

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 Derbyshire and Derby was opened on 5 February and closed on 26 March 2026. We received a total of 702 responses.
2. The five 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 702 responses received to the Government's consultation on the proposals for future unitary local government in Derby and Derbyshire.
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 submitted by Chesterfield Borough Council, Derby City Council, Erewash Borough Council and High Peak Borough Council**. In implementing this option, the Secretary of State will exercise the power to modify the proposal submitted by South Derbyshire District Council to achieve the boundary change councils requested.
5. These new councils will comprise of the current areas of:
 - **Northern Derbyshire:** Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, High Peak, North-East Derbyshire plus 21 parishes from Amber Valley
 - **Southern Derbyshire:** Derby, Erewash, South Derbyshire plus 14 parishes from Amber Valley

From here, this is referred to as the '2 unitary proposal B1'.

6. The consultation also invited views on the proposals submitted by:
7. **Derbyshire County Council** for 1 unitary council:
 - Amber Valley, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derby, Derbyshire Dales, Erewash, High Peak, North-East Derbyshire, and South Derbyshire

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

8. **Amber Valley Borough Council** for 2 unitary councils:
 - **Northern Derbyshire:** Amber Valley, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, High Peak, and North-East Derbyshire
 - **Southern Derbyshire:** Derby, Erewash, and South Derbyshire

From here, this is referred to as the '2 unitary proposal A'.

9. **Bolsover District Council and North-East Derbyshire District Council for 2 unitary councils.**

- **Northern Derbyshire:** Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, High Peak, North-East Derbyshire plus 21 parishes from Amber Valley
- **Southern Derbyshire:** Derby, Erewash, South Derbyshire plus 14 parishes from Amber Valley

From here, this is referred to as the '2 unitary proposal A1'.

10. **South Derbyshire District Council for 2 unitary councils**

- **Northern Derbyshire:** Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, High Peak, and North-East Derbyshire
- **Southern Derbyshire:** Amber Valley, Derby, Erewash, and South Derbyshire

From here, this is referred to as the '2 unitary proposal B'

11. 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.
12. 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.
13. This consultation relates to the structure of local government in Derbyshire and Derby. These proposals relate to England only.

Methodology

14. 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'.
15. The list of named consultees is available on [gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk).
16. 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.
17. 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](#).

18. Responses to the consultation were also received by email and letter.
19. 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.
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?
 - 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.
- i) **Question 9:** This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary change or that affects wider public services. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change?
- j) **Question 10:** If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 9.

Summary of responses

23. There were 702 responses to this consultation, 26 from named consultees and 676 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	10
Neighbouring Councils	3
Strategic Authorities	2
Health bodies	3
Police and Fire	1
Education bodies	2
Other Public Sector	1
Voluntary and Community Sector	0
Business Organisations	1
National Bodies	3
Other named consultees	0
Total named consultees	26

Responses from other respondents

Other respondents	Number of Responses
Individual living in Derby and Derbyshire	584
Individual not living in affected area or who did not specify their location	43
Organisation	49
Total other respondents	676
Total responses (Including named consultees)	702

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 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.
26. 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.
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 and 10. A summary of the relevant views expressed in those responses against each criterion is included within the summary of free text responses for each respondent type.
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	4415	26%	65%	8%	1%
2 unitary A	3848	45%	40%	13%	2%
2 unitary A1	4142	34%	51%	13%	2%
2 unitary B1	4298	36%	50%	12%	2%
2 unitary B	3704	35%	50%	13%	2%

31. Overall, the responses demonstrate a preference for 2 unitary proposal A. 45% of respondents to the proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 40% of respondents provided negative responses. 15% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 2 unitary B1 proposal received the second highest proportion of positive responses at 36%, followed marginally by the 2 unitary B proposal with 35% positive responses and 2 unitary A1 with 34% positive responses. The 1 unitary proposal was least popular with 26% of respondents providing positive responses.

