

Summary and analysis of consultation responses and summary of representations from named consultees

Background

1. A statutory consultation on proposals for unitary local government in Gloucester was opened on 5 February and closed on 26 March 2026. We received a total of 2,252 responses.
2. The 3 proposals being consulted on were made by councils and submitted to the Government on 28 November 2025.
3. This document provides a summary of the 2,252 responses received to the Government's consultation on the proposals for future unitary local government in Gloucestershire.
4. The Government announced to Parliament on 16 July 2026 that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government had decided to implement, subject to Parliamentary approval, **the single unitary proposal submitted by Cotswold District, Stroud District, Tewksbury Borough and Gloucestershire County Council. These would comprise the current areas of:**
 - a. **Gloucestershire:** Cheltenham Borough Council, Cotswold District Council, Forest of Dean District Council, Gloucester City Council, Gloucestershire County Council, Stroud District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council

From here, this is referred to as the '**1 Unitary**' proposal.

5. **The consultation also invited views on the proposal submitted by Cheltenham Borough Council for a 2 unitary authority:**
 - a. **East Authority:** Cheltenham Borough Council, Cotswold District Council, and Tewkesbury Borough Council
 - b. **West Authority:** Forest of Dean District Council, Gloucester City Council, and Stroud District Council

From here, this is referred to as the '**2 Unitary (Cheltenham)**' proposal.

6. **The consultation also invited views on the proposal submitted by Gloucester City Council for a 2 unitary authority:**
 - a. **Expanded Gloucester City:** Gloucester City Council, 2 parishes from Forest of Dean; 8 parishes from Stroud (8 parishes); and 11 parishes from Tewkesbury Borough Council
 - b. **Gloucestershire County:** remaining parishes from Forest of Dean District Council, Stroud District Council, and Tewkesbury Borough Council; Cheltenham Borough Council; Cotswold District Council
7. From here, this is referred to as the '**2 Unitary (Gloucester City)**' proposal.

8. 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.
9. 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. The consultation asked questions relating to the criteria for each of the above proposals.
10. This consultation relates to the structure of local government in Gloucestershire. These proposals relate to England only.

Methodology

11. 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 persons as they consider appropriate. Those councils and persons considered appropriate are hereafter referred to as 'named consultees'.
12. The list of named consultees is available on [gov.uk](#) Annex C.
13. 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.
14. 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](#).
15. Responses to the consultation were also received by email and letter.
16. 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 Ministry 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.
17. The department has conducted an evaluation of the Consult tool and concluded that Consult's theme mappings are consistent with human reviewers' assessments. For this consultation, human reviewers independently checked the theme assignments Consult had produced and likewise found that Consult's theme mappings were broadly consistent with the human reviewers

Consultation Questions

18. 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
19. The questions were as follows:
- a) **Question 1:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?
 - b) **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?
 - c) **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?
 - d) **Question 4:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?
 - e) **Question 5:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?
 - f) **Question 6:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?
 - g) **Question 7:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?
 - h) **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 the proposal.
 - i) **Question 9:** This is a proposal that is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers a boundary change or that affects wider public services. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change?
 - j) **Question 10:**
If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 9.

Summary of responses

20. There were 2,252 responses to this consultation, 28 from named consultees and 2,224 by other respondents.

Responses from named consultees

Named Consultee respondents	Number of Responses
Principal councils	7
Neighbouring councils	7
Strategic Authority	0
Health Bodies	1
Police and Fire	1
Education Bodies	5
Other Public Sector	1
Voluntary and Community Sector	1
Business Organisations	1
National Bodies	3
Other named consultees	1
Total named consultees	28

Responses from other respondents

Other respondents	Number of Responses
Individuals living in Gloucestershire	2,006
Individuals not living in Gloucestershire or who did not specify their location	100
Organisation	118
Total other respondents	2,224
Total responses (Including named consultees)	2,252

Summary of findings

21. Tables in this report included numbers rounded to the nearest whole number, and as such, not all cumulative scores will equal 100%.
22. Respondents were invited to respond to 7 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.
23. 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.

