

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 Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent was opened on 5 February and closed on 26 March 2026. We received a total of 1,875 responses.
2. The 5 proposals being consulted on were made by councils and submitted to the Government on 28 November 2026.
3. This document provides a summary of the 1,875 responses received to the Government's consultation on the proposals for future unitary local government in Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent area.
4. The Government announced to Parliament on 16 July 2026 that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government had decided to implement, subject to Parliamentary approval, **the two unitary proposal submitted by Cannock Chase District Council, East Staffordshire Borough Council, Stafford Borough Council, and Stoke-on-Trent City Council. These would comprise the current areas of:**
 - a. **North Staffordshire:** Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire Moorlands, and Stoke-on-Trent
 - b. **South Staffordshire:** Cannock Chase, East Staffordshire, Lichfield, South Staffordshire, Stafford, and Tamworth

From here, this is referred to as the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) proposal.

5. The consultation also invited views on the proposal submitted by:
6. **Staffordshire County Council proposed 2 unitary councils across the whole area of Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent, comprising the areas of:**
 - a. **East Staffordshire:** East Staffordshire, Lichfield, Staffordshire Moorlands, Stoke-on-Trent, and Tamworth
 - b. **West Staffordshire:** Cannock Chase, Newcastle-under-Lyme, South Staffordshire, and Stafford

From here, this is referred to as the 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council) proposal.

7. **Staffordshire Moorlands District Council proposed 2 unitary councils across the whole area of Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent, comprising the areas of:**
 - a. **North Staffordshire:** Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire Moorlands, plus 16 parishes from East Staffordshire and 6 from Stafford

- b. Southern and Mid-Staffordshire:** Cannock Chase, Lichfield, South Staffordshire, Tamworth, and the remaining 22 parishes of East Staffordshire, and 34 parishes of Stafford

From here, this is referred to as the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) proposal.

- 8. **Lichfield District Council, South Staffordshire Borough Council, Tamworth Borough Council proposed 3 unitary councils across the whole area of Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent, comprising the areas of:**
 - a. **North Staffordshire:** Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire Moorlands, and Stoke-on-Trent
 - b. **South-West Staffordshire:** Cannock Chase, South Staffordshire, and Stafford
 - c. **South-East Staffordshire:** Lichfield, East Staffordshire, and Tamworth

From here, this is referred to as the 3 unitary proposal.

- 9. **Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council proposed 4 unitary councils across the whole area of Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent, comprising the areas of:**
 - a. **Unitary Authority 1:** Newcastle-under-Lyme
 - b. **Unitary Authority 2:** Cannock Chase, South Staffordshire, and Stafford
 - c. **Unitary Authority 3:** Staffordshire Moorlands, and Stoke-on-Trent
 - d. **Unitary Authority 4:** East Staffordshire, Lichfield and Tamworth.

From here, this is referred to as the 4 unitary proposal.

- 10. The consultation on these proposals has informed an assessment of the merits of each proposal. All the proposals have been considered carefully, alongside the responses received to this consultation, representations and any other relevant information, in assessing the proposals against the criteria before a judgement was taken on which proposal to implement.
- 11. The criteria by which proposals for local government reorganisation have been assessed are set out in the letter of invitation, sent to councils in area on 5 February 2025 [Letter of Invitation](#). The consultation asked questions relating to the criteria for each of the above proposals.
- 12. This consultation relates to the structure of local government in Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent. These proposals relate to England only.

Methodology

- 13. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 states that the Secretary of State may not implement a proposal unless they have consulted with every authority affected by the proposal and other such other

persons as they consider appropriate. Those councils and persons considered appropriate are hereafter referred to as 'named consultees'.

14. The list of named consultees is available on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk).
15. In addition, the Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government (the Ministry) welcomed the views of any other persons or bodies interested in these proposals, including local residents, town and parish councils, businesses and the voluntary and community sector.
16. The Ministry used Citizen Space, a third-party consultation programme to collect responses. Citizen Space was open to both named consultees and all other interested parties. Further information on the statutory basis for, and methodology of, the consultation is provided on the [publication page](#).
17. Responses to the consultation were also received by email and letter.
18. The Ministry used a tool named Consult AI to assist in the analysis of responses. The AI tool identified themes present in the responses which Ministry officials have checked for accuracy. The tool did not have access to any personal data. All responses from named consultees were read by Ministry staff.
19. 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

20. 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
21. The questions were as follows:
 - a) **Question 1:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?
 - b) **Question 2:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?
 - c) **Question 3:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?
 - d) **Question 4:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that this proposal will put local government in the area as a whole on a firmer footing, particularly

given that some councils in the area are in receipt of exceptional financial support?

