

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 **Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire** was opened on 5 February and closed on 26 March 2026. We received a total of 1173 responses.
2. The four 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 1173 responses received to the Government's consultation on the proposals for future unitary local government in **Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire area**.
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 4 Unitary Councils** submitted by **City of Lincoln District Council**. In implementing this option, the Secretary of State will exercise the power to modify the proposal to achieve the boundary changes requested by the City of Lincoln District Council. These new councils will comprise of the current areas of:
5. From here, this is referred to as the '**4 Unitary City**'.
6. **The consultation also invited views on the proposal submitted by Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council and South Holland District Council proposed 2 unitary councils submitted by South East Lincolnshire Partnership.**
 - a. **Northern Lincolnshire:** Lincoln, North-East Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and West Lindsey.
 - b. **Southern Lincolnshire:** Boston, East Lindsey, South Holland, North Kesteven and South Kesteven
7. From here, this is referred to as the '**2 Unitary**'.
8. **The consultation also invited views on the proposal submitted by Lincolnshire County Council (supported by North East Lincolnshire and North Lincolnshire) councils proposed 3 unitary councils:**
 - a. **North East Lincolnshire** to remain unchanged
 - b. **North Lincolnshire** to remain unchanged
 - c. **Lincolnshire:** Boston, City of Lincoln, East Lindsey, North Kesteven, South Holland, South Kesteven, and West Lindsey
9. From here, this is referred to as the '**3 Unitary**'.

10. **The consultation also invited views on the proposal submitted by North Kesteven District Council and South Kesteven District Council proposed 4 unitary councils:**
 - a. **Unitary Authority 1:** North Kesteven, South Holland, South Kesteven
 - b. **Unitary Authority 2:** Boston, City of Lincoln, East Lindsey, West Lindsey
 - c. **North East Lincolnshire** to remain unchanged
 - d. **North Lincolnshire** to remain unchanged
11. From here, this is referred to as the '**4 Unitary Kestevens**'.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. This consultation relates to the structure of local government in **Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire**. These proposals relate to England only.

Methodology

15. 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'.
16. The list of named consultees is available on [gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk).
17. 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.
18. 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](#).
19. Responses to the consultation were also received by email and letter.

20. The Ministry used a tool named Consult AI to assist in the analysis of responses. The AI tool identified themes present in the responses, which MHCLG officials have checked for accuracy. The tool did not have access to any personal data. All responses from named consultees were read by Ministry staff.
21. 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

22. 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.
23. 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 changes 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

24. There were 1173 responses to this consultation, 33 from named consultees and 1140 by other respondents. Not all respondents provided an answer to each question. Please see the analysis of responses by question below for individual response data.

Responses from named consultees

Named Consultee respondents	Number of Responses
Principal councils	12
Neighbouring councils	2
Strategic Authority	2
Health Bodies	2
Police and Fire	4
Education Bodies	2
Other Public Sector	0
Voluntary and Community Sector	2
Business Organisations	1
National Bodies	4
Other named consultees	2
Total named consultees	33

Responses from other respondents

Other respondents	Number of Responses
Individual living in Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire	1,036
Individual not living in affected area or who did not specify their location	48
Organisation	56
Total other respondents (named consultees)	33
Total responses (Including named consultees)	1,173

Summary of findings

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

26. 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 agree/agree neither agreed nor disagreed, somewhat disagree/disagree, strongly disagreed, or did not know when responding to a statement.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. 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>
2 Unitary	6484	30%	57%	10%	3%
4 Unitary City	7159	26%	61%	10%	3%
3 Unitary	6458	40%	49%	9%	2%
4 Unitary – Kestevens	6537	37%	49%	11%	3%

32. Overall, the responses demonstrate a marginal preference for the **3 Unitary** proposal. 40% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive

responses to the questions and 49% of respondents provided negative responses. 11% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 4 unitary Kestevens proposal was the second most popular with 37% of respondents providing a positive response. The 4 unitary City proposal was the least popular with 26% 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>
2 Unitary	110	19%	62%	18%	1%
4 Unitary City	114	13%	65%	21%	1%
3 Unitary	111	55%	23%	22%	1%
4 Unitary – Kestevens	105	31%	41%	24%	4%

25. Overall, the responses from named consultees demonstrate a preference for the **3 Unitary**. 55% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 23% of respondents provided negative responses. 23% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 4 unitary Kestevens proposal was the second most popular with 31% of respondents providing a positive response. The 4 unitary City proposal was the least popular with 13% of respondents providing a positive response.