24. Quantitative scoring against specific questions was applied to responses submitted by email and post only where respondents provided explicit answers based on the scale provided. No assumptions or inferred positions were applied to submissions that did not directly address those questions.
25. Responses received by email and post are not included in the respondent count for questions 8 and 10. A summary of the relevant views expressed in those responses against each criterion is included within the summary of free text responses for each respondent type.
26. In addition to this round of consultation, the Government undertook consultation on 6 other local government reorganisation areas between 19 November 2025 and 11 January 2026. One response received as part of that consultation is relevant to all local government reorganisation areas, including those in this round of consultation. A summary of the relevant views expressed in that response against each criterion is included within the summary of free text responses for that respondent type.
27. The table below takes the average response across the multiple choice questions to provide an overall view of whether all respondents viewed a proposal positively or negatively.

All respondents

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
1 Unitary	14,889	65%	24%	9%	1%
2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	14,160	23%	65%	9%	2%
2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	15,800	7%	83%	7%	1%

28. Overall, the responses demonstrate a preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 65% of respondents to the 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 24% of respondents provided negative responses, while 10% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Preference is for the 1 unitary, with the other 2 proposals less preferred. There is low level of positive responses (7%) for the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal.

Named consultees

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
1 Unitary	131	73%	15%	13%	0%

<i>2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	131	29%	53%	18%	1%
<i>2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	146	10%	73%	16%	1%

29. Overall, the responses from the named consultees demonstrate a preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 73% of respondents to the 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 15% of respondents provided negative responses, whilst 13% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Preference in order is for 1 unitary, 2 unitary (Cheltenham) and 2 unitary (Gloucester City).

Individuals living in Gloucestershire

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>1 Unitary</i>	13,472	65%	25%	9%	2%
<i>2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	12,875	23%	66%	9%	2%
<i>2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	14,362	7%	84%	7%	2%

30. Overall, the responses from the individuals living in the Gloucestershire area demonstrate a preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 65% of respondents to the 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 25% of respondents provided negative responses, whilst 11% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Preference in order is for 1 unitary, 2 unitary (Cheltenham) and 2 unitary (Gloucester City).

Individuals living outside of the Gloucestershire area

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>1 Unitary</i>	685	66%	23%	9%	2%
<i>2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	650	27%	60%	12%	2%
<i>2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	735	6%	83%	10%	1%

31. Overall, the responses from the individuals living outside the Gloucestershire area demonstrate a preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 66% of respondents to the 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 23% of respondents provided negative responses, while 11% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Preference in order is for 1 unitary, 2 unitary (Cheltenham) and 2 unitary (Gloucester City).

Organisations

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
1 Unitary	601	63%	20%	12%	5%
2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	504	16%	65%	12%	7%
2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	557	6%	79%	10%	5%

32. Overall, the responses from organisations demonstrate a preference for the 1 unitary proposal. 63% of respondents to the 1 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 20% of respondents provided negative responses, whilst 17% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Preference in order is for 1 unitary, 2 unitary (Cheltenham) and 2 unitary (Gloucester City).

Analysis of responses by question

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/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary	4	50%	25%	25%	0%

Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Strategic Authority 1 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 1 unitary	5	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary	1	67%	33%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	33%	67%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	19	74%	16%	11%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	19	32%	58%	11%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2	19	11%	79%	11%	0%

Unitary (Gloucester City)					
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 1 unitary</i>	1924	77%	20%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1845	26%	70%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1798	9%	87%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	98	78%	17%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	93	27%	66%	8%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	92	5%	85%	10%	0%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	86	78%	14%	8%	0%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	72	22%	67%	10%	1%
<i>Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	70	10%	83%	6%	1%

Total Responses Question 1

<i>Respondent type/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>Total all responses 1 unitary</i>	2127	77%	20%	4%	0%