- e) **Question 5:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?
- f) **Question 6:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?
- g) **Question 7:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?
- h) **Question 8:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?
- i) **Question 9:** If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-8 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on the proposal.
- j) **Question 10:** This is a proposal that 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? - Prop 3 Q10.
- k) **Question 11:** If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 10 (Proposal 3 only)

Summary of responses

22. There were 1,875 responses to this consultation, 28 from named consultees and 1,847 other respondents.

Responses from named consultees

Named Consultee respondents	Number of Responses
Principal councils	10
Neighbouring councils	3
Strategic Authority	0
Health Bodies	4
Police and Fire	1
Education Bodies	3
Other Public Sector	1
Voluntary and Community Sector	2
Business Organisations	1
National Bodies	3

Other named consultees	0
Total named consultees	28

Reponses from other respondents

<i>Other respondents</i>	Number of Responses
Individual living in Staffordshire Stoke on Trent	1702
Individual not living in affected area or who did not specify their location	61
Organisation	84
Total other respondents	1,847
Total responses (Including named consultees)	1,875

Summary of findings

23. Tables in this report included numbers rounded to the nearest whole number, and as such, not all cumulative scores will equal 100%.
24. 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.
25. For the purposes of this document we have classified positive responses as strongly agree, somewhat agreed or agree and negative responses as somewhat disagree or disagree and strongly disagree.
26. 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.
27. Responses received by email and post are not included in the respondent count for questions 9 and 11. A summary of the relevant views expressed in those responses against each criterion is included within the summary of free text responses for each respondent type.
28. 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.

29. 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 (Cannock Chase)	11,546	31%	57%	10%	2%
2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	11,096	14%	76%	8%	2%
2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	12,114	25%	63%	10%	2%
3 unitary	11,122	40%	49%	9%	2%
4 unitary	12,068	39%	50%	9%	2%

30. 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 second preference is for 4 unitary at 39% positive responses, and third preference is for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) at 31% 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>
2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	128	63%	9%	21%	6%
2 unitary (Staffordshire	119	25%	41%	27%	7%

County Council)					
2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	135	42%	22%	29%	7%
3 unitary	127	33%	30%	30%	7%
4 unitary	125	15%	50%	29%	6%

31. Overall, the responses from named consultees demonstrate a clear preference for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) proposal. 63% of respondents to the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 9% of respondents provided negative responses. 27% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The second preference is for 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) at 42%, followed by the 3 unitary.

Individuals living in Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent

<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 (Cannock Chase)	10596	30%	59%	9%	2%
2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	10163	14%	76%	7%	2%
2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	11091	25%	64%	9%	2%
3 unitary	10182	40%	50%	8%	2%
4 unitary	11089	40%	50%	8%	2%

32. Overall, the responses from individuals living in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent demonstrate an equal preference for the 3 and 4 unitary proposals. 40% of respondents to both the 3 and 4 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 second preference is for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) proposal at 30% positive responses and the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) at 25% positive responses.

Individuals living outside of the affected area

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	392	33%	52%	10%	5%
2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	391	14%	71%	12%	4%
2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	423	30%	54%	12%	4%
3 unitary	383	30%	52%	14%	4%
4 unitary	448	41%	43%	12%	4%

33. Overall, the responses from individuals living outside Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent area demonstrate a preference for the 4 unitary proposal. 41% of respondents to the 4 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 43% of respondents provided negative responses. 16% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. Second preference is for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) at 33% positive responses, followed by both the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) at 30% and 3 unitary with 30% positive responses.

Organisations

<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 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	430	43%	34%	20%	3%
Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	423	13%	72%	12%	3%
Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	465	24%	54%	16%	6%

Total all responses 3 unitary	430	47%	35%	16%	2%
Total all responses 4 unitary	406	17%	60%	19%	4%

34. Overall, the responses from organisations demonstrate a marginal preference for the 3 unitary proposal. 47% of respondents to the 3 unitary proposal provided positive responses to the questions and 35% of respondents provided negative responses. 18% were responses of neither agree nor disagree or don't know. The next most popular option was 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) with 43% positive responses, followed by 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) at 24% positive responses.

