

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 Warwickshire was opened on 5 February and closed on 26 March 2026. We received a total of 2120 responses.
2. The two 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 2120 responses received to the Government's consultation on the proposals for future unitary local government in the Warwickshire area.
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 proposal for two unitaries submitted by North Warwickshire Borough Council, Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council, Stratford-on-Avon District Council and Warwick District Council.
5. **The consultation invited views on the proposals submitted for Warwickshire:**
6. One Warwickshire, Stronger Together, submitted by Warwickshire County Council and supported by Rugby Borough Council, proposed one unitary council across the whole of the area of Warwickshire comprising the current district areas of North Warwickshire, Nuneaton and Bedworth, Rugby, Stratford-on-Avon and Warwick.
7. **From here this will be referred to as the 1 unitary proposal.**
8. A Case for Two Councils for Warwickshire submitted by North Warwickshire District Council, Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council, Stratford-on-Avon District Council and Warwick District Council proposed two unitary councils: one for the North comprising the current district areas of North Warwickshire, Nuneaton and Bedworth and Rugby; the other for the South comprising the current district areas of Stratford-on-Avon and Warwick.
9. **From here this is referred to as the 2 unitary proposal.**
10. 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.

11. The criteria by which proposals for local government reorganisation have been assessed are set out in the letter of invitation, sent to councils in Warwickshire on 5 February 2025 [[Letter: Warwickshire - GOV.UK](#)]. The consultation asked questions relating to the criteria for each of the above proposals.
12. This consultation relates to the structure of local government in Warwickshire. These proposals relate to England only.

Methodology

13. 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.
14. The list of named consultees is available at Annex C of the consultation document. [[Proposals for local government reorganisation in Warwickshire - GOV.UK](#)]
15. 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.
16. 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](#).
17. Responses to the consultation were also received by email and letter.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. 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

21. 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
22. 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, for example, the establishment of a strategic authority?
 - 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 this proposal.

Summary of responses

23. There were 2120 responses to this consultation, 17 from named consultees and 2103 from other respondents.

Responses from named consultees

Named Consultee respondents	Number of Responses
Principal councils	6
Neighbouring councils	6

Strategic Authorities	0
Health Bodies	1
Police and Fire	1
Education Bodies	1
Other Public Sector	2
Voluntary and Community Sector	0
Business Organisations	0
National Bodies	0
Other named consultees	0
Total named consultees	17

Reponses from other respondents

<i>Other respondents</i>	Number of Responses
Individuals living in Warwickshire	1937
Individuals not living in affected area or who did not specify their location	94
Organisation	72
Total other respondents	2103
Total responses (Including named consultees)	2120

Summary of findings

24. Tables in this report included numbers rounded to the nearest whole number, and as such, not all cumulative scores will equal 100%.
25. Respondents were invited to respond to eight 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.
26. For the purposes of this document we have classified positive responses as strongly agree, somewhat agreed and negative responses as somewhat disagree and strongly disagree.
27. 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.
28. Responses received by email and post are not included in the respondent count for questions 8. 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.

29. 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
30. 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	13537	27%	65%	7%	1%
2 Unitary	14099	68%	24%	6%	1%

31. Overall, the responses demonstrate a preference for the 2 unitary proposal. 68% of respondents for the 2 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 24% of respondents provided negative responses. 7% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The preference overall is for the 2 unitary proposal, with the 1 unitary proposal being less preferred.

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	98	14%	73%	12%	0%
2 Unitary	98	82%	7%	10%	1%

32. Overall, the responses from the named consultees demonstrate a preference for the 2 unitary proposal. 82% of respondents to the 2 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 7% of respondents provided negative responses. 11% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The preference overall is for the 2 unitary proposal, with the 1 unitary proposal being less preferred.

Individuals living in Warwickshire

<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	12475	26%	66%	7%	1%
2 Unitary	12967	68%	24%	6%	1%

33. Overall, the responses from the individuals living in Warwickshire demonstrate a preference for the 2 unitary proposal. 68% of respondents to the 2 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 24% of respondents provided negative responses, while 7% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The preference overall is for the 2 unitary proposal, with the 1 unitary proposal being less preferred.

Individuals living outside of the affected area

<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	607	43%	47%	7%	2%
2 Unitary	629	55%	35%	8%	2%

34. Overall, the responses from the individuals living outside Warwickshire demonstrate a preference for the 2 unitary proposal. 55% of respondents to the 2 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 35% of respondents provided negative responses, while 10% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The preference overall is for the 2 unitary proposal, with the 1 unitary proposal being less preferred.

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	357	28%	60%	10%	2%
2 Unitary	405	78%	16%	5%	1%

35. Overall, the responses from organisations demonstrate a preference for the 2 unitary proposal. 78% of respondents to the 2 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 16% of respondents provided negative responses, while 6% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The preference overall is for the 2 unitary proposal, with the 1 unitary proposal being less preferred.