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	119	22%	64%	14%	0%
2 unitary A	119	52%	29%	18%	0%
2 unitary A1	120	48%	31%	22%	0%
2 unitary B1	128	52%	21%	27%	0%
2 unitary B	105	50%	25%	25%	0%

32. Overall, the responses from the named consultees demonstrate a very slight preference for the 2 unitary B1 proposal. 52% of respondents to the proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 21% of respondents provided negative responses. 27% were responses of neither agree nor disagree. The 2 unitary A proposal also received 52% positive responses however, 29% of responses were negative and 18% were responses of neither agree or disagree. The 2 unitary proposal B received the third highest proportion of positive responses at 50%, followed by the 2 unitary A1 proposal with 48% positive responses. The least popular proposal was 1 unitary, with 22% positive responses.

Individuals living in Derby and Derbyshire

<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	3770	27%	64%	7%	2%
2 unitary A	3253	45%	40%	13%	3%
2 unitary A1	3502	34%	52%	12%	3%
2 unitary B1	3604	37%	51%	10%	2%
2 unitary B	3130	34%	52%	12%	3%

33. Overall, the responses from the individuals living in Derby and Derbyshire demonstrate a preference for the 2 unitary A proposal. 45% of respondents to the proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 40% of respondents provided negative responses. 16% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 2 unitary B1 received the second highest proportion of positive responses at 37%, followed by both the 2 unitary A1 proposal and 2 unitary B proposal, for each of which 34% of respondents provided positive responses. The 1 unitary proposal was the least popular with 27% of respondents providing positive responses to the questions.

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	286	22%	67%	9%	2%
2 unitary A	259	34%	51%	9%	5%
2 unitary A1	288	28%	53%	15%	4%
2 unitary B1	288	25%	51%	20%	5%
2 unitary B	259	41%	40%	15%	4%

34. Overall, the responses from the individuals living outside Derby and Derbyshire area demonstrate a marginal preference for the 2 unitary B proposal. 41% of respondents to the proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 40% of respondents provided negative responses. 19% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 2 unitary A proposal was the second most popular with 34% of respondents providing positive responses to the questions. This was followed by the 2 unitary A1 proposal with 28% of responses and the 2 unitary B1 proposal with 25% of responses. The 1 unitary was the least popular with 22% 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>
1 unitary	240	13%	68%	18%	1%
2 unitary A	217	50%	29%	21%	0%
2 unitary A1	232	34%	47%	19%	0%
2 unitary B1	278	38%	41%	21%	0%
2 unitary B	210	35%	45%	20%	0%

35. Overall, the responses from organisations demonstrate a preference for the 2 unitary A proposal. 50% of respondents to the proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 29% of respondents provided negative responses. 21% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 2 unitary B1 proposal was the second most popular with 38% of respondents providing positive responses. This was followed marginally by the 2 unitary B proposal with 35% positive responses and 2 unitary A proposal with 34% positive responses. The 1 unitary was the least popular with 13% 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>	No. of responses	Positive	Negative	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Don't know
<i>Principal Council - 1 unitary</i>	9	11%	89%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary A</i>	9	33%	67%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary A1</i>	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary B1</i>	9	67%	22%	11%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary B</i>	8	63%	25%	13%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary A</i>	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary A1</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities - 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies - 1 unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1	3	0%	33%	67%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B1	3	0%	33%	67%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Police and Fire - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 1 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies - 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 1 unitary	17	24%	65%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary A	17	35%	53%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	47%	33%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	50%	25%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B	15	53%	27%	20%	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>	541	33%	64%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	466	51%	42%	7%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	438	37%	55%	7%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	453	41%	52%	6%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	448	39%	53%	8%	1%
<i>Individual living outside affected area -1 unitary</i>	41	24%	68%	5%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	37	41%	57%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	31%	64%	6%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	31%	58%	11%	0%

Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary B	37	51%	46%	3%	0%
Organisations - 1 unitary	35	17%	74%	9%	0%
Organisations – 2 unitary A	31	58%	32%	10%	0%
Organisation - 2 unitary A1	29	34%	55%	10%	0%
Organisations - 2 unitary B1	35	40%	46%	14%	0%
Organisations – 2 unitary B	30	37%	53%	10%	0%