Analysis of responses by question

Question 1: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council 3 unitary	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
Principal Council 4 Unitary	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

Neighbouring Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	0%	67%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 3 unitary	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 4 unitary	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 4 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 unitary	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)					
National Bodies 3 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	16	81%	6%	13%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	15	20%	60%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	15	53%	27%	20%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 unitary	16	56%	31%	13%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 unitary	16	19%	63%	19%	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>
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1330	41%	54%	5%	0%
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1275	16%	80%	4%	0%
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1238	32%	61%	6%	0%
Individual living in affected area 3 unitary	1275	49%	46%	5%	0%
Individual living in affected area 4 unitary	1392	45%	51%	5%	0%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	49	47%	47%	6%	0%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	49	14%	80%	6%	0%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	38%	55%	4%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 3 unitary	48	40%	48%	13%	0%
Individual living outside affected area 4 unitary	56	50%	45%	5%	0%
Organisations	54	56%	35%	9%	0%

2 unitary (Cannock Chase)					
Organisations 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	53	19%	74%	8%	0%
Organisation 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	52	31%	58%	8%	4%
Organisations 3 unitary	54	57%	31%	11%	0%
Organisations 4 unitary	51	24%	65%	10%	2%

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 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1449	42%	53%	5%	0%
Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1392	16%	79%	4%	0%
Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1352	32%	61%	7%	0%
Total all responses 3 unitary	1393	49%	46%	6%	0%
Total all responses 4 unitary	1515	44%	51%	5%	0%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council Proposal	4	50%	50%	0%	0%

2 unitary (Cannock Chase)					
Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council 3 unitary	5	60%	40%	0%	0%
Principal Council 4 unitary	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Health Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	0%	67%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 3 unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 4 unitary	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	3	67%	0%	0%	33%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 2 unitary	2	50%	0%	0%	50%

(Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Education Bodies 3 unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 4 unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%

Business Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 4 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees	16	69%	13%	13%	6%

2 unitary (Cannock Chase)					
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	15	33%	40%	20%	7%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	15	47%	27%	20%	7%
Total Named Consultees 3 unitary	16	38%	38%	19%	6%
Total Named Consultees 4 unitary	16	19%	56%	19%	6%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1329	33%	57%	8%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1272	16%	76%	6%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1235	27%	63%	9%	1%
Individual living in affected area 3 unitary	1275	43%	49%	7%	2%
Individual living in affected area 4 unitary	1389	41%	51%	7%	1%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	49	39%	53%	6%	2%

Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	49	14%	73%	10%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	38%	55%	6%	0%
Individual living outside affected area 3 unitary	48	31%	54%	13%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 4 unitary	56	43%	45%	9%	4%
Organisations 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	54	46%	35%	17%	2%
Organisations 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	53	17%	70%	13%	0%
Organisation 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	52	23%	54%	17%	6%
Organisations 3 unitary	53	51%	32%	17%	0%
Organisations 4 unitary	51	20%	57%	20%	4%

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 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1448	34%	56%	8%	2%
Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1389	16%	75%	7%	2%

Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1349	28%	62%	9%	2%
Total all responses 3 unitary	1392	43%	48%	7%	2%
Total all responses 4 unitary	1512	40%	51%	7%	1%

Question3: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council 3 unitary	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
Principal Council 4 unitary	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

(Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies 3 unitary	3	0%	0%	100%	0%
Health Bodies 4 unitary	3	0%	33%	67%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	3	67%	0%	0%	33%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 3 unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 4 unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	0%	50%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies proposal 4 unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

4 unitary					
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 3 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 4 unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	16	56%	13%	19%	13%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	15	33%	27%	27%	13%
Total Named Consultees 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	15	47%	13%	27%	13%
Total Named Consultees 3 unitary	16	13%	44%	31%	13%
Total Named Consultees 4 unitary	16	6%	56%	25%	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>
Individual living in affected area	1326	33%	58%	8%	1%

2 unitary (Cannock Chase)					
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1271	18%	71%	9%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1230	28%	62%	9%	2%
Individual living in affected area 3 unitary	1273	39%	52%	7%	1%
Individual living in affected area 4 unitary	1387	38%	55%	6%	1%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	49	35%	49%	14%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	49	22%	65%	10%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	38%	53%	6%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 3 unitary	48	29%	58%	13%	0%
Individual living outside affected area 4 unitary	56	39%	50%	9%	2%
Organisations 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	54	44%	30%	22%	4%
Organisations 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	52	13%	67%	15%	4%

