

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 Nottinghamshire was opened on 5 February and closed on 26 March 2026. We received a total of 2631 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 2631 responses received to the Government's consultation on the proposals for future unitary local government in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham.
4. The Government announced to Parliament in July 2026 that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government had decided to implement, subject to Parliamentary approval, **the two unitary option requested by Nottingham City Council**. In implementing this option, the Secretary of State will exercise the power to modify the two unitary proposal submitted by Nottinghamshire County Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council to achieve the boundary changes requested by Nottingham City Council. These new councils will comprise of the current areas of:
 - **Southwest:** Nottingham, plus 15 wards from Broxtowe, 15 wards from Gedling and 17 wards from Rushcliffe
 - **North and East:** Ashfield, Bassetlaw, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood, plus 5 wards from Broxtowe, 4 wards from Gedling and 7 wards from Rushcliffe

From here, this is referred to as the 'Bii proposal.'

5. The consultation also invited views on the proposals submitted by:
6. **Bassetlaw District Council, Gedling Borough Council, Mansfield District Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council for 2 unitary councils.**
 - **Sherwood Forest:** Ashfield, Bassetlaw, Gedling, Mansfield, and Newark and Sherwood
 - **Nottingham and South Nottinghamshire:** Broxtowe, Nottingham, and Rushcliffe

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

7. **Nottinghamshire County Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council for 2 unitary councils.**
 - **Nottingham City:** Nottingham, Broxtowe, and Gedling

- **Nottinghamshire:** Ashfield, Bassetlaw, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood, and Rushcliffe

From here, this is referred to as the '1b 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 Nottinghamshire and Nottingham. 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 other 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](#).
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 this proposal will put local government in the area as a whole on a firmer footing, particularly given that some councils in the area are in Best Value intervention and in receipt of exceptional financial support?
 - e) **Question 5:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?
 - f) **Question 6:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?
 - g) **Question 7:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?
 - h) **Question 8:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?
 - i) **Question 9:** If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-8 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.
 - j) **Question 10:** This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary changes. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change?

- k) **Question 11:** If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 10.

Summary of responses

20. There were 2631 responses to this consultation, 24 from named consultees and 2607 by other respondents. Not all respondents provided an answer to each question, please see analysis of responses by question below for individual response data.

Responses from named consultees

Named Consultee respondents	Number of Responses
Principal Councils	9
Neighbouring Councils	0
Strategic Authorities	2
Health Bodies	5
Police and Fire	0
Education Bodies	1
Other Public Sector	0
Voluntary and Community Sector	1
Business Organisations	1
National Bodies	3
Other named consultees	2
Total named consultees	24

Responses from other respondents

Other respondents	Number of Responses
Individual living in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham	2450
Individual not living in affected area or who did not specify their location	111
Organisation	46
Total other respondents	2607
Total responses (Including named consultees)	2631

Summary of findings

21. Tables in this report include numbers rounded to the nearest whole number, and as such, not all cumulative scores will equal 100%.
22. Respondents were invited to respond to 8 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 agree/agree and negative responses as somewhat disagree/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 9 and 11. 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>
Proposal 1e	19022	35%	53%	10%	2%
Proposal Bii	21147	27%	64%	7%	2%
Proposal 1b	18778	29%	59%	10%	2%

28. Overall, the responses demonstrate a marginal preference for proposal **1e**. 35% of respondents to proposal **1e** provided positive responses to the questions and 53% of respondents provided negative responses. 12% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Proposal **1b** was marginally the second most popular with 29% of respondents providing a positive response. Proposal **Bii** was the least popular with 27% of respondents providing a positive response.

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>
Proposal 1e	97	46%	25%	29%	0%
Proposal Bii	108	31%	39%	30%	0%
Proposal 1b	105	30%	42%	27%	1%

31. Overall, the responses from the named consultees demonstrate a preference for proposal **1e**. 46% of respondents to proposal **1e** provided positive responses to the questions and 25% of respondents provided negative responses. 29% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Proposal **Bii** was marginally the second most popular with 31% of named consultees providing positive responses. Proposal **1b** was marginally the least popular with 30% of named consultees providing positive responses.

Individuals living in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Proposal 1e	17889	35%	54%	10%	2%
Proposal Bii	19857	26%	65%	7%	2%
Proposal 1b	17703	30%	59%	9%	2%

32. Overall, proposal **1e** received the largest proportion of positive responses from individuals living in the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham area. 35% of respondents to the **1e** proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 54% of respondents provided negative responses. 12% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Proposal **1b** received the second highest proportion of positive responses at 30%. Proposal **Bii** was the least popular with 26% of respondents providing positive responses.