Total Responses Question

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Total all responses - 1 unitary	634	31%	65%	4%	0%
Total all responses – 2 unitary A	551	50%	43%	7%	0%
Total all responses - 2 unitary A1	518	37%	55%	7%	0%
Total all responses - 2 unitary B1	540	41%	51%	8%	1%
Total all responses – 2 unitary B	530	40%	52%	8%	1%

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

<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 - 1 unitary	9	11%	89%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A	9	89%	11%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A1	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B1	9	67%	22%	11%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B	8	63%	25%	13%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 1 unitary	2	0%	100%	0%	0%

Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A1	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities- 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies - 1 unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B1	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Police and Fire - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 1 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies - 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 1 unitary	17	24%	65%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A	17	65%	24%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	53%	33%	13%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	56%	25%	1%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B	15	53%	27%	20%	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>	538	30%	64%	4%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	465	47%	40%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	437	37%	50%	12%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	452	40%	50%	8%	2%

<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	446	38%	52%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 1 unitary</i>	41	22%	68%	10%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	37	38%	51%	5%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	31%	53%	17%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	28%	47%	22%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	37	46%	41%	8%	5%
<i>Organisations - 1 unitary</i>	35	14%	77%	6%	3%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary A</i>	31	61%	26%	13%	0%
<i>Organisation - 2 unitary A1</i>	29	34%	55%	10%	0%
<i>Organisations - 2 unitary B1</i>	35	40%	46%	14%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary B</i>	30	43%	47%	10%	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 - 1 unitary</i>	631	29%	65%	5%	1%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary A</i>	550	48%	40%	11%	2%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary A1</i>	517	37%	50%	12%	1%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary B1</i>	539	39%	49%	10%	2%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary B</i>	528	39%	48%	11%	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?

<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 - 1 unitary	9	11%	89%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A	9	44%	22%	33%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A1	8	63%	13%	25%	0%
Principal Council- 2 unitary B1	9	67%	11%	22%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B	8	63%	25%	13%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 1 unitary	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies - 1 unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies -2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%

Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B1	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Police and Fire- 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire-2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire- 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 1 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies-2 unitary B	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector -2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary A</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary B</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary A</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 1 unitary	17	24%	65%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary A	17	35%	29%	35%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	40%	27%	33%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	50%	19%	31%	0%

Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B	15	47%	27%	27%	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>	540	30%	64%	5%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	465	46%	42%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	437	38%	49%	12%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	451	40%	48%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	447	35%	51%	12%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 1 unitary</i>	41	22%	68%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	37	35%	54%	8%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	33%	50%	14%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	22%	50%	25%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	37	46%	41%	14%	0%
<i>Organisations - 1 unitary</i>	34	21%	56%	24%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary A</i>	31	55%	29%	16%	0%
<i>Organisation - 2 unitary A1</i>	29	41%	38%	21%	0%
<i>Organisations - 2 unitary B1</i>	35	31%	40%	29%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary B</i>	30	37%	43%	20%	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>
Total all responses - 1 unitary	632	29%	64%	6%	1%
Total all responses - 2 unitary A	550	45%	41%	12%	2%
Total all responses - 2 unitary A1	517	38%	47%	13%	1%
Total all responses - 2 unitary B1	538	38%	47%	14%	1%
Total all responses - 2 unitary B	529	36%	49%	13%	2%

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>
Principal Council - 1 unitary	9	11%	89%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A	9	67%	33%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A1	8	88%	13%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B1	9	67%	22%	11%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B	8	63%	25%	13%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 1 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary A1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Strategic Authorities- 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies - 1 unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies -2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B1	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Police and Fire - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 1 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies - 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 1 unitary	17	24%	59%	18%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary A	17	47%	35%	18%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	53%	27%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	50%	25%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B	15	47%	27%	27%	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>	540	26%	64%	9%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	463	44%	38%	15%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	436	35%	48%	14%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	448	37%	49%	13%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	447	34%	51%	13%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 1 unitary</i>	41	22%	61%	15%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	37	35%	49%	11%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	28%	47%	19%	6%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	28%	44%	25%	3%