<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	2029	26%	70%	4%	0%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1979	9%	87%	4%	0%

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/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>Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary</i>	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Health Bodies 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 1 unitary	5	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	5	0%	80%	20%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	19	74%	16%	11%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	19	32%	53%	16%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	18	11%	72%	17%	0%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 1 unitary</i>	1926	70%	24%	5%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1843	25%	66%	8%	2%

<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1799	8%	85%	6%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	98	72%	22%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	93	33%	56%	10%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	92	5%	85%	10%	0%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	86	67%	12%	15%	6%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	72	17%	65%	11%	7%
<i>Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	70	6%	77%	10%	7%

Total Responses Question 2

<i>Respondent type/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>Total all responses 1 unitary</i>	2129	70%	23%	6%	1%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	2027	25%	65%	8%	2%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1979	7%	85%	6%	2%

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?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/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>Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary</i>	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	4	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	3	0%	33%	33%	33%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Unitary (Gloucester City)					
Education Bodies 1 unitary	5	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	20%	60%	20%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

<i>Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>					
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	19	74%	11%	16%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	20	25%	50%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	18	0%	83%	11%	6%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 1 unitary</i>	1924	70%	23%	6%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1837	23%	69%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1797	7%	87%	5%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	98	73%	21%	5%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	93	24%	73%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	92	5%	88%	5%	1%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	85	68%	14%	13%	5%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	72	15%	72%	7%	6%

<i>Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	70	3%	87%	7%	3%
---	----	----	-----	----	----

Total Responses Question 3

<i>Respondent type/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>Total all responses 1 unitary</i>	2126	70%	22%	6%	1%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	2022	23%	69%	7%	2%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1977	6%	87%	5%	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/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>Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary</i>	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Princi pal Authority 2</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%

Unitary (Gloucester City)					
Strategic Authority 1 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 1 unitary	5	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	5	0%	80%	20%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	17	76%	12%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	18	33%	50%	17%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	18	11%	72%	17%	0%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 1 unitary</i>	1927	63%	25%	11%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1834	22%	65%	12%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1793	7%	83%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	98	66%	24%	8%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	93	26%	61%	12%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	92	5%	84%	10%	1%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	86	60%	20%	13%	7%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	72	11%	65%	15%	8%
<i>Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	69	3%	81%	10%	6%

Total Responses Question 4

<i>Respondent type/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>Total all responses 1 unitary</i>	2128	63%	24%	11%	2%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	2017	22%	64%	12%	2%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1972	7%	83%	8%	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/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>Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary</i>	6	67%	33%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	4	75%	0%	25%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	4	25%	25%	25%	25%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	3	0%	33%	33%	33%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 1 unitary	5	80%	0%	20%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	40%	40%	20%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	20	70%	15%	15%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	19	21%	58%	16%	5%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	18	6%	72%	17%	6%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 1 unitary</i>	1925	57%	29%	12%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1839	20%	67%	10%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1792	6%	84%	7%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	98	57%	29%	11%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected</i>	93	23%	59%	16%	2%

area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)					
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	92	5%	85%	8%	2%
Organisations 1 unitary	86	51%	35%	9%	5%
Organisations 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	72	15%	65%	11%	8%
Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	69	6%	74%	14%	6%

Total Responses Question 5

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Total all responses 1 unitary	2129	56%	29%	12%	3%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	2023	20%	67%	10%	3%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1971	6%	84%	7%	3%

Question 6: To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary	6	67%	33%	0%	0%
Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Principal Authority proposal	6	17%	83%	0%	0%

2 Unitary (Gloucester City)					
Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	4	25%	25%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Princi pal Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	3	0%	33%	67%	0%
Strategic Authority 1 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 1 unitary	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	5	40%	60%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector 4 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	19	74%	16%	11%	0%

Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	19	26%	58%	16%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	19	16%	68%	16%	0%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 1 unitary</i>	1922	64%	19%	13%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1837	20%	61%	14%	5%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1797	7%	78%	11%	4%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	98	59%	17%	17%	6%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	92	22%	54%	17%	7%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	92	4%	78%	14%	3%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	86	62%	14%	19%	6%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	72	14%	65%	13%	8%
<i>Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	69	10%	80%	4%	6%

Total Responses Question 6

<i>Respondent type/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>Total all responses 1 unitary</i>	2125	64%	19%	13%	4%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	2020	20%	61%	14%	5%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1977	7%	78%	11%	4%

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/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>Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary</i>	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 1 unitary	5	80%	0%	20%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	5	40%	40%	20%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	5	0%	60%	50%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	18	67%	17%	17%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)	17	35%	41%	24%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	19	16%	58%	26%	0%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 1 unitary</i>	1924	52%	34%	12%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2</i>	1840	25%	63%	11%	2%

<i>Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>					
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1796	8%	83%	8%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	1924	52%	34%	12%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	1840	25%	63%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1796	8%	83%	8%	1%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	97	56%	30%	13%	1%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	93	32%	53%	15%	0%
<i>Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	91	9%	76%	14%	1%

Total Responses Question 7

<i>Respondent type/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>Total all responses 1 unitary</i>	2125	52%	34%	12%	1%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	2022	25%	62%	11%	2%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1976	8%	82%	9%	1%

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 1 unitary</i>	14	1141	52	74
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Cheltenham)</i>	13	1060	48	60
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	12	993	50	52

33. We also received 76 responses by email and post. 15 were from named consultees, 20 were from individuals living in area, 12 were from individuals not in area or who did not specify their location, 42 were from organisations. A summary of the views shared in these responses is included within the summaries below

Summary of named consultee responses

34. Principal Councils

Principal councils supported those proposals that they had put forward. Principal councils who challenged other proposals raised concerns over issues such as alignment of service delivery, deprivation imbalance, financial viability, housing supply and coherence of proposed footprints.

35. Neighbouring principal councils

Three neighbouring principal councils preferred the 1 unitary citing benefits, savings and efficiencies. Two neighbouring councils preferred the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) proposal as best for supporting different economic functional areas, while two neighbouring principal councils did not indicate a preference.

36. Health Bodies

One health body preferred the 1 unitary citing a county footprint as the most effective for supporting system-wide planning, integrated discharge pathways and consistent adult social care provision. They raised concerns around complexity and fragmentation of service delivery under a 2 unitary solution.

37. Other public sector

Public sector bodies who responded, preferred the 1 unitary proposal while noting the importance of town and parish councils for retaining local knowledge and expertise through transition.

38. Education Bodies

Five education bodies responded all preferred 1 unitary arguing that it would best support how employers, learners and providers operate across the Gloucestershire labour market and post-16 pathways. They also highlighted benefits in relation to funding and commissioning of services, including SEND services. One education body raised some concerns about scale of the 1 unitary and offered some support for the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) as a sensible

coherent footprint and acknowledged the potential for the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) to support urban regeneration.

39. Voluntary and Community Sector

One voluntary and community sector body preferred the 1 unitary on the basis it could provide one commissioning team helping to build strong working relationships with the education, health and social care teams. They raised concerns that a 2 unitary could disadvantage outcomes for those living around the border.

40. Business Bodies

One business body preferred the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) as a proportionate footprint to target local needs and deliver effective neighbourhood engagement.

41. National Bodies

Three national bodies responded respondents indicated a preference for the single unitary, though noted the importance of town and parish councils within the neighbourhood governance solution for retaining robust local engagement. Or expressed no overall preference for an LGR proposal and instead focused on the opportunity to strengthen services, improve health outcomes, and streamline systems.

42. Other

One Other named consultee preferred 1 unitary while also noting the importance of town and parish councils for community engagement. They raised concerns about the border to the Forest of Dean under 2 unitary (Cheltenham) and financial concerns with 2 unitary (Gloucester City).