Organisation 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	52	27%	46%	21%	6%
Organisations 3 unitary	54	44%	37%	17%	2%
Organisations 4 unitary	50	12%	70%	16%	2%

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 2 unitary (Cannock Chase)	1445	28%	60%	10%	3%
Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1389	14%	75%	9%	2%
Total all responses 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1346	24%	62%	11%	3%
Total all responses 3 unitary	1391	35%	52%	10%	3%
Total all responses 4 unitary	1508	35%	53%	9%	3%

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

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	4	50%	50%	0%	0%

Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal 3 Unitary	5	60%	40%	0%	0%
Principal Council 4 Unitary	4	0%	100%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

Strategic Authority 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Health Bodies 3 Unitary	2	0%	0%	100%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	67%	0%	0%	33%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%

Education Bodies4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other Public Sector4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	0%	50%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

Business Bodies proposal 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 3 Unitary (Lichfield)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	16	50%	13%	25%	13%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	14	21%	29%	36%	14%
Total Named Consultees 2	15	47%	13%	27%	13%

Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	16	19%	31%	38%	13%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary	15	0%	53%	33%	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>
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1326	27%	62%	9%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1273	14%	76%	8%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1233	23%	64%	10%	2%
Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary	1274	36%	52%	10%	2%
Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary	1387	37%	53%	8%	3%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	49	22%	51%	18%	8%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	49	8%	65%	20%	6%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary	47	26%	49%	19%	6%

(Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary	48	23%	58%	13%	6%
Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary	56	34%	52%	9%	5%
Organisations 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	54	39%	37%	22%	2%
Organisations 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	53	11%	75%	9%	4%
Organisation 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	51	25%	51%	16%	8%
Organisations 3 Unitary	53	45%	42%	11%	2%
Organisations 4 Unitary	50	10%	62%	24%	4%

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 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1445	28%	60%	10%	3%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1389	14%	75%	9%	2%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1346	24%	62%	11%	3%
Total all responses 3 Unitary	1391	35%	52%	10%	3%

Total all responses 4 Unitary	1508	35%	53%	9%	3%
-------------------------------	------	-----	-----	----	----

Question 5: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal 3 Unitary	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
Principal Council 4 Unitary	4	0%	100%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 Unitary (Lichfield)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire	3	0%	0%	0%	0%

County Council)					
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 3 Unitary	3	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary	3	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	67%	0%	0%	33%

Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	0%	0%	50%	50%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2	2	0%	50%	0%	50%

Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)					
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies propo sal 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)					
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	16	63%	6%	19%	13%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshir e County Council)	15	27%	40%	20%	13%

Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	15	40%	20%	27%	13%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	16	25%	31%	31%	13%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary	15	13%	53%	20%	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>
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1325	26%	60%	12%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1269	14%	76%	9%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1227	23%	64%	11%	2%
Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary	1269	38%	50%	9%	2%
Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary	1386	39%	50%	10%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	49	29%	55%	14%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	49	14%	76%	8%	2%

Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	32%	53%	13%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary	48	25%	63%	10%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary	56	38%	43%	14%	5%
Organisations 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	53	42%	34%	23%	2%
Organisations 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	53	11%	74%	11%	4%
Organisation 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	51	24%	55%	16%	6%
Organisations 3 Unitary	54	43%	35%	19%	4%
Organisations 4 Unitary	51	14%	59%	24%	4%

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 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1443	28%	58%	12%	2%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1386	14%	75%	9%	2%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1340	23%	63%	11%	3%

Total all responses 3 Unitary (Lichfield)	1387	38%	50%	10%	2%
Total all responses 4 Unitary (Newcastle Under Lyme)	1508	38%	50%	10%	2%

Question 6: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal 3 Unitary (Lichfield)	5	80%	20%	0%	0%
Principal Council 4 Unitary (Newcastle Under Lyme)	5	20%	40%	40%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%

Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	33%	0%	0%	67%

Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	3	33%	0%	0%	67%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	33%	0%	0%	67%
Health Bodies 3 Unitary	3	33%	0%	0%	67%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary	3	33%	0%	0%	67%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2	3	67%	0%	0%	33%