<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	37	32%	35%	27%	5%
<i>Organisations - 1 unitary</i>	34	9%	65%	26%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary A</i>	31	45%	23%	32%	0%
<i>Organisation - 2 unitary A1</i>	29	28%	45%	28%	0%
<i>Organisations - 2 unitary B1</i>	34	29%	38%	32%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary B</i>	30	33%	43%	23%	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>	632	24%	64%	11%	1%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary A</i>	548	44%	38%	16%	3%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary A1</i>	516	35%	47%	15%	3%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary B1</i>	534	36%	47%	15%	2%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary B</i>	529	34%	49%	15%	2%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Council - 1 unitary</i>	9	11%	89%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary A</i>	9	89%	11%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary A1</i>	8	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary B1</i>	9	67%	22%	11%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary B</i>	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 1 unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary A1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities- 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies - 1 unitary	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies -2 unitary A	3	0%	33%	67%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1	3	0%	33%	67%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B1	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Police and Fire- 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire-2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire- 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 1 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies - 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
National Bodies - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 1 unitary	17	18%	59%	24%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A	17	53%	24%	24%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	40%	33%	27%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	44%	19%	38%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B	15	47%	20%	33%	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>	535	24%	67%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	465	40%	41%	15%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	438	32%	54%	11%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	450	35%	53%	10%	3%

<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	448	29%	53%	13%	4%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 1 unitary</i>	40	20%	70%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	37	27%	57%	11%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	28%	50%	19%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	19%	52%	22%	6%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	37	35%	46%	16%	3%
<i>Organisations - 1 unitary</i>	34	9%	71%	18%	3%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary A</i>	31	42%	32%	23%	3%
<i>Organisation - 2 unitary A1</i>	29	31%	45%	24%	0%
<i>Organisations - 2 unitary B1</i>	35	37%	40%	23%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary B</i>	30	27%	43%	27%	3%

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>	626	22%	67%	9%	2%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary A</i>	550	40%	41%	15%	4%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary A1</i>	518	32%	53%	13%	3%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary B1</i>	537	34%	51%	12%	3%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary B</i>	530	30%	51%	15%	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>
Principal Council - 1 unitary	10	11%	89%	0%	0%
Principal Council- 2 unitary A	10	89%	11%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A1	10	88%	13%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B1	10	67%	11%	22%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B	10	63%	25%	13%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 1 unitary	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council- 2 unitary A1	3	50%	50%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1	3	50%	50%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B	3	50%	50%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities- 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies - 1 unitary	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies -2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1	3	67%	0%	33%	0%

Health Bodies - 2 unitary B1	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Police and Fire - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 1 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Business Bodies - 1 unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary A</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary B</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary A</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 1 unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 1 unitary	17	18%	71%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary A	17	65%	24%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	67%	20%	13%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	63%	13%	25%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B	15	53%	27%	20%	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>	538	29%	54%	13%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	465	42%	37%	16%	5%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	439	34%	48%	15%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	449	37%	47%	12%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	447	33%	47%	15%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 1 unitary</i>	41	22%	59%	17%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	37	35%	43%	11%	11%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	28%	47%	11%	14%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	31%	39%	19%	11%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	37	41%	35%	16%	8%
<i>Organisations - 1 unitary</i>	34	15%	50%	35%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary A</i>	31	45%	23%	32%	0%
<i>Organisation - 2 unitary A1</i>	29	34%	34%	31%	0%
<i>Organisations - 2 unitary B1</i>	35	40%	31%	29%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary B</i>	30	37%	33%	30%	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>
Total all responses - 1 unitary	630	28%	54%	14%	3%
Total all responses - 2 unitary A	550	43%	36%	17%	5%
Total all responses - 2 unitary A1	519	34%	46%	15%	4%
Total all responses - 2 unitary B1	536	38%	44%	14%	4%
Total all responses - 2 unitary B	529	34%	45%	16%	5%