Comments against the criteria

43. For criterion 1: A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government:

The majority of named consultees agree that the 1 unitary is a sensible economic and geographical footprint which supports housing, growth, system-wide NHS delivery, and education and employment pathways. Opponents of the 1 unitary raised concerns that it is too large an area to deliver local priorities, making it harder to develop tailored, place-sensitive housing, transport, planning, and economic strategies that reflect these differences. Opponents of the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) were concerned about cutting across employment and education pathways, slowing growth and housing between Cheltenham and Gloucester, the geographical disconnect to the Forest of Dean, and creating a more deprived 'West Council'. Supporters of the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) favoured the smaller size for targeting local delivery and needs. Opponents of the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) noted concern regarding dividing established communities, while supporters favoured the potential for city growth.

44. For criterion 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:

The majority of named consultees preferred the 1 unitary arguing it would deliver savings and efficiencies, while the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) and 2 unitary (Gloucester City) will have a negative impact. Opponents of the 1 unitary raised concerns about the distribution of resources to citizens across the area and queried the likelihood of delivering planned savings. Opponents of the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) were concerned about duplicating costs and systems to establish two new unitary authorities. Opponents of the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) were concerned about financial sustainability.

45. For criterion 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:

The majority of named consultees agreed that the 1 unitary would support quality and quantity of service delivery. Supporters note the 1 unitary keeps complex, high-risk services (adult and children's social care, SEND, safeguarding) integrated and resilient, avoiding duplication and disaggregation costs. The 1 unitary was favoured as covering the county footprint which aligns with hospital discharge and patient flows, while opponents of the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) were concerned about duplicating these pathways or the additional complexity of a boundary change through 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal. The 1 unitary proposal is the only option which retains the Fire and Rescue Service governance arrangements and minimises complexity. Opponents of the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) raised concerns about duplication and complexity of contract arrangements having a detrimental impact on the community of Gloucester City, and the capacity of the smaller city unitary to deliver sustainable and quality social care services. The 2 unitary (Cheltenham) was considered deliverable for services, though concerns were raised

46. For criterion 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:

The majority of named consultees noted the strengths of the 1 unitary for engagement with locals and how the proposal will deliver for communities, while a minority raised concerns about a large unitary not having capacity to hear local views or meet local needs. Supporters of the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) thought this proposal created two unitary authorities of a proportionate size for local engagement. Opponents of the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) were concerned about the complexity of dividing up county-wide services and a loss of local representation.

47. For criterion 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:

There was support for devolution from across named consultees with supporters favouring the 1 unitary overall, although the 2 unitary (Cheltenham) was seen as a flexible solution for devolution.

48. For criterion 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:

There were similarities across the neighbourhood engagement strategies across proposals especially the 1 unitary and 2 unitary (Cheltenham). Named consultees broadly supported 1 unitary as a preference, however opponents raised concerns about capacity of a large authority for delivering tailored local solutions and emphasised the importance of town and parish councils in any future neighbourhood empowerment model. One respondent raised concerns that residents were widely against both 2 unitary proposals which would hinder implementation of any neighbourhood empowerment solutions. Concern that the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal does not set out how its suggested boundary changes will enable community engagement across Greater Gloucester.

49. The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

Single unitary authority increases efficiency and cost savings

A 1 unitary authority is expected to improve efficiency, reduce duplication, lower costs, enhance strategic planning, provide clearer accountability, and better align with countywide and public services.

Loss of Local Representation and Identity

A 1 unitary authority would erode local identities, reduce local representation and engagement, marginalise rural or minority communities, and make government more remote and less responsive to diverse local needs and knowledge.

Increased economic and social inequality

Splitting Gloucestershire into two authorities will worsen economic and social divides, entrenching inequality, and disadvantage poorer or vulnerable areas, particularly in the West.

Increased costs and administrative complexity

Establishing two councils will duplicate functions, raise costs, reduce efficiency, and introduce operational complexity and transition challenges that may outweigh potential benefits.