Individuals living in Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
2 Unitary	5891	30%	58%	9%	3%
4 Unitary City	6535	27%	62%	9%	3%
3 Unitary	5861	40%	50%	8%	2%
4 Unitary Kestevens	5943	38%	49%	11%	2%

26. Overall, the responses from the individuals living in Lincoln and Lincolnshire area demonstrate a marginal preference for the **3 Unitary**. 40% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 50% of respondents provided negative responses. 10% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 4 unitary Kestevens proposal was the second most popular with 38% of respondents providing a positive response. The 4 unitary City proposal was the least popular with 27% of respondents providing a positive response.

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>
2 Unitary	231	30%	49%	17%	3%
4 Unitary City	238	22%	60%	17%	1%
3 Unitary	202	34%	59%	5%	2%
4 Unitary Kestevens	273	32%	52%	11%	5%

27. Overall, the responses from the individuals living outside Lincoln and Lincolnshire area demonstrate a marginal preference for **the 3 Unitary** proposal. 34% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 59% of respondents provided negative responses. 7% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The 4 unitary Kestevens proposal was the second most popular with 32% of respondents providing a positive response. The 4 unitary City proposal was the least popular with 22% of respondents providing a positive response.

Organisations

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
2 Unitary	252	38%	37%	23%	3%
4 Unitary City	272	22%	44%	21%	12%
3 Unitary	284	49%	31%	18%	1%
4 Unitary Kestevens	216	33%	38%	25%	4%

28. Overall, the responses from organisations demonstrate a preference for the **3 Unitary** proposal. 49% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 31% of respondents provided negative responses. 19% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The **2 Unitary** proposal was the second most popular with 38% of respondents providing a positive response, followed by the 4 unitary Kestevens proposal with 33% of positive responses, The **4 Unitary City** proposal was the least popular with 22% of respondents providing a positive response.

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 2 Unitary</i>	7	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary City</i>	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 3 Unitary</i>	5	60%	20%	20%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	7	43%	57%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 3 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>Business Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 4 Unitary City</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 3 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	17	24%	65%	12%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	15	13%	67%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	15	60%	20%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens	15	47%	40%	13%	0%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	844	38%	58%	4%	0%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	818	31%	63%	5%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary</i>	840	46%	49%	4%	0%

<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	33	42%	45%	9%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	30	27%	60%	13%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	29	38%	59%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary</i>	39	38%	51%	5%	5%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	33	42%	45%	9%	3%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	36	42%	39%	19%	0%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	26%	44%	24%	6%
<i>Organisation 3 Unitary</i>	41	56%	32%	12%	0%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	31	39%	32%	29%	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>
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	930	38%	57%	5%	0%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	897	31%	62%	6%	1%
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	925	46%	48%	5%	0%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	936	43%	49%	7%	1%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/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 2 Unitary</i>	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary City</i>	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 3 Unitary</i>	5	80%	0%	20%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	7	29%	71%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 3 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 4 Unitary City</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 3 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	15	20%	67%	13%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	13	15%	62%	23%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	15	67%	13%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens	15	33%	47%	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 2 Unitary</i>	842	31%	59%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	818	29%	61%	9%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary</i>	838	42%	49%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	850	40%	48%	9%	3%

<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	33	30%	58%	12%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	30	20%	57%	23%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary</i>	29	38%	59%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	39	33%	54%	8%	5%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	36	36%	42%	19%	3%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	21%	47%	18%	15%
<i>Organisation 3 Unitary</i>	41	49%	32%	20%	0%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	31	35%	39%	23%	3%

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>
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	926	31%	58%	8%	2%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	895	28%	60%	10%	3%
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	923	43%	48%	8%	2%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	935	40%	47%	10%	3%