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

<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 - 1 unitary	9	11%	89%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A	9	100%	0%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary A1	8	88%	13%	0%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B1	9	78%	11%	11%	0%
Principal Council - 2 unitary B	8	75%	13%	13%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 1 unitary	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary A1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies - 1 unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B1	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies - 2 unitary B	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Police and Fire - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 1 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies - 1 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies - 2 unitary B	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies - 2 unitary B	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 1 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 2 unitary A	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B1	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Other Named consultees - 2 unitary B</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 1 unitary	17	24%	65%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary A	17	65%	18%	18%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	53%	20%	27%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	56%	13%	31%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B	15	53%	20%	27%	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>	538	21%	71%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	464	43%	41%	14%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	437	33%	53%	11%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	450	35%	53%	10%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	447	30%	56%	11%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area -1 unitary</i>	41	20%	76%	5%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary A</i>	37	30%	49%	16%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	19%	53%	22%	6%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	19%	58%	17%	6%

<i>Individual living outside affected area – 2 unitary B</i>	37	35%	38%	19%	8%
<i>Organisations - 1 unitary</i>	34	3%	85%	12%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary A</i>	31	42%	39%	19%	0%
<i>Organisation - 2 unitary A1</i>	29	34%	52%	14%	0%
<i>Organisations - 2 unitary B1</i>	35	46%	43%	11%	0%
<i>Organisations – 2 unitary B</i>	30	30%	50%	20%	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 - 1 unitary</i>	630	20%	72%	7%	1%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary A</i>	549	43%	40%	15%	2%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary A1</i>	517	32%	52%	13%	3%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary B1</i>	537	35%	52%	11%	2%
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary B</i>	529	31%	53%	12%	3%

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

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
<i>Total all responses - 1 unitary</i>	15	376	28	28
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary A</i>	15	279	21	26
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary A1</i>	13	248	16	21
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary B1</i>	14	253	15	28
<i>Total all responses – 2 unitary B</i>	13	259	19	22

36. We also received 30 responses by email and post. 10 were from named consultees, 7 were from individuals living in area, 2 were from individuals not in area, 11 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

Principal councils supported those proposals that they had put forward.

38. Neighbouring Councils

Three neighbouring councils responded. One was broadly supportive of all 2 unitary proposals for Derbyshire and Derby, considering that two unitary options over one were the most advantageous for cross border collaboration. One was not in favour of any proposals because they considered that all would create large, remote authorities. One supported the 2 unitary A proposal, considering it to be strongest in terms of community identity and meeting community needs as well as for achieving resilient councils and balance of economic opportunity.

39. Strategic Authorities

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.

40. Health Bodies

Three health bodies responded. One preferred the 2 unitary B proposal, stating it would minimise risks on key interfaces required for hospital discharge, but also raising concerns for all proposals around disruption to working arrangements during implementation. One preferred the 1 unitary proposal, highlighting that it would simplify partnership arrangements between the NHS and local authorities. The response also notes that the 2 unitary proposal A would disrupt patient flows and for all 2 unitary options, the greater inefficiency of two unitaries over one for NHS staff working to discharge patients. One did not express a preference for a particular proposal but highlighted the need to safeguard health protection functions and budgets held by upper-tier local authorities.

41. Police and Fire

One police and fire body responded and remained neutral on the options.

42. Other Public Sector

One organisation responded and remained neutral on the options.

43. Education Bodies

Two education bodies responded. One preferred the 2 unitary B1 proposal and the associated boundary change, believing it would provide the most coherent and supportive governance environment for their existing and potential

learners, employers and partnerships across the region. One preferred the single unitary proposal as it considers two unitaries would break up the county and impact collaboration in delivering the region's skills priorities.

44. 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.

45. National Bodies

Three national bodies responded and remained neutral on the options.