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>
Proposal 1e	749	44%	44%	10%	2%
Proposal Bii	861	31%	56%	9%	4%
Proposal 1b	710	23%	64%	10%	3%

33. Overall, proposal **1e** received the largest proportion of positive responses from individuals living outside the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham area. 44% of respondents to proposal **1e** provided positive responses to the questions and 44% of respondents provided negative responses. 12% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Proposal **Bii** received the second highest proportion of positive responses at 31%. Proposal **1b** was the least popular with 23% of respondents providing positive responses.

Organisations

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Proposal 1e	287	44%	30%	25%	1%
Proposal Bii	321	26%	47%	26%	2%
Proposal 1b	260	10%	57%	34%	0%

34. Overall, the responses from organisations demonstrate a preference for proposal **1e**. 44% of respondents to **1e** proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 30% of respondents provided negative responses. 25% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Proposal **Bii** received the second highest proportion of positive responses at 26%. Proposal **1b** was the least popular with 10% of respondents providing positive responses.

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 Council Proposal 1e</i>	6	67%	33%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council proposal Bii</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1b</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	12	50%	25%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	25%	42%	33%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	13	23%	38%	38%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2243	42%	53%	4%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2213	31%	65%	4%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2219	34%	61%	4%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	93	51%	44%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	96	34%	57%	6%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	89	27%	66%	6%	1%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	36	53%	25%	22%	0%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	36	31%	50%	19%	0%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	33	12%	58%	30%	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>
Total all responses Proposal 1e	2384	43%	53%	4%	0%
Total all responses Proposal Bii	2357	31%	64%	4%	0%
Total all responses Proposal 1b	2354	33%	61%	5%	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>
Principal Council Proposal 1e	6	67%	33%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal Bii	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
Principal Council Proposal 1b	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority Proposal Bii	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority Proposal 1b	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies Proposal Bii	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies Proposal 1b	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies Proposal 1e	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	12	42%	33%	25%	0%

Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	42%	33%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	13	31%	46%	23%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2241	37%	53%	9%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2210	27%	66%	6%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2214	32%	58%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	93	44%	47%	9%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	96	30%	55%	10%	4%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	89	28%	62%	8%	2%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	36	47%	25%	25%	3%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	36	28%	44%	25%	3%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	33	15%	55%	30%	0%

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 Proposal 1e</i>	2382	37%	52%	9%	2%
<i>Total all responses 2 Proposal Bii</i>	2354	27%	65%	6%	2%
<i>Total all responses Proposal 1b</i>	2349	32%	58%	8%	2%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/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 Council Proposal 1e</i>	7	57%	43%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council proposal Bii</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1b</i>	7	43%	57%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	13	38%	31%	31%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	33%	42%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	14	36%	43%	21%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2236	37%	51%	10%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2206	28%	63%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2215	32%	56%	10%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	94	50%	40%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	95	34%	57%	6%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	89	24%	64%	10%	2%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	36	47%	22%	31%	0%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	36	33%	44%	19%	3%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	33	12%	55%	33%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2379	38%	50%	10%	2%
<i>Total all responses Proposal Bii</i>	2349	29%	62%	8%	1%
<i>Total all responses Proposal 1b</i>	2351	32%	56%	10%	2%

Question 4: To what extent do you agree or disagree that this proposal will put local government in the area as a whole on a firmer footing, particularly given that some councils in the area are in Best Value intervention and in receipt of exceptional financial support?

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 Council Proposal 1e</i>	6	67%	33%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council proposal Bii</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1b</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	12	42%	33%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	25%	42%	33%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	13	31%	46%	23%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2236	35%	54%	9%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2210	26%	65%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2214	29%	60%	9%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	94	44%	41%	13%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	96	28%	56%	11%	4%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	89	22%	69%	6%	3%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	36	42%	31%	25%	3%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	36	25%	50%	25%	0%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	33	6%	55%	39%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2378	35%	53%	10%	2%
<i>Total all responses Proposal Bii</i>	2354	26%	65%	8%	1%
<i>Total all responses Proposal 1b</i>	2349	29%	60%	9%	2%

Question 5: 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 Council Proposal 1e</i>	6	67%	33%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council proposal Bii</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1b</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	12	50%	25%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	33%	42%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	13	31%	46%	23%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2233	33%	55%	10%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2207	25%	66%	8%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2212	30%	57%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	94	46%	44%	10%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	95	31%	52%	13%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	88	23%	60%	15%	2%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	36	36%	36%	25%	3%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	36	22%	42%	33%	3%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	33	6%	55%	39%	0%