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 2 Unitary</i>	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary City</i>	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 3 Unitary</i>	7	57%	29%	14%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	7	29%	43%	29%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 3 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 4 Unitary City</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 3 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	15	40%	40%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	15	13%	73%	13%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	17	59%	24%	18%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens	15	27%	40%	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 2 Unitary</i>	843	33%	56%	9%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	819	28%	64%	7%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary</i>	836	41%	50%	7%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	849	40%	48%	10%	2%

<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	33	42%	39%	18%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	29	21%	69%	10%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary</i>	29	38%	59%	3%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	39	36%	51%	10%	3%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	36	39%	33%	25%	3%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	24%	44%	21%	12%
<i>Organisation 3 Unitary</i>	40	45%	35%	20%	0%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	31	26%	42%	29%	3%

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>
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	927	34%	54%	10%	2%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	897	27%	63%	7%	2%
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	922	42%	49%	8%	1%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	934	39%	48%	11%	2%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Council 2 Unitary</i>	7	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary City</i>	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 3 Unitary</i>	5	60%	20%	20%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	7	29%	57%	14%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 3 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 4 Unitary City</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 3 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	17	12%	71%	18%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	15	13%	67%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	15	53%	20%	27%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens	15	33%	40%	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 2 Unitary</i>	840	28%	58%	11%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	819	26%	60%	11%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary</i>	835	38%	49%	11%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	850	37%	48%	13%	3%

<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	33	24%	52%	21%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	30	20%	53%	27%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary</i>	28	29%	64%	7%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	39	31%	56%	10%	3%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	36	36%	36%	25%	3%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	24%	38%	24%	15%
<i>Organisation 3 Unitary</i>	41	51%	27%	22%	0%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	31	32%	39%	23%	6%

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>
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	926	28%	57%	12%	3%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	898	26%	59%	12%	3%
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	919	39%	48%	11%	2%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	935	36%	47%	13%	3%

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 2 Unitary</i>	7	0%	86%	14%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary City</i>	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Council 3 Unitary</i>	7	43%	43%	14%	0%
<i>Principal Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	7	14%	57%	14%	14%
<i>Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 3 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 2 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 3 Unitary</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
<i>Health Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	0%	0%	100%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

<i>National Bodies 2 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 3 Unitary</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 4 Unitary City</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 3 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	17	6%	65%	24%	6%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	15	13%	67%	13%	7%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	17	41%	29%	24%	6%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens	15	20%	40%	27%	13%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	842	24%	61%	10%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	815	23%	64%	10%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary</i>	836	35%	55%	7%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	848	33%	52%	11%	3%

<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	33	18%	48%	24%	9%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	30	20%	60%	17%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary</i>	29	28%	59%	7%	7%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	39	28%	51%	13%	8%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	36	31%	42%	22%	6%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	18%	53%	18%	12%
<i>Organisation 3 Unitary</i>	41	46%	34%	15%	5%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	31	32%	42%	23%	3%

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>
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	928	24%	60%	11%	5%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	894	23%	63%	11%	4%
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	923	35%	53%	8%	3%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	933	32%	52%	12%	4%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Council 2 Unitary</i>	5	0%	100%	0%	0%

Principal Council 4 Unitary City	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Principal Council 3 Unitary	5	60%	20%	20%	0%
Principal Council 4 Unitary Kestevens	7	29%	57%	0%	14%
Neighbouring Councils 2 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary City	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Strategic Authorities 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Health Bodies 3 Unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Education Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary	2	0%	100%	0%	0%

<i>Other named consultees 4 Unitary City</i>	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 3 Unitary</i>	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Other Named consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	15	20%	67%	13%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	13	15%	62%	23%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	15	60%	20%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens	15	27%	47%	20%	7%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	839	31%	52%	12%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	815	25%	58%	13%	4%
<i>Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary</i>	838	39%	45%	12%	3%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	846	35%	47%	15%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	33	33%	45%	15%	6%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	29	21%	55%	17%	7%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary</i>	29	34%	55%	7%	3%

<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	39	26%	49%	18%	8%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	36	36%	31%	31%	3%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	26%	35%	24%	15%
<i>Organisation 3 Unitary</i>	40	48%	30%	20%	3%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	30	27%	37%	30%	7%

