	13%	9%

**Question 5:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

**Summary of Named Consultee Responses**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	11	18%	55%	27%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	60%	10%	30%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>National Bodies</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Suffolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</b>	28	29%	39%	32%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	63%	11%	26%	0%

### Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1078	25%	68%	6%	1%
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1091	64%	28%	7%	1%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	663	24%	28%	24%	24%

<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	644	18%	34%	24%	24%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	74	14%	49%	23%	15%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	75	36%	28%	23%	13%

#### **Total Responses Question 5**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1843	24%	52%	13%	10%
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1837	47%	30%	14%	10%

**Question 6:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements, for example, the establishment of a strategic authority?

#### **Summary of Named Consultee Responses**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------

<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	11	27%	64%	9%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	70%	20%	10%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies</i>	3	33%	0%	33%	33%

<i>Suffolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</b>	28	32%	46%	18%	4%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	63%	15%	22%	0%

#### **Individuals and Organisations (not named consultees)**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1077	35%	49%	13%	3%
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1090	58%	28%	11%	3%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	663	29%	25%	23%	23%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	644	17%	38%	23%	23%

<i>Organisations Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	75	23%	43%	19%	16%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	74	36%	26%	19%	19%

### Total Responses Question 6

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1843	32%	40%	17%	11%
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1835	43%	31%	16%	11%

**Question 7:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

### Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%

<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	11	18%	73%	9%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	70%	20%	10%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Education Bodies</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%

<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>					
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Suffolk 1 unitary</i>					
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 1 unitary</b>	28	25%	54%	21%	0%
<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	67%	15%	19%	0%

#### Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1077	25%	68%	6%	0%
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1092	68%	24%	7%	1%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	665	26%	28%	23%	22%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	643	21%	34%	24%	21%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	75	19%	52%	13%	16%

<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	74	43%	26%	15%	16%
--	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

### Total Responses Question 7

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	1845	25%	53%	13%	9%
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1836	51%	27%	13%	8%

**Question 8:** If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on this proposal.

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 1 unitary</i>	24	708	273	59
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	23	698	255	61

### Principal Authorities

83. Responses from principal councils supported the proposals that they put forward. Responses to the 3 unitary proposal highlighted significant concerns about the impact of disaggregation and the financial viability of new councils. Responses to the 1 unitary proposal raised concerns about it too large to represent Suffolk communities. Responses challenged the evidence used in the 1 unitary proposal that concluded the 3 unitary model would cost more than the current two-tier system.

### Neighbouring Principal Authorities

84. Responses from neighbouring authorities noted the 3 unitary proposal's locality and proximity to communities. Responses to the 1 unitary option noted greater financial resilience and avoidance of service disaggregation.

### **Health Bodies**

85. Health bodies in Suffolk did not demonstrate a strong preference for either option with respondees citing strengths and weaknesses in both proposals.

### **Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies**

86. Police and Fire authorities in Suffolk had no preference between the 1 and the 3 unitary authorities, noting instead general concerns about the impact of local government reorganisation and reform on service delivery.

### **Education**

87. Responses from education bodies were varied. Respondents that supported the single unitary raised concerns about the impact of disaggregation in alternative models, and those that supported the 3 unitary model were concerned that the size of the single unitary would lead to remoteness from communities.

### **Other public Sector**

88. Responses from other public sector bodies favoured the 3 unitary proposal, noting that smaller unitaries may be better placed to work with service providers. Other respondents provided no overall preference and signalled a willingness to work with councils regardless of the outcomes.

### **Voluntary and community sector**

89. Responses from the voluntary and community sector were favourable towards both models, identifying the strengths contained within each proposal and opportunities for future working between councils and the voluntary and community sector.

### **Business Bodies**

90. Responses from business were mixed, with some respondents offering no preference for either model, but identifying the strengths and weaknesses of both. Of those that did indicate a preference, there was support for the 3 unitary authority model on the basis of proximity to communities and sectors.

### **Other Named consultees**

91. Responses offered no preference, but signalled intent to work with new unitaries implemented under either proposal.
92. **For criteria 1: A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government:** Responses were comparable to Norfolk, noting that councils supporting the 1 and the 3 unitaries models in both areas had worked closely together. Those not in support of the 1 unitary considered the area to be too large and too remote from the varied coastal, urban, and rural communities of Suffolk. Those in support of the 1 unitary agreed that Suffolk has a single economic area and strong county

wide identity. Support for the 3 unitary model focussed on the proximity of the proposed councils to local communities and economies.