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 Proposal 1e</i>	2375	34%	54%	10%	2%
<i>Total all responses Proposal Bii</i>	2350	25%	65%	9%	1%
<i>Total all responses Proposal 1b</i>	2346	29%	57%	12%	2%

Question 6: 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 Council Proposal 1e</i>	6	67%	17%	17%	0%
<i>Principal Council proposal Bii</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1b</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	12	33%	17%	50%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	25%	42%	33%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	13	23%	38%	38%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2234	30%	59%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2195	23%	69%	6%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2207	28%	62%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	94	38%	48%	11%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	96	28%	58%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	89	17%	69%	12%	2%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	36	42%	36%	22%	0%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	36	19%	56%	25%	0%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	32	6%	59%	34%	0%

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 Proposal 1e</i>	2376	31%	58%	9%	2%
<i>Total all responses 2 Proposal Bii</i>	2339	23%	68%	7%	1%
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary (Nottingham) Bii</i>	2341	27%	62%	9%	2%

Question 7: 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>
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1e</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council proposal Bii</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1b</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	12	58%	17%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	42%	33%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	13	38%	38%	23%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2233	32%	48%	16%	5%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2204	25%	58%	12%	5%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2209	27%	53%	14%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	93	40%	42%	15%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	96	32%	52%	9%	6%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	88	23%	63%	11%	3%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	36	42%	28%	31%	0%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	36	25%	44%	28%	3%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	32	9%	56%	34%	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 Proposal 1e</i>	2374	32%	47%	16%	5%
<i>Total all responses Proposal Bii</i>	2348	25%	58%	12%	5%
<i>Total all responses Proposal 1b</i>	2342	27%	54%	15%	5%

Question 8: 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 Council Proposal 1e</i>	6	83%	17%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal Bii</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council Proposal 1b</i>	6	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1e</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary Proposal 1e</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal 1b</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1e</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal 1b</i>	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1e	12	58%	17%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	33%	33%	33%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal 1b	13	31%	38%	23%	8%

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 Proposal 1e</i>	2233	30%	58%	10%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2211	25%	67%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal 1b</i>	2213	27%	61%	10%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1e</i>	94	41%	49%	9%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	95	32%	58%	7%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal 1b</i>	89	22%	62%	12%	3%
<i>Organisations Proposal 1e</i>	35	46%	34%	20%	0%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	35	23%	49%	29%	0%
<i>Organisation Proposal 1b</i>	31	10%	61%	29%	0%

Total Responses Question 8

<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 Proposal 1e</i>	2374	31%	57%	11%	2%
<i>Total all responses Proposal Bii</i>	2353	25%	66%	7%	2%
<i>Total all responses Proposal 1b</i>	2346	27%	61%	11%	1%

Question 9: If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-8 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 Proposal 1e</i>	11	1317	53	31
<i>Total all responses Proposal Bii</i>	10	1347	56	29
<i>Total all responses Proposal 1b</i>	11	1288	47	26

35. We also received 28 free text responses by email and post. 11 were from named consultees, 2 were from individuals living in the area, 7 were from individuals not in the area or who did not specify their location and 8 were from organisations. A summary of the views shared in these responses is included within the summaries below.

Summary of named consultee responses

36. Principal Councils

Principal councils supported those proposals that they had put forward, with 4 supporting proposal 1e. Councils that did not submit proposals set out their reason for not responding to the statutory invitation, however they did not express a preference for a particular proposal.

37. Strategic Authority

Two strategic authorities responded. The Mayor of the East Midlands Combined County Authority did not express a preference for a particular proposal but set out her priorities for local government reorganisation. The other strategic authority likewise did not express a preference for a particular proposal.

38. Health Bodies

Two health bodies responded. One expressed a preference for proposal 1e. One remained neutral but set out the importance of choosing an option based on a sensible geography that takes the footprint of local hospital services into account.

39. Education Bodies

One education body responded and expressed a preference for proposal Bii, stating that it best supports strategic ambitions for growth around Nottingham city.

40. Voluntary and Community Sector

One voluntary sector body responded and expressed a preference for proposal Bii.

41. Business Bodies

One business body responded neutrally on the options. They outlined that the final model must result in an economic landscape that supports the private sector, including addressing planning, transport and infrastructure challenges that can stifle growth.

42. National Bodies

Three national bodies responded and remained neutral on the options.