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>
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	923	32%	51%	13%	4%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	891	25%	57%	13%	4%
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	922	40%	44%	13%	3%
<i>Total all responses 4 Kestevens</i>	930	34%	47%	15%	4%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Principal Councils 2 Unitary</i>	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Principal Councils 4 Unitary City</i>	5	20%	60%	20%	0%
<i>Principal Councils 3 Unitary</i>	7	43%	43%	14%	0%
<i>Principal Councils 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	7	29%	43%	14%	14%
<i>Neighbouring Councils 2 Unitary</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

Neighbouring Councils 4 Unitary City	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Councils 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Councils 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Strategic Authorities 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Health Bodies 3 Unitary	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary Kestevens	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Unitary City	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 Kestevens	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary City	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary Kestevens	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 4 Unitary City	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 3 Unitary	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Other Named consultees 4 Kestevens	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	14	14%	57%	29%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	13	15%	54%	31%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	17	47%	29%	24%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary Kestevens	15	33%	33%	27%	7%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary</i>	841	24%	65%	10%	1%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	819	27%	61%	10%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary</i>	838	35%	55%	8%	2%
<i>Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	849	34%	51%	12%	2%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary</i>	33	21%	58%	21%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	30	23%	60%	17%	0%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary</i>	29	31%	59%	7%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary - Kesteven</i>	39	31%	54%	13%	3%
<i>Organisations 2 Unitary</i>	36	44%	33%	19%	3%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	24%	41%	24%	12%
<i>Organisation 3 Unitary</i>	40	48%	30%	20%	3%

<i>Organisations 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	31	39%	35%	23%	3%
--	----	-----	-----	-----	----

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>
<i>Total all responses 2 Unitary</i>	924	25%	63%	11%	1%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	896	26%	60%	11%	2%
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	924	36%	54%	9%	2%
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	934	34%	51%	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 2 Unitary</i>	11	489	22	24
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary City</i>	10	471	20	20
<i>Total all responses 3 Unitary</i>	11	523	21	24
<i>Total all responses 4 Unitary Kestevens</i>	11	477	29	21

We also received 84 responses by email and post. 19 were from named consultees, 37 were from individuals living in area, 16 were from individuals not in area or who did not specify their location, 12 were from organisations. A summary of the views shared in these responses is included within the summaries below.

Summary of named consultee responses

29. Principal Councils

Principal councils supported those proposals that they had put forward.

30. Neighbouring Councils

One neighbouring council responded and remained neutral on the options, outlining the criteria that they felt all proposals should adhere to.

31. Health Bodies

Two health bodies responded. One did not express a preference for a particular proposal. One didn't express a preference for a particular proposal but set out the importance of reorganisation in Lincolnshire providing an opportunity to strengthen partnership working with local government.

32. Education Bodies

Two education bodies responded, both expressing a preference for the 3 Unitary proposal due to perceived benefits for planning and service delivery.

33. Voluntary and Community Sector

Two voluntary and community sector bodies responded. One expressed a preference for the 3 Unitary proposal, viewing it as supporting the voluntary and community sector landscape across Greater Lincolnshire. One expressed a preference for the 2 Unitary proposal, feeling it would best serve the interests of residents and the voluntary and community sector landscape.

34. Business Bodies

One business body responded and did not express a preference for a particular proposal.

35. Strategic Authority

Two strategic authorities responded and did not express a preference for a particular proposal.

36. Police and Fire Bodies

Four police and fire bodies responded. None expressed a preference for a particular proposal but one raised concerns about the 2 Unitary proposal, flagging the complexities of transferring responsibilities from Humberside Fire and Rescue Service to a new mayoral structure and questioned whether the proposed councils could deliver on claimed outcomes.

37. Other named consultees

Six organisations responded, with four not expressing a preference for a particular proposal. One supported the 4 Unitary City proposal, viewing it as helping to reinforce the natural socio-economic identities of the North, Middle and Southern Lincolnshire geographies. One supported the 3 Unitary proposal.