93. **For criteria 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:** There was concern that the 1 unitary proposal would result in a council with too great a population, and that it would lack the financial agility to respond to local needs. Support for the 1 unitary proposal noted potential efficiencies, economies of scale, and the financial resilience of the model. There was concern that the 3 unitary model would be inefficient and financial vulnerable.
94. **For criteria 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:** There was concern that the 1 unitary model would be too large to deliver services locally. Support for the economies of scale that would support service procurement and the absence of disaggregation. There was support for the smaller local councils in the 3 unitary model, and that this would result in improved service provision. There was concern on the impact of disaggregation on adult and children's social care services and the provision of safeguarding.
95. **For criteria 4: Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views:** Principal authorities justified their own models and there was concern that the models in other proposals were not properly informed by local engagement, or selectively chose outcomes from that engagement. Less commentary was provided on this criteria from named consultees outside the principal and neighbouring authorities.
96. **For criteria 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:** Principal authorities justified their own models and noted concern that the models in other proposals would not align with devolution ambitions. Less commentary was provided on this criteria from named consultees outside the principal and neighbouring authorities.
97. **For criteria 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:** Principal authorities justified their own models and noted concern that the models adopted within other proposals would not provide a platform for community engagement and empowerment. Less commentary was provided on this criteria from named consultees outside the principal and neighbouring authorities.

**The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:**

#### **Local Democratic Representation**

98. Respondents raised concerns about the loss of local representation, identity and democracy from larger authorities. There was a perception that decision making made further away from the community would not reflect needs across the local community and that local areas could neglected.

## Geographical Split and Size

99. There was concern about geographical split of areas. Feedback was provided around distinct geographic divided and needs, including representation, cultural considerations and community impacts, and remoteness and access.

## Impact on Public Services and Governance

100. Positive feedback was provided on improved service delivery and efficiency, eliminating duplication and clear leadership. There was concern about implementation cost, disruption to services through implementation, and bureaucracy associated with larger councils.

## Support for Proposal

101. Support for the single unitary proposal included cost savings, improved local governance, coherent strategic planning and avoiding service disaggregation. The three unitary proposal received support including a balanced approach to scale and local responsiveness which considers the local geography.

## Financial Stability and Efficiencies of New Unitaries

102. There was concern that smaller unitaries would not be financially resilient, adding financial risk and inefficiency. In addition, there were concerns raised regarding the cost of reorganisation and the disruption of the change, increased council tax, and risks to service provision.

## Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

103. Paper and email responses included similar themes to those raised by both the named consultees and the non-named consultees who responded on Citizen Space. Respondents that supported the 1 unitary model referenced the greater capacity for efficiencies and there was concerns about the impact of disaggregating services. Respondents that supported the 3 unitary proposal felt those councils would be closer to their local communities, and that a single council as per the 1 unitary proposal would be too remote.

**Question 9:** This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary changes. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change? This question and question 10 were asked in relation to proposal the Suffolk 3 unitary proposal.

## Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%

<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	10	70%	20%	10%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>National Bodies Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<b>Total Named Consultees Suffolk 3 unitary</b>	27	63%	15%	22%	0%
---	----	-----	-----	-----	----

**Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1089	58%	31%	10%	2%
<i>Individual outside Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	643	16%	41%	22%	21%
<i>Organisations Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	73	34%	32%	21%	14%

**Total Responses Question 9**

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Suffolk 3 unitary</i>	1832	42%	34%	15%	9%

**Question 10:** If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 9

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	---------------------------

<i>Total all responses</i>	21	410	178	38
<i>Suffolk 3 unitary</i>				

## **Summary of Local Government Boundary Commission (The Commission) Response**

104. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England provided observations on the evidence provided to support the boundary change request within the 3 unitary proposal, drawing on their Principal Area Boundary Review expertise. They observed that the evidence put forward concentrated more on the case for three unitaries than on evidencing the necessity and impact of the specific boundary changes.