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>
<i>Principal Authority Proposal 1 unitary</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	6	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	14	14%	79%	7%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	79%	14%	7%	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>	1786	29%	68%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	1855	75%	23%	2%	0%

<i>Individual living outside affected area</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	87	47%	53%	0%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	90	60%	37%	35	0%
<i>Organisations</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	51	35%	59%	6%	0%
<i>Organisations</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	58	83%	16%	2%	0%

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</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	1938	30%	67%	3%	0%
<i>Total all responses</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	2017	74%	23%	2%	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?

<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</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Principal Authority</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	6	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>1 unitary</i>					
<i>Strategic Authority 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	14	14%	71%	14%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	79%	7%	14%	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>	1784	27%	67%	5%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	1854	70%	25%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	87	45%	47%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	89	55%	40%	3%	1%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	51	31%	55%	14%	0%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	58	79%	17%	2%	2%

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>	1936	27%	66%	6%	1%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	2015	69%	25%	4%	1%

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?

<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	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	6	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	14	14%	79%	7%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	79%	14%	7%	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>	1778	29%	64%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	1849	69%	26%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	87	48%	46%	6%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	90	52%	44%	3%	0%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	51	33%	59%	6%	0%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	58	76%	19%	5%	0%

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>	1930	30%	63%	7%	1%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	2011	68%	26%	4%	1%

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

<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	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	6	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

2 Unitary					
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	14	14%	79%	7%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	79%	14%	7%	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>	1781	29%	68%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	1849	75%	23%	2%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area</i>	87	47%	53%	0%	0%

<i>1 unitary</i>					
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	90	60%	37%	3%	0%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	51	35%	59%	6%	0%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	58	83%	16%	2%	0%

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>	1933	26%	67%	6%	1%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	2011	66%	26%	7%	1%

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

<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	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	83%	0%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	6	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

2 Unitary					
<i>Education Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	14	14%	71%	14%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	86%	0%	14%	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>	1784	22%	69%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	1854	65%	24%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	86	37%	47%	10%	6%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	90	53%	27%	17%	3%
<i>Organisations 1 unitary</i>	51	22%	67%	10%	2%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	57	75%	16%	7%	2%

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>
<i>Total all responses 1 unitary</i>	1933	28%	54%	13%	4%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	2015	63%	23%	10%	4%

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

<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	17%	67%	17%	0%

<i>Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	83%	0%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority 1 unitary</i>	6	0%	83%	17%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority 2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
<i>Education Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	14	14%	64%	21%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	79%	0%	14%	7%

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>	1782	27%	55%	13%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	1853	63%	23%	11%	4%

<i>Individual living outside affected area</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	86	47%	36%	9%	8%
<i>Individual living outside affected area</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	90	50%	36%	9%	6%
<i>Organisations</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	51	27%	55%	14%	4%
<i>Organisations</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	58	76%	14%	7%	3%

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</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	1933	28%	54%	13%	4%
<i>Total all responses</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	2015	63%	23%	10%	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?

<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</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
<i>Principal Authority</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Authority</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	6	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Principal Authority</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>1 unitary</i>					
<i>Strategic Authority 2 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 1 unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named</i> <i>consultees</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named</i> <i>consultees</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 1 unitary	14	14%	71%	14%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	93%	0%	7%	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</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	1780	23%	71%	5%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	1853	70%	23%	6%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	87	34%	54%	11%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	90	64%	23%	11%	1%
<i>Organisations</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	51	22%	67%	10%	2%
<i>Organisations</i> <i>2 Unitary</i>	58	81%	12%	7%	0%

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</i> <i>1 unitary</i>	1932	23%	70%	6%	1%

<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	2015	70%	23%	6%	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 Warwickshire 1 unitary</i>	0	985	51	42
<i>Total all responses Warwickshire 2 unitary</i>	10	1036	48	48

36. We also received 40 responses by email and post. 10 were from named consultees, 5 were from individuals living in area, 4 were from individuals not in area or who did not specify their location, 21 were from organisations. A summary of the views shared in these responses is included within the summaries below.

Summary of named consultee responses

37. **Principal Councils** - Responses from principal councils supported the proposals that they put forward. Comments included that the 1 unitary proposal was too large and centralised, and risked being less agile and less place-responsive; while the 2 unitary proposal was seen as not being financially viable and risked the financial and operational stability of local government.
38. **Neighbouring principal councils** – Of the six councils that gave consultation responses all showed support for the 2 unitary proposal. None supported the one unitary option.
39. **Health Bodies** – One response was received not showing a preference for either option but stated that the 1 unitary avoids risks seen in the 2 unitary proposal.
40. **Other public sector** – Of the two responses received both were neutral, but one stated if the 2 unitary proposal were chosen there would be a need for local points of contact and pathways for joint working.