Comments against the criteria

46. 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:

Respondents raised concerns that the 1 unitary proposal would be too large in geography and population. Supporters of the proposal felt that it would provide the scale, resilience and flexibility to meet needs across the county. Some respondents suggested the 2 unitary proposals rely on unfamiliar boundaries and create risks to community identity, operational flexibility and efficiency between areas and parity between the two councils. Responses also noted concerns about options which split districts and communities, cutting across partnership footprints and increasing disruption during implementation. Supporters of the two unitary proposals highlight the greater ability of the councils to meet local needs in the north and south and the alignment of the councils to economic areas in the context of supporting the growth ambitions of the combined authority. Concern was expressed in relation to the 2 unitary A proposal that it limits Derby City on its northern edge in terms of growth and does not reflect natural movement patterns in the area. Some respondents considered that 2 unitary proposal B creates imbalanced councils in terms of economic opportunity, strength and resilience.

47. 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. Some were supportive of the scale benefits and resilience that could be achieved via a single unitary. Supporters of the two unitary proposals considered that they were the right size to achieve value for money while remaining locally responsive.

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

Some respondents were sceptical that the 1 unitary option would be able to maintain service quality over a large area and respond effectively to varying local needs, with a risk of slower decision-making. An education provider supported the 1 unitary proposal considering it a better size for collaboration on regional skills priorities. Likewise, a health body highlighted that the 1 unitary

would simplify partnership arrangements with the NHS and combined authority to deliver population health improvement. Those not in favour of the 2 unitary proposals noted that splitting services between two unitaries risks service quality, reduces opportunities for scale benefits, and disperses existing expertise and capacity across two organisations. They also noted the potential for inequalities between the two councils, driven by differences in scale and demand. For proposals A1 and B1 concerns were raised around splitting districts and communities, cutting across partnership footprints and increasing disruption during implementation. A health body expressed a preference for the 2 unitary B proposal, feeling it would minimise risks on key interfaces required for hospital discharge. Where respondents supported proposals, they considered that they would improve service delivery by removing fragmentation, aligning functions and enabling place-based, preventative models across key services.

49. **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:**

Many responses highlighted the local engagement work that had to be undertaken ahead of proposal submission, though it was noted that the 1 unitary proposal and the 2 unitary B1 proposal were not included as part of this engagement. Respondents expressed mixed views about the extent to which boundaries presented by proposals reflect local identities. Many respondents expressed the view that a single unitary would be too large to meet local needs, though some recognised the scale benefits of a large authority.

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

With regard to the 1 unitary proposal, some highlighted concerns that moving to a single authority could create an imbalance in combined authority governance and influence, particularly if the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham area is covered by two unitaries, with insufficient detail on how revised governance arrangements would operate in practice. Supporters of the 1 unitary proposal consider that it would provide a strategically aligned, collective voice in the combined authority. With regard to the 2 unitary proposals, various respondents highlighted that splitting the county could cause short-term disruption that would hinder devolution priorities and disrupt established combined authority ways of working. Supporters of the 2 unitary options point to the balance that would be created in the combined authority should a two unitary solution be implemented in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham.

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

Some respondents highlight concerns over the scale of the unitary within the 1 unitary proposal, feeling it could make effective neighbourhood engagement difficult, with local structures potentially covering areas that are too large to reflect communities and their needs. With regard to the 2 unitary proposals, some felt that the practical challenges of establishing effective neighbourhood engagement structures across different areas, could provide difficult,

particularly where boundaries are seen as artificial and with the mix of parished and unparished areas. Those in favour of the two unitary proposals note that the scale of the authorities ensures that democratic engagement remains meaningful.

The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

52. Concerns single unitary is too large and diverse

While some respondents identified the efficiencies that could be achieved from a single authority, a large proportion of respondents expressed the view that Derbyshire is too large and diverse for a single authority to manage effectively, risking overstretch, neglect of rural or peripheral areas and the inability to address varied local needs. This included the view that the scale of the single unitary would weaken local representation and accountability. Concerns were raised that the needs of the city would be prioritised over the needs of rural areas.