Comments against the criteria

38. 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:

Some respondents raised concerns regarding all four proposals over their respective boundaries/geographies, with concerns raised over deliverability,

financial sustainability and operational and financial planning. Those who did not support proposals challenged disaggregation costs and savings assumptions, with widespread concerns about impacts on statutory services. Supporters across the proposals felt they would provide a better alignment of housing, infrastructure and regeneration, ensuring improved housing outcomes are supported.

39. 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. Supporters across the proposals highlighted the efficiencies they set out and suggested the new unitary structures would be better positioned to respond to future economic challenges.

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

Some respondents raised concerns regarding all four proposals over the new councils' ability to deliver services, and the potential disruption to service delivery of creating large authorities that cut across existing economic and public service boundaries. Many state the proposals underestimate integration and disaggregation costs, rely on unrealistic savings assumptions, and fail to address growing service demand. Supporters across the proposals felt reorganisation would improve service delivery by bringing together fragmented responsibilities, thereby enabling more joined-up and coordinated services with clearer accountability.

41. 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:

Some felt that the models proposed across all four proposals would be more centralised, reducing community engagement, as well as local responsiveness and accountability. Supporters across the proposals pointed to their respective approaches to engagement with residents, stakeholders and partners.

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

Those not in favour of the 3 Unitary proposal felt that the scale of the proposed larger unitary would be problematic, potentially dominating regional governance structures and weakening balanced representation within the Combined County Authority. Supporters across the proposals felt their respective preferred options would unlock devolution and strengthen strategic leadership.

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

Some respondents raised concerns regarding all four proposals over their ability to enable stronger community engagement, with concerns about how

meaningful local participation in neighbourhood governance structures and responsive place-based governance would be maintained. Supporters across the proposals pointed to their respective frameworks for ongoing community and neighbourhood engagement.

The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

Large authority scale risks undermining local representation, identity and urban–rural balance

Responses to all four proposals expressed opinions that the proposed structures were too large and centralised to be managed effectively, risking unresponsiveness to local needs, weakening democratic accountability, and undermining established community and historic identities. Concerns consistently highlight the potential for urban dominance, marginalisation of rural and coastal communities, and reduced engagement, with local voices and representation seen as diminished within larger, more remote authorities.

Concerns about service disruption and misaligned boundaries

A high level of responses to the two unitary proposal specifically expressed concerns over the impact of splitting or merging services on quality and continuity.

Preference for smaller or alternative governance arrangements

For the 4 Unitary City and 3 Unitary proposals, views highlighted that alternative governance arrangements may be more appropriate, including retaining existing unitary councils, adopting smaller or more localised authorities, or aligning with historic boundaries. These are the options that were considered more logical, sustainable, and better able to reflect local needs and identities.

Concerns over financial viability and delivery of efficiencies

In responses to the 2 Unitary, 4 Unitary City and 4 Unitary Kestevens proposals there are concerns that they would not deliver anticipated efficiencies or cost savings, and potentially increase costs, create duplication, and introduce financial risks. Respondents questioned the financial sustainability and evidence base underpinning these proposals, with uncertainty over whether new structures would be viable or deliver improved value.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

Most respondents who expressed a preference favoured the **3 Unitary** proposal followed by the 4 Unitary Kestevens proposal with fewer supporting the 2 Unitary proposal, with the 4 Unitary City proposal least favoured. Many respondents did not express a clear preference.

Responses consistently raised concerns about the impact of large geographies on local representation and identity, risks to service delivery and existing partnerships, and doubts about achieving efficiency savings. Alignment under the 2 unitary with existing service boundaries was also a frequent issue, particularly for police, fire and health services. Some respondents did identify potential benefits in clearer governance, financial resilience and strategic coordination.

Question 9: One proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary changes. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change? This question and question 10 were asked in relation to proposal **4 Unitary City**.

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 4 Unitary City</i>	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
<i>Neighbouring Council 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
<i>Strategic Authorities 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Health Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Education Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Other Public Sector 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary City</i>	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Business Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>National Bodies 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
<i>Other named consultees 4 Unitary City</i>	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary City	15	7%	67%	27%	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 4 Unitary City</i>	812	23%	64%	10%	3%
<i>Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary City</i>	30	23%	63%	13%	0%
<i>Organisations 4 Unitary City</i>	34	15%	53%	21%	12%

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 4 Unitary City</i>	891	22%	64%	11%	3%

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

<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 4 Unitary City</i>	6	326	18	14

We also received 84 responses by email and post. 19 were from named consultees, 37 were from individuals living in area, 16 were from individuals not in area or did not specify their location, 12 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

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England provided observations on the evidence provided to support the boundary change request for the 4 unitary

(City) proposal 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, while efforts have been made to support the proposals in a general sense, there was little detail to support the specific boundary changes that were put forward, particularly in terms of community identity and local linkages.