Unitary – (Cannock Chase)					
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	0%	0%	50%	50%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community	2	0%	100%	0%	0%

Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)					
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies propos al 4 Unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire	1	0%	0%	100%	0%

County Council)					
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	16	56%	13%	25%	6%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	15	13%	53%	27%	7%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary	15	33%	27%	33%	7%

(Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	16	38%	25%	31%	6%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary	16	25%	31%	38%	6%

Individuals and Organisation (not named consultees)

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1321	24%	64%	10%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1273	11%	82%	5%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1232	21%	68%	8%	3%
Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary	1273	39%	49%	9%	3%
Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary	1382	42%	48%	8%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	49	29%	55%	6%	10%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	49	10%	67%	14%	8%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	21%	57%	15%	6%

Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary	48	29%	46%	17%	8%
Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary	56	39%	34%	20%	7%
Organisations 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	54	33%	39%	22%	6%
Organisations 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	53	8%	75%	11%	6%
Organisation 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	52	19%	56%	13%	12%
Organisations 3 Unitary	54	46%	35%	15%	4%
Organisations 4 Unitary	51	20%	57%	16%	8%

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 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1440	25%	62%	10%	2%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1390	10%	81%	6%	3%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1346	21%	67%	9%	4%
Total all responses 3 Unitary	1391	39%	48%	10%	3%

Total all responses 4 Unitary	1505	41%	47%	9%	3%
-------------------------------	------	-----	-----	----	----

Question 7: To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	4	75%	25%	0%	0%
Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
Principal Council proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
Principal Council proposal 3 Unitary	5	60%	20%	20%	0%
Principal Council 4 Unitary	5	20%	60%	20%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%

Health Bodies 3 Unitary	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	0%	0%	50%	50%

Education Bodies 4 Unitary	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Voluntary and Community	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

Sector 4 Unitary					
Business Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Business Bodies proposal 4 Unitary	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

(Staffordshire County Council)					
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	16	75%	6%	19%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	15	40%	33%	27%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	15	60%	13%	27%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	15	40%	20%	33%	7%
Total Named Consultees 4	16	19%	50%	31%	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>
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1317	32%	53%	11%	4%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary	1264	14%	68%	12%	5%

(Staffordshire County Council)					
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1231	25%	59%	13%	4%
Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary	1272	37%	49%	10%	4%
Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary	1383	35%	50%	10%	5%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	49	33%	49%	10%	8%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	49	16%	59%	16%	8%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	28%	51%	15%	6%
Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary	47	28%	47%	17%	9%
Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary	56	38%	45%	13%	5%
Organisations 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	53	40%	25%	30%	6%
Organisations 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	53	13%	64%	19%	4%
Organisation 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	51	24%	45%	27%	4%
Organisations 3 Unitary	54	43%	31%	22%	4%
Organisations 4 Unitary	51	16%	53%	27%	4%

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 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1435	32%	51%	12%	5%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1381	15%	67%	13%	5%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1344	25%	57%	14%	4%
Total all responses 3 Unitary	1388	37%	48%	11%	4%
Total all responses 4 Unitary	1506	35%	50%	11%	5%

Question 8 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Summary of Named Consultee Responses

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Principal Council Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire)	4	25%	50%	25%	0%

County Council)					
Principal Council proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
Principal Council proposal 3 Unitary	5	60%	20%	20%	0%
Principal Council 4 Unitary	4	0%	75%	25%	0%
Neighbouring Council 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 3 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority Proposal 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 2	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)					
Strategic Authority pro posal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority pro posal 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strategic Authority 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Health Bodies 3 Unitary (Lichfield)	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Health Bodies 4 Unitary	3	33%	0%	67%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)					
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	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	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 3 Unitary	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Education Bodies 4 Unitary	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Public Sector 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 3 Unitary	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 4 Unitary	2	0%	50%	50%	0%

Business Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Business Bodies proposal 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 3 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 4 Unitary	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 3 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Named consultees 4 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	16	56%	6%	38%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	15	13%	47%	40%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	15	33%	27%	40%	0%
Total Named Consultees 3 Unitary	16	38%	19%	44%	0%
Total Named Consultees 4 Unitary	15	20%	33%	47%	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>
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary –	1322	24%	65%	10%	1%