53. Concerns boundary changes and splits reduce community connection and historic identity.

While a proportion considered boundary change options to create more sensible geographies, a larger proportion of views shared opposed the splitting of Amber Valley between unitaries. Concerns centred around potential inequalities and inconsistent service levels and the importance of preserving identities and community ties.

54. Concerns reorganisation increases complexity, costs and risks to service delivery, with limited confidence in efficiency savings.

Respondents expressed concern for all proposals that reorganisation would lead to disruption and increased complexity with scepticism about the savings and benefits that would be achieved. These concerns were greatest for the proposals that involved boundary change. Supporters of the 1 unitary proposal were more likely to identify savings and efficiencies as a potential benefit. Some respondents expressed concerns that the 2 unitary proposal B would create a north-south imbalance.

55. Preference for retaining existing structures or more locally accountable alternatives

Some respondents expressed a preference for maintaining the status quo or creating smaller, more locally accountable structures. Larger councils were considered to erode community identities, reduce local knowledge and accountability and make it harder for residents to influence decisions.

56. Support for two unitary authorities as a compromise providing a more balanced and pragmatic option.

Some respondents expressed the view that creating two unitaries is preferable to a single large authority as a practical compromise that is a more manageable size, better for local identities and efficiency while minimising disruption.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

57. Where views were expressed, support was spread across the 2 unitary proposals with little support for the 1 unitary model. Proposal B was more commonly supported, with 2 unitary A attracting a similar number of supporters. Proposals that involve splitting Amber Valley, A1 and B1, tended to attract greater concern, particularly regarding the deliverability of benefits, the coherence of the geographies and extent to which anticipated benefits would be realised. Opinions expressed about the 1 unitary proposal highlighted concerns regarding its scale and the diverse make-up of the area, with risks identified around effective management, reduced local representation and accountability, and the potential for rural communities to be overlooked.

Question 9: This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary changes. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change? This question and question 10 were asked in relation to proposals 2 unitary A1 and 2 unitary B1.

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 - 2 unitary A1</i>	8	38%	63%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council - 2 unitary B1</i>	9	56%	33%	11%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary A1</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council - 2 unitary B1</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	3	0%	33%	67%	0%
<i>Health Bodies – 2 unitary B1</i>	3	0%	33%	67%	0%

<i>Police and Fire- 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire- 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies - 2 unitary B1</i>	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
<i>Other Public Sector - 2 unitary A1</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector - 2 unitary B1</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Business Bodies - 2 unitary B1</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary A1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees - 2 unitary B1</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary A1	15	27%	53%	20%	0%

Total Named Consultees - 2 unitary B1	16	44%	31%	25%	0%
--	----	-----	-----	-----	----

Individuals and Organisations (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	440	25%	57%	13%	5%
<i>Individual living in affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	451	30%	57%	8%	4%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary A1</i>	36	25%	64%	8%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area - 2 unitary B1</i>	36	19%	58%	17%	6%
<i>Organisations - 2 unitary A1</i>	29	31%	55%	10%	0%
<i>Organisations- 2 unitary B1</i>	34	38%	47%	12%	0%

Total responses Question 9

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary A1</i>	520	26%	57%	13%	4%
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary B1</i>	537	30%	56%	9%	4%

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

<i>Respondent type/ Proposal</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary A1</i>	13	179	14	18
<i>Total all responses - 2 unitary B1</i>	14	184	15	24

58. We also received 30 responses by email and post. 10 were from named consultees, 7 were from individuals living in area, 2 were from individuals not in area, 11 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

59. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England provided observations on the evidence provided to support the boundary change request for the 2 unitary A1 proposal and the 2 unitary B1 proposal, drawing on its Principal Area Boundary Review expertise. It considered the evidence in the proposal 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, across both proposals, while efforts have been made to support the proposed patterns in a general sense, there was less detail to support the specific boundary changes that had been put forward. It also queried the extent to which the parishes affected had been consulted.

Summary of named consultee responses

60. Principal Councils

Principal councils supported those proposals that they had put forward. Councils not in favour of the boundary change options felt the additional cost and complexity of boundary change is not justified, pointing to perceived minimal differences between options that request boundary change and those using existing district boundaries.