41. **Education Bodies** – One response was received showing no preference towards either proposal, though they stated that they would welcome opportunities to engage with any new local government arrangements.
42. **Voluntary and Community Sector** – Named consultees from the sector did not respond to the consultation.
43. **Business Bodies** – Named consultees from the sector did not respond to the consultation

Comments against the criteria

44. **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:**
Concerns were raised that the single unitary authority could be too large, making it harder to stay connected to local communities and respond to their specific needs. Others highlighted that continuity of countywide services was crucial, and it was felt the single unitary would be better placed to provide this. Some respondents also expressed concerns that the two-unitary proposal may not meet population guidelines and could create financial challenges, particularly in the North, while potentially affecting service delivery, efficiency, leadership, local decision-making and partnership working. The 2 unitary was seen as being able to be better connected to communities and their needs, especially due to the differences in the North and the South.
45. **For criteria 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:** Concerns were raised that the two-unitary proposal could result in councils that are too small and may struggle financially, particularly in the North, with some respondents feeling that the risks outweighed the benefits despite local support. Some also expressed concerns about the impact on community and economic connections, the potential costs of splitting services, and the effect this could have on key services such as adult social care, children's services and SEND. Some residents put forward the view that the two unitary model gave improved representation and tailored services. The single unitary authority proposal's focus on achieving efficiencies through scale raised concerns it may not address underlying demand pressures, reinforcing centralised, reactive service delivery, and raising questions about its long-term financial resilience and ability to respond effectively to future challenges and financial shocks. However, there was also the view put forward by some residents that reduced duplication could provide efficiency gains.
46. **For criteria 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:** Concerns were raised by residents around the size of the one unitary proposal with it being seen as large. It was thought it could weaken local connection, accountability and responsiveness, with risks of centralisation and limited-service improvement. Concerns were also noted that the 2 unitary proposal may struggle with consistency and fairness, recruiting leadership teams and maintaining continuity of care for vulnerable children, while worsening the north–south divide and imbalance of needs and resources.

47. **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:** Concerns were raised that consultation with residents on the single unitary authority had been limited. The openness of the process was questioned and some expressed concerns that the proposal could lead to decision-making becoming more centralised, which they felt could affect public confidence. In contrast, responses showed it was felt that the two-unitary proposal had provided greater opportunities for residents to share their views and engage with the process, including through surveys, focus groups and other forms of consultation.
48. **For criteria 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:** Concerns were raised that the 1 unitary proposal may not strengthen devolution, with some feeling a single large council could make it harder to manage local differences and create imbalances on a future strategic authority. Concerns were also raised that aligning with wider regional boundaries may not reflect local areas or economies, potentially making services less effective. It was felt the two unitary option could open up wider devolution opportunities for the areas.
49. **For criteria 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:** Concerns were raised that, given the scale of the single unitary authority, it could be challenging for communities to feel heard. The importance of maintaining strong local decision-making arrangements was emphasized to ensure communities continued to feel represented and empowered and offer a solution to this. In contrast, the 2 unitary proposal was seen as better supporting local identity and community ties, with smaller councils helping improve accountability, increase community engagement, and deliver services that are more closely aligned to local needs and priorities.

The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

50. **Distinct economic, geographic and cultural differences.** Concerns were raised that there were clear differences between the North and South of Warwickshire, including how the economy works, the type of landscape, and the local culture in each area. It was felt the 2 unitary addressed these differences.
51. **A single authority is too large.** Concerns were raised that the 1 unitary proposal which creates a single large authority, risks being too remote, making it too large and distant from local areas, this may make services less efficient and reduce their quality.
52. **A single unitary may offer unfair resource distribution.** There were concerns that a single unitary authority could lead to an unfair spread of resources, with rural, northern and more vulnerable communities not getting enough support, while having two unitaries was seen as a better way to represent local areas and provide services that meet their needs.

53. **A single unitary gives efficiency gains.** The single unitary was seen as more efficient as it would cut down on duplication and complexity of service delivery and partnerships.
54. **A single unitary is seen to reduce local identity and accountability.** There were concerns that a single unitary was likely to weaken local identity and accountability, making it harder for decisions to reflect the needs of communities, while a two-unitary option was viewed as more responsive and locally focused.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

55. Statutory consultation responses on LGR in Warwickshire highlighted a variety of views that were often unclear as to which would be their preferred option, many respondents commented on principles, services, and implementation rather than stating a clear preference. Where preferences were expressed, most favoured the 2 unitary proposal. Key themes included the importance of accessible local democracy, concerns about decision-making becoming too remote in larger authorities, and the need for strong local engagement under any model. Responses also focused on service delivery and financial sustainability, with perceived advantages of a single structure for coordination and reducing fragmentation, and of two councils for place-based leadership and tailoring services. Transition risks and costs were also raised, particularly around reorganising complex services, governance and partnerships, and maintaining specialist capacity during change.