(Cannock Chase)					
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1266	11%	82%	5%	2%
Individual living in affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1236	22%	68%	8%	2%
Individual living in affected area 3 Unitary	1271	42%	49%	8%	2%
Individual living in affected area 4 Unitary	1383	44%	46%	9%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	49	31%	59%	6%	4%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	48	8%	81%	6%	4%
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	23%	53%	19%	4%
Individual living outside affected area 3 Unitary	48	33%	46%	19%	2%
Individual living outside affected area 4 Unitary	56	45%	32%	20%	4%
Organisations 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	54	41%	41%	17%	2%
Organisations 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	53	13%	74%	9%	4%
Organisation 2 Unitary	52	23%	58%	15%	4%

(Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Organisations 3 Unitary	54	46%	33%	19%	2%
Organisations 4 Unitary	51	22%	57%	18%	4%

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 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	1441	25%	63%	10%	1%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	1382	11%	81%	6%	2%
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1350	23%	66%	9%	2%
Total all responses 3 Unitary	1389	42%	48%	9%	2%
Total all responses 4 Unitary	1505	43%	45%	10%	2%

Question 9: If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-8 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on this proposal.

<i>Respondent type/Proposal</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
Total all responses 2 Unitary – (Cannock Chase)	13	734	34	35
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council)	13	735	32	39

Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	13	672	27	37
Total all responses 3 Unitary	14	707	28	41
Total all responses 4 Unitary	10	813	42	37

35. We also received 69 responses by email and post. 12 were from named consultees, 12 were from individuals living in area, 21 were from individuals not in area or who did not specify their location, 36 were from organisations. A summary of the views shared in these responses is included within the summaries below.

Summary of named consultee responses

36. Principal Councils

Principal councils supported those proposals that they had put forward. Principal councils who challenged other proposals and raised concerns over issues such as complex boundary changes, weak support locally, poor geographic and economic fit, disruption to established partnership and service delivery. There was strong opposition to the social care disaggregation and financial viability within the 4 unitary proposal.

37. Neighbouring principal councils

Neighbouring principal councils were either neutral or indicated a preference for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) proposal, while noting the interplays with devolution and supporting outcome delivery across a wider geographic area.

38. Health Bodies

There were mixed views across health bodies. There was broad support for either the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) based on alignment with current service delivery footprints and partnership working, or the 3 unitary which is seen as a pragmatic solution for patient flows in the South of the area. Opponents of the 2 unitary (Staffordshire County Council) note the East/West split does not align well with existing health, local government and education systems, and raise concerns about the distance from top to bottom of these authorities. Some support for the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) for alignment to current service delivery footprints, but concerns expressed about the boundary change and complicated disaggregation. Opponents of the 4 unitary raised concerns about significant fragmentation, service disruption, and the viability of the smaller authority for delivering services.

39. Other public sector

One respondent provided broad views without specifying a preferred proposal.

40. Education Bodies

Support was expressed from education bodies for a north/south split, preferring the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) proposal, with some support for the 2 unitary

(Staffordshire Moorlands). A north-south split, particularly 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) is seen as reflecting travel to learn patterns and aligning with the functional economic, labour market and service geographies.

41. Voluntary and Community Sector

There was broad support for a north-south split from voluntary sector respondents, with preference for a 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) and a 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) as best aligning with current service delivery. They raised that additional attention is required to ensure rural areas are not disadvantaged through a north-south proposal where the north unitary risks being dominated by Stoke-on-Trent.

42. Business Bodies

One respondent business body set out a preference for two unitary councils, with a preference for a north/south division which best reflects existing community ties, travel patterns, and service delivery relationships. They could also support an east/west division too. They noted opposition to the 3 unitary and 4 unitary proposals.

Comments against the criteria

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

Respondents preferred a north-south division, with a preference for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) as best aligning with functional economic areas, service footprints, and commuting patterns. Responses noted that the proposal keeps Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme together, that would support housing and growth around Stoke-on-Trent, and would also align with existing health, education, transport and partnership arrangements. While the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) is also on a north-south division, concerns were raised about the complexity and cost of a boundary change and the impact on local identifies. The 3 unitary was also broadly supported as a sensible geographic footprint, though concerns were raised about efficiency and additional service fragmentation. The 4 unitary has some resident support however the majority of named consultees opposed this proposal as poorly evidenced, with additional disaggregation of services compounded by establishing a very small Newcastle-under-Lyme council.