61. Neighbouring Councils

Two neighbouring principal councils responded. One supported all 2 unitary options for Derbyshire and Derby in general but did not provide comments specific to boundary change. One did not support either boundary change option, feeling that they, alongside all other options put forward, would create very large authorities.

62. Health Bodies

Three health bodies responded. One disagreed with both boundary change options, preferring an alternative 2 unitary option that it considers minimises disruption and risks for hospital discharge. One did not agree or disagree with either boundary change option but raised concerns that disaggregating a

district will lead to a loss of local knowledge that supports addressing the wider determinants of health and be more costly given that it is more complex. One did not agree or disagree with either boundary change option but flagged that either may cause disruption to key functions like trading standards and environmental health teams.

63. Education Bodies

One education body responded and preferred proposal B1 and the associated boundary change, believing it would provide the most coherent and supportive governance environment for their existing and potential learners, employers, and partnerships across the region.

64. National Bodies

The Boundary Commission response is noted above.

Comments against the criteria

65. 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:

Views expressed against this criterion were mixed, with some suggesting the boundary change options rely on unfamiliar boundaries and create significant risks to community identity, operational flexibility and parity between the two councils. Concerns from local engagement are highlighted about splitting districts and communities, cutting across partnership footprints and increasing disruption, as well as the risk of undermining Derby City's identity through its expansion.

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

Views expressed against this criterion were mixed, with respondents raising questions around the methodology and assumptions used for the financial estimates of all proposals, including the boundary change options. Supporters of boundary change options felt they would support service transformation, efficiency, economic growth and housebuilding delivery, with the proposals creating new unitary structures which would be better positioned to respond to future economic challenges.

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

While there was some recognition of the benefits of aligning boundaries such that they support authorities to better meet the needs of residents, some respondents highlighted the disruption to services and partnership arrangements, as well the risk of losing local intelligence.

68. 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:

It was noted that the proposal B1 boundary change option was not included as part of initial local engagement across Derbyshire. Respondents expressed

mixed views about the extent to which boundaries presented by proposals reflect local identities. Those in favour of the 2 Unitary A1 proposal pointed to the proposal's approach to engagement with residents, stakeholders and partners.

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

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

70. **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 across all the boundary change options were as follows:

71. **Insufficient justification for boundary change**

For both proposals that include a request for boundary change, a large proportion of respondents expressed the view that the proposals do not provide a strong or convincing justification for boundary changes. Changing boundaries is seen to increase costs, create financial inefficiencies, administrative complexity and disrupt services without clear long-term benefit.

72. **Boundary changes are illogical, harm community identities and representation**

Respondents to both proposals that include a request for a modification to achieve boundary change, expressed the view that boundary changes risk damaging established community identities. Concern was expressed that the split would create unfair distribution of resources between areas.

73. **Preference for retaining existing boundaries or geographies**

Some respondents expressed a preference for retaining existing council boundaries or geographies or pursuing alternative reforms rather than implementing boundary changes. Retaining current arrangements was seen to maintain local democracy, accountability and effective service delivery and avoid disruption.

74. **Boundary changes improve balance, coherence or alignment**

A smaller proportion of respondents expressed the view that boundary changes could create more balanced and sustainable councils in terms of population and resources, improve representation, or reflect logical and geographically coherent areas. Alignment with economic, social and housing relationships, including links with Derby City was also identified as a potential benefit.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

75. A large proportion of responses to the proposals which include a boundary change express concerns or opposition, particularly in relation to the proposed splitting of Amber Valley parishes between northern and southern unitaries. Where views are stated, many respondents favoured options that retain existing boundaries. Responses highlighted the additional complexity of boundary change and raised concerns relating to impacts of boundary change on community identity and cohesion, as well as democratic representation and local accountability. Respondents raised potential impacts on travel and the accessibility and coordination of services. However, some respondents supported boundary change and identified potential benefits, including improved balance between authorities and possible efficiencies.