## **Summary of named consultee responses**

### **Principal Authorities**

105. Principal authorities that supported the 3 unitary proposal reflected the arguments set out in the overall proposal, and set out how the proposed boundary change was necessary to reflect the economic and social areas within Suffolk. Councils that did not support this proposal made the case that there was no strong justification, the proposed boundaries remained arbitrary and that changes were of limited purpose beyond the balancing of populations between the three areas.

### **Neighbouring Principal Authorities**

106. Neighbouring authorities that agreed with the 3 unitary proposal reflected the same arguments as set out in that proposal, and agreed that the boundary change was justified. Councils that did not agree with the proposed changes suggested that even with the proposed changes the boundaries of the proposed unitaries remained arbitrary and at odds with economic and social areas.

### **Health Bodies**

107. Health bodies that supported the proposal noted that the changes enabled balance between the three unitaries.

### **Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies**

108. Respondents did not directly comment on the proposed boundary change.

### **Education Bodies**

109. Education bodies that agreed with the 3 unitary proposal reflected the same arguments as set out in that proposal, and agreed that the boundary change was justified. Education bodies that did not agree with proposed changes did not directly comment on the proposed boundary change.

### **Other public Sector**

110. Other public bodies that supported the 3 unitary proposal reflected the arguments set out in the overall proposal, and set out that the proposed boundary change was justified.

### **Voluntary and Community Sector**

111. Voluntary sector bodies did not have an overall preference on boundary change, but noted that proposed boundary changes reflected natural geographies.

### **Business Bodies**

112. Business that supported the 3 unitary proposal reflected the same arguments in that proposal, and agreed that the boundary change was justified. Businesses that did not agree with proposed changes did not directly comment on the proposed boundary change.

### **Other named consultees**

113. Other bodies that did not agree with the proposed changes suggested that even with the proposed changes the boundaries of the proposed unitaries remained arbitrary and indicated overall preference for the single unitary model.

### **Comments against the criteria**

114. **For criteria 1: A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government:** Where respondents agreed with the proposed boundary change their responses aligned with the argument set out in the overall business case, referencing how the existing district boundaries were outdated and did not reflect economic and social reality in Suffolk.
115. **For criteria 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:** Respondents that agreed with the proposed changes referenced the overall case for 3 unitaries as set out in the business case. Respondents that did not agree with the proposed changes suggested that the changes did not significantly increase the financial resilience of the 3 unitaries.
116. **For criteria 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:** Responses that agreed with the proposed changes aligned with the arguments set out in the overall business case for how three unitaries will best support the varied communities of Suffolk. Responses that did not agree noted concern that the proposed boundary changes would complicate the disaggregation of services.
117. **For criteria 4: Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views:** Arguments made for and against the merits of the proposed boundary change in relation to criteria 4 were consistent with those set out in respondents assessments of the overall business cases.

118. **For criteria 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:** Neither respondents agreeing with, nor those disagreeing with the proposed boundary change made strong arguments in relation to the impact of the proposed boundary changes on devolution.
119. **For criteria 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:** Arguments made for and against the merits of the proposed boundary change in relation to criteria 6 were consistent with those set out in respondents assessments of the overall business cases.

**Themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:**

**Support for geographies**

120. Those respondents in support of proposed boundary changes set out that they reflected sensible geographic boundaries and natural geographies and align with fire and police. There was a view that existing boundaries are outdated and need updating, and that much of Mid and East Suffolk had less connection with Lowestoft than Ipswich.

**Democratic and community empowerment**

121. Responses in support of boundary changes said they offered a stronger framework for empowering neighbourhoods and local communities. Some stated that a single council for the whole of Suffolk is not workable, necessitating boundary changes.

**Concern about geographies**

122. Some responses from businesses stated that splitting the region into three unitaries would increase complexity, reduce efficiency, and hinder productivity and competitiveness. There were concerns that new boundaries would not match historic or economic areas, causing potential issues with merging systems and working practices.

**Political/Government Concerns Raised**

123. Some responses saw boundary changes as politically motivated, and not of direct benefit to the public.

**Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses**

124. Responses were consistent with the overall themes emerging from non-named consultee responses. Responses that directly engaged with the boundary change noted how the existing boundaries were outdated, and that three unitaries would be closer to their communities than a single unitary. Responses that did not support the change noted concerns about the cost and lack of efficiencies, echoing concerns about the overall proposal.