Summary of named consultee responses

28. Principal Councils

Councils opposing the boundary change felt it would increase the likelihood of disruption to key services and give the proposed larger Lincoln City unitary a disproportionate advantage in terms of resource allocation.

29. Neighbouring Councils

One neighbouring council responded and did not offer a view on the boundary change.

30. Health Bodies

Two health bodies responded. Neither offered a view on the boundary change.

31. Other public sector

Two strategic authorities responded and did not offer a view on the boundary change.

Four police and fire bodies responded. None offered a view on the boundary change.

Six other organisations responded, with two neither agreeing or disagreeing with the boundary change. Four did not offer a view on the boundary change.

32. Education Bodies

Two education bodies responded. One strongly opposed the boundary change but did not offer additional comments to explain their view. One did not offer a view on the boundary change.

33. Business Bodies

One business body responded and did not offer a view on the boundary change.

Comments against the criteria

34. 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:.

Those not in favour of the boundary change option raised concerns over the proposed boundaries, with some concerns raised over deliverability and

financial sustainability. Some challenged the disaggregation costs and savings assumptions set out in the proposal, with concerns about impacts on statutory services. Those in favour of the boundary change option felt it would provide a better alignment of housing, infrastructure and regeneration, ensuring improved housing outcomes are supported.

35. 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 regarding the potential benefits of the proposed boundary change. Those in favour of the boundary change option highlighted the efficiencies it sets out and suggested the new unitary structures would be better positioned to respond to future economic challenges.

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

Those not in favour of the boundary change option raised concerns over the model's ability to deliver services, with concerns being raised over potential disruption of service delivery by creating larger authorities that cut across existing economic and public service boundaries. Some state the proposal underestimates aggregation and disaggregation costs, relies on unrealistic savings assumptions, and fails to address growing service demand. Those in favour of the boundary change option felt the proposal would improve service delivery by bringing together fragmented responsibilities, thereby enabling more joined-up and coordinated services with clearer accountability.

37. 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:

Respondents felt that the boundary change option would be more centralised, reduce community engagement, as well as local responsiveness and accountability. Those in favour of the boundary change option pointed to the proposal's approaches to engagement with residents, stakeholders and partners.

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

Comments on boundary change did not relate to criterion 5.

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

Comments on boundary change did not relate to criterion 6.

The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:

1. Lack of justification, evidence and clarity

Many respondents expressed the view that the proposal lacked robust evidence, clear benefits and sufficient detail to support boundary change, with some concerns raised about the extent of consultation undertaken for the proposal.

2. Risks to service delivery, communities and rural areas

Some respondents felt that boundary changes were likely to disrupt or impact public services, increase complexity and costs, and fragment service delivery. Concerns were raised about community cohesion, local democracy and whether the proposed model would meet the needs of rural areas, including the potential for urban-rural divides to widen.

3. Preference for existing boundaries or alternative models

Some respondents preferred maintaining current boundaries or adopting alternative governance arrangements, such as a single authority or wider strategic models, which they felt better reflect local identities, economic relationships and existing functional geographies.

4. Alignment with economic and urban geography can be beneficial

Some respondents supported boundary change where it aligns with urban growth, commuting patterns and economic linkages, suggesting that revised boundaries could support more coherent governance, strategic planning and efficient service delivery.

Summary of paper and emailed non-named consultee responses

Many respondents expressed concerns or opposition to boundary change, particularly to the proposed splitting of North Kesteven and West Lindsey. Concerns were expressed that the proposed boundaries do not align with existing economic, social or service geographies and that boundary change would create greater complexity as the new model was implemented. Where respondents supported boundary change, it was seen as addressing the city being under bounded and better reflecting how people live and access services.