43. Other named consultees

Two organisations responded and remained neutral, outlining implementation considerations for any chosen option. A third organisation stated a preference for proposal 1b, noting benefits in terms of structures and service delivery.

Comments against the criteria

44. 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:

Supporters of the 1e proposal note that the proposal creates a balanced distribution of deprivation across authorities and aligns well with existing partnership structures and the way people live and work. With reference to proposal 1e, some respondents expressed concern that the southern unitary would require diverse service delivery models to address the needs of large urban and rural areas. Supporters of proposal 1b highlight that the option provides the optimal urban/rural split that can be achieved using existing districts as building blocks, with each unitary having an economic focus. Some respondents noted that proposal 1b aligns less favourably with mayoral development areas such as the Trent Arc. Concerns were raised that proposals 1b and 1e split the urban area of Nottingham between two councils putting the city at a structural disadvantage, limiting growth and slowing down decision making. Supporters of proposal Bii expressed the view that the model would be beneficial for economic growth and that it would help to unlock investment, align well with the priorities of the mayor and strengthen service delivery by enabling clear urban/rural delivery models. Some respondents noted, with reference to proposal Bii, that concentrating urban assets under one council could weaken the more rural authority over time. Respondents also questioned the exclusion of some urban areas like Hucknall from the Southwest unitary and asking whether the geographies proposed would improve outcomes compared to other models proposed on district building blocks. A health body noted that the chosen option should take into account the footprint of health services and local needs. A business body expressed the view that the chosen option should address planning, transport and infrastructure challenges which can stifle growth.

45. For criterion 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks: Respondents raised questions around the methodology and assumptions used for the financial estimates in all proposals.

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

Some respondents welcomed the service delivery and public service reform improvements outlined in proposals. In relation to proposal 1b, respondents expressed concern about the balance of deprivation across the two unitaries. They also noted the administrative challenges of delivering on the footprint of the proposed geography. Concerns were raised in relation to the boundary changes in proposal Bii, noting that they lead to uncertainty in the modelling and unnecessary fragmentation of services. With reference to proposals 1b and Bii, respondents noted concern that a highly concentrated urban authority could distort provider markets, recruitment and investment. In relation to proposal 1e, some respondents were sceptical that social care transformation was achievable.

47. 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:

There were limited comments on how councils had sought to work together in regard to the 1e and 1b proposals. However, respondents noted that there was more limited local engagement on option Bii than for other options.

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

Respondents tended to reference the alignment of the proposed new councils with mayoral priority areas. Some respondents noted that proposal 1b aligns less favourably with current priorities and that splitting the urban area of Nottingham between two authorities as per proposal 1b and 1e may hamper the growth ambitions of the mayor.

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

Respondents noted the opportunities for community engagement and neighbourhood empowerment that would be enabled by the engagement models outlined in the proposals. For proposals 1b and 1e, some respondents noted potential engagement challenges, for the urban residents in a predominantly rural authority. Some respondents expressed concern about the reduction in democratic representation in all proposals, as well as the risks of losing local knowledge and community trust.

The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

50. The importance of aligning boundaries to real-world geographies and communities

Responses expressed views about how the proposed boundaries reflect the realities of how local communities function or the areas with which residents identify. There were mixed views on whether Rushcliffe and Gedling should align more closely with the more urban or rural authorities. Opinion was also divided on whether the boundaries put forward in proposal Bii strengthened city identity and effectiveness or created arbitrary divisions.

51. Concerns about joining with Nottingham City Council due to historic failings

Merging with Nottingham City Council was opposed by some respondents, with responses referring to its past financial challenges and fears of increased financial risks, reduced service quality and increased taxes.

52. Opposition to merging rural areas with urban Nottingham City

Some respondents expressed concerns that combining Nottingham City with rural areas risks neglecting the unique needs, priorities and identities of those communities.

53. Concerns about likelihood of service improvement or greater efficiency

Some respondents expressed scepticism that reorganisation will deliver promised efficiencies or cost savings.

54. Concerns about loss of local identity and reduction in democratic accountability

Some respondents indicated concerns about the creation of larger authorities eroding local identity and reducing democratic accountability and representation.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

55. Responses emphasised a desire to create councils that reflect existing communities. Concerns were noted around the complexity of boundary change, the deliverability of the proposed benefits, the financial sustainability of councils and the potential impact on local identities and local representation.

Question 10: This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary changes. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change? This question and question 11 were asked in relation to proposal Bii.