Concerns About Financial Viability and Management

The proposed changes raise doubts about economic sustainability, value for money, and financial stability, especially due to perceived poor management and increased costs associated with Gloucester City Council.

Artificial and Confusing Boundaries

The proposed boundaries are seen as arbitrary and confusing, not reflecting existing communities or geographic logic, leading to disruption and governance challenges.

50. Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

Most respondents who expressed a clear view indicated a preference for the 1 unitary proposal, this was particularly the case amongst county wide bodies, service delivery organisations and a significant number of parish and town councils. Some respondents favoured a two-unitary model, often citing concerns about scale, local identity or governance at a more local level. While a smaller number of

respondents expressed support for alternative configurations or expressed opposition to all proposals.

Boundary Change:

Question 9: 2 Unitary (Gloucester City) This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers a boundary change or that affects wider public services. 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 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/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>Principal Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority – 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)	17	6%	82%	12%	0%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/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>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1790	8%	81%	8%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	92	7%	84%	9%	1%
<i>Organisation 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	70	6%	74%	10%	10%

Total Responses Question 9

<i>Respondent type/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>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	1969	8%	81%	8%	3%

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 2 Unitary (Gloucester City)</i>	8	601	32	41

51. We also received 76 responses by email and post. 15 were from named consultees, 20 were from individuals living in area, 12 were from individuals not in area or did not specify their location, 42 were from organisations. A summary of the views relevant to this question shared in these responses is included within the summaries below

Summary of Local Government Boundary Commission (The Commission) Response

52. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England provided observations on the evidence to support the boundary change requested within the 2 Unitary (Gloucester City) proposal drawing on its Principal Area Boundary Review expertise. It considered the evidence in the proposal as it related to the identity and interests of local communities, and the promotion of effective and convenient local government. The Commission observed that the evidence to support the expansion of Gloucester was more detailed than that provided to support the other proposed authority of Greater Gloucestershire.

Summary of named consultee responses

53. Principal Councils

Principal councils supported those proposals that they had put forward. Opponents raised concerns about the credibility of the expanded City of Gloucester arguing that it is an incoherent geography which does not reflect how communities live within the area. They stated they did not support the proposed boundary change, raised concerns around financial viability, service disaggregation and resident engagement on the boundary change proposition.

54. Neighbouring principal councils

While the majority of neighbouring Principal councils did not support the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal with boundary modification, one respondent indicated support for the potential city growth, advocating for two place-based authorities to target service delivery, whilst also raising concerns about financial viability of Gloucester City.

55. Health Bodies

One respondent was concerned about the impact of boundary changes on discharge pathways and reconfiguring alignment with partners such as Gloucestershire Safeguarding Adults Board and the Integrated Care Board.

56. Other public sector

One respondent was concerned that the proposed boundary changes may divide established communities, create complexity in service delivery and weaken local representation.

57. Education Bodies

Most education body respondents were concerned about the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal including boundary change. Reasons included:

fragmenting countywide strategic functions, particularly for skills, transport, employability, and inclusive growth. Creating a separate city unitary would add complexity for partners, increase the number of strategies and governance touchpoints, and risk inconsistent approaches. A smaller city-focused unitary would also have a narrower tax base and less ability to spread risk, while still needing full corporate and specialist capacity. One respondent noted potential opportunities for urban regeneration across Gloucester City, though raised concerns about the larger authority's capacity to deliver across rural areas.

58. Voluntary and Community Sector

One respondent raised concerns about different contract arrangements in the centre of the county, risking distancing voluntary and community sector organisations from the community of Gloucester City.

59. Business Bodies

One respondent was concerned the boundary modification proposal had not been considered properly.

Comments against the criteria

60. For criterion 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 from majority of named consultees regarding boundary change proposition for 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal, that it divides established communities, creates complexity in service delivery and weakens local representation. One respondent noted potential for city growth and targeted service delivery across two place-based authorities

61. For criterion 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:

Opponents raised concerns on the financial viability of the smaller city unitary and whether the delivery model was viable and would limit service capacity.

62. For criterion 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:

Opponents raised concerns about the impact of boundary changes on discharge pathways and reconfiguring alignment with partners such as Gloucestershire Safeguarding Adults Board and the Integrated Care Board. There was concern implementation would require multiple sets of discharge to assess pathways, social care eligibility interpretations, housing and homelessness protocols, and safeguarding processes for the same hospital wards. Opponents state it would create avoidable variation in patients' experience of discharge dependent on their home postcode. Concern the smaller authority could struggle to deliver adult social care, children's services and SEND, impacting on the NHS acute sector, with quality, safety and financial implications. Concerns that the 2 unitary proposals would require establishing a new Independent Fire and Rescue Authority, which is considered to be under-powered for its size. Also, that different contract arrangements in

the centre of the county risk distancing voluntary sector organisations from the community of Gloucester City.

63. **For criterion 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:**

The majority of named consultees are concerned that the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal development did not engage locals well enough and are concerned about delivering for communities.

64. **For criterion 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:**

65. The majority of named consultees disagree or strongly disagree that the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal supports devolution while a minority agree or strongly agree. Concern that Greater Gloucester and the Gloucestershire Unitary could not conceivably be part of different regions, but that Gloucestershire's voice, and ability to deliver, would be compromised. Concern from respondents it would be harder to present a single, credible strategic partner for government and for any devolved responsibilities. Concern the boundary change has not been considered properly.

66. **For criterion 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:**

The majority of named consultees disagree or strongly disagree that the 2 unitary (Gloucester City) proposal supports community engagement and empowerment. Opponents raised concerns with the councillor-to-electors ratios, and with the financial position inherent in the proposed Greater Gloucester council. One respondent raised concerns the proposal does not lay out how its suggested boundary changes will enable community engagement across Greater Gloucester. They also note the proposal was widely opposed by residents, with concerns about fairness, division, and efficiency. Concerns there was no rationale for the specific parishes selected for the boundary modification proposal, and that impacted residents were not engaged, although impacted town and parish councils were engaged.

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

Proposal Lacks Strong Justification and Evidence

The proposal does not provide clear, robust, or evidence-based justification for boundary changes, especially regarding improvements to public services or financial sustainability, and there is no clear need or benefit.

Doubts About Financial Sustainability of Changes

The changes are unlikely to deliver financial sustainability, may increase costs, cause financial instability, and fail to achieve significant savings or equity.

Proposed Changes Increase Complexity and Inefficiency

The proposed changes would create unnecessary complexity, duplication, bureaucracy, and confusion, leading to inefficiency and disruption in public service delivery.

Preference for Unitary Authority or Broader Reform

Ask that the proposal should be replaced by a single unitary authority, county-wide services, or broader local government reform, which are seen as more efficient and cost-effective alternatives.

Boundary Changes Threaten Community Identity and Rural Representation

Boundary changes would erode local and rural identities, undermine community cohesion and democratic representation, and disadvantage rural or less affluent areas.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

68. Most respondents who expressed a clear view on the Gloucester City boundary change proposal opposed it, while many others commented on broader reorganisation issues without taking a specific position on boundary change. Supporters argued that expanding Gloucester's boundaries could address the city's historic under-bounding, better reflect its economic and travel to work area, support housing and employment growth, strengthen place based leadership and improve outcomes through a more focused urban authority. However, respondents more commonly raised concerns that the proposal would split existing district areas and communities, weaken local identity and rural representation, create artificial or incoherent geographies, increase travel and accessibility challenges for some residents, and introduce additional complexity for service delivery, governance and partnership working. There were also concerns about financial viability, duplication of services, accountability, and whether sufficient evidence had been provided that the proposed parish transfers would improve public services or justify the disruption involved.