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Council Proposal Bii</i>	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authority</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	3	0%	0%	100%	0%

<i>Police and Fire Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 52 Proposal Bii</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees Proposal Bii</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees Proposal Bii	12	25%	42%	33%	0%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in affected area Proposal Bii</i>	2450	2201	27%	67%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area Proposal Bii</i>	111	96	31%	60%	5%
<i>Organisations Proposal Bii</i>	46	34	26%	44%	26%

Total Responses Question 10

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses Proposal Bii</i>	2343	27%	66%	6%	2%

Question 11: If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 10

<i>Respondent type</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 Proposal Bii</i>	10	1010	39	25

56. We also received 28 free text responses by email and post. 11 were from named consultees, 2 were from individuals living in the area, 7 were from individuals not in the area or who did not specify their location and 8 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

57. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England provided observations on the evidence provided to support the boundary change request for option Bii, drawing on its Principal Area Boundary Review expertise. It considered the evidence in the bid documentation 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 provided in the submission made more of a case for a two unitary pattern in a general sense, rather than setting out how it supported the specific boundary changes put forward.

Summary of named consultee responses

58. Principal Councils

Councils not in support of proposal Bii consider the additional complexity and risk introduced by boundary changes to be unjustified and highlight increased costs. Ongoing improvement efforts at Nottingham City Council were noted as well as the risk that there is lower capacity to deliver additional national reforms should more complex transition arrangements be required.

59. Strategic Authorities

The strategic authorities that responded did not give a view on boundary change.

60. Health Bodies

Two health bodies noted the risk of increased complexity, cost and disruption, particularly in relation to partnerships, as well as the potential loss of local intelligence on health inequalities. Some respondents noted that current boundaries may not reflect the realities or service needs of communities.

61. Education Bodies

One education body was supportive of option Bii and the long-term potential benefits for economic growth in the city.

62. Voluntary and Community Sector

One voluntary and community sector organisation noted the benefits of an enlarged tax base for the authority containing the city.

63. National Bodies

The Boundary Commission response is noted above.

Comments against the criteria

64. 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 were mixed views as to whether boundary change was justified. Some respondents expressed the view that the additional cost and complexity was not justified given the alternative options. Others considered that the boundary changes made sense for the city's future growth and sustainability.

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

Some respondents considered that boundary change would support the long-term financial sustainability of the city. However, others expressed the view that concentrating assets in one urban unitary is likely to weaken the rural authority over time.

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

Some respondents noted that the proposed boundary change could create councils that could better meet the needs of residents. Some respondents highlighted the disruption to services and partnership arrangements and the risk of losing local intelligence. Others noted the increased complexity of disaggregation and aggregation could risk the delivery of wider national reforms and transformation opportunities.

67. 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:

There was a recognition among respondents that local engagement on option Bii had been more limited than for other proposals.

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

Comments on devolution in response to this criterion were not provided.

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

Comments on community engagement and neighbourhood empowerment in response to this criterion were not provided.

The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

70. Boundary change lacks clear justification

Respondents expressed the view that boundary change lacked sufficient evidence and clear justification, with concerns about potential service deterioration, increased costs and administrative complexity, and no clear guarantee of improved efficiency or service quality. There are also concerns that the proposal may primarily serve Nottingham City Council's financial position rather than wider public benefit.

71. Aligning boundaries with urban realities can be beneficial

Some respondents expressed the view that aligning administrative boundaries with urban areas better reflects how people live and work could improve service delivery and efficiency, as well as supporting economic growth and financial sustainability.

72. Impact on community identity, rural areas and local representation

Some respondents felt that boundary changes could undermine local identities and reduce democratic accountability. Some expressed the view that the boundary changes proposed could negatively affect rural areas by merging them with urban areas with differing needs.

73. Boundary changes prioritise the needs of the city

Some respondents raised concerns that the boundary changes proposed prioritise the city's interests over those of rural areas, leading to unfair resource distribution and disadvantaging the rural unitary.

74. Preference for existing arrangements or alternative boundaries

Some respondents expressed a preference for retaining current governance arrangements or adopting alternative models, including different boundary configurations.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

75. Respondents frequently described the boundary changes put forward as complex and potentially disruptive, with concerns that changes could weaken coherence and make the new structures harder to deliver. Some noted that the proposed configuration could combine areas with differing needs or separate communities with established links, leading to challenges for community identity as well as for service delivery and strategic planning. Concerns were also expressed about the accessibility of services, democratic representation and accountability, including

the risk that rural areas could be overshadowed within the urban unitary. Some respondents questioned the robustness of the evidence base and the level of consultation underpinning the proposal. A smaller number of respondents acknowledged that boundary changes could, in some cases, better reflect functional economic or urban areas.