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

Respondents had a preference for larger unitary authorities to be better able to deliver efficiencies, build capacity and withstand financial shocks. Across all proposals concerns were raised about the financial position of Stoke-on-Trent for whichever authority the city is included within. Support was strongest for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) as the most financially resilient proposal. Concerns were raised about the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) high estimated transition costs and a costly boundary modification proposal. Concerns were raised about the efficiency of the 3 unitary and 4 unitary proposals, with opposition concerns greatest regarding the proposed very small Newcastle-

under-Lyme council given the small tax base, lower savings and adult social care sustainability concerns.

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

The two-unitary proposals were generally seen as better able to protect high quality and sustainable public services, because they reduce fragmentation, limit the number of organisational interfaces, and provide greater scale for adult social care, children's services, SEND, transport and wider public service delivery. Support was strongest for the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) as it aligns with existing health, care, commissioning, hospital discharge and partnership arrangements. Respondents noted that the 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council) has some scale benefits but is weakened by poor alignment with health and service delivery footprints, while the 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) has similar North/South integration benefits but is weakened by boundary-change complexity and disaggregation risks. Respondents noted the 3 Unitary has some advantages from maintaining a coherent North Staffordshire footprint and more localised southern geographies, but raises concerns about additional interfaces, service fragmentation and statutory leadership requirements. The 4 Unitary presents the greatest risk, with significant concerns that four smaller authorities would fragment services, increase complexity, weaken social care and SEND resilience, and undermine integrated public service delivery.

46. For criterion 4: Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views:

Consultation responses raised common concerns about the adequacy and transparency of the process. Respondents felt the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) was based on extensive local engagement, while 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) was said to reflect a range of local views, though feedback was mixed in areas affected by boundary change. The 3 Unitary had the strongest public and organisational support. Concerns were raised about the 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council) as lacking wider community support. Opponents also raised concerns the 4 Unitary proposal engagement process was focused mainly on Newcastle-under-Lyme rather than the whole Staffordshire area. Across all proposals, respondents raised concerns that decisions should better reflect local identity, historic boundaries and community views.

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

Respondents felt all options could support devolution by enabling constituent membership of a new Strategic Authority. The two-unitary options were generally viewed more favourably by transport officials because they avoid splitting transport and highways functions before any future Strategic Authority arrangements are established. The 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) appears strongest overall, as it was described as a robust platform for devolution, aligns with sensible economic geographies and had the strongest organisational support. Though similar benefits for the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands), opponents raised concerns around council consensus and transition risks due

to boundary change. Some support for 3 the unitary was providing a voting majority within a Foundational Strategic Authority. Concern the 4 unitary would increase complexity, weakening strategic coordination and undermining effective devolution.

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

All proposals include some commitment to neighbourhood governance and community engagement, using mechanisms such as area committees, community boards, neighbourhood hubs, parish and town councils, and community forums. However, named consultees consistently raised concerns that the proposals need more detail on how these arrangements would work in practice, including roles, accountabilities, funding, capacity and how residents would meaningfully influence decisions. Respondents supported the 2 unitary (Cannock Chase) given the proposed neighbourhood governance framework, including Neighbourhood Area Committees and a focus on local voice, accountability and inclusivity. The 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) also received some positive feedback with a structured model based on Neighbourhood Area Committees and Integrated Neighbourhood Teams, though concerns were raised about boundary changes and local identity issues. While the 2 Unitary (Staffordshire County Council) set out a good approach, respondents were concerned the east-west geography was less coherent and therefore weaker for neighbourhood empowerment. The 3 and 4 Unitary received strong resident support on local identity and keeping decision-making closer to communities.

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

Loss of local identity and creation of artificial boundaries

The proposed reorganisation, especially the East-West split, would undermine historic and community ties, erode local identity, and result in artificial administrative boundaries that could weaken effective governance.

Concerns about authority size and imbalance

Proposed authorities may be too large, imbalanced, or diverse, leading to manageability issues, unequal representation, and neglect of smaller or rural areas.

Loss of local identity and representation from larger councils

Creating larger or merged councils risks eroding local identities, reducing local representation and accountability, and disrupting established community ties, particularly in rural areas and smaller towns.

Financial unsustainability and increased costs

Concern that the reorganisation may not be financially viable, could increase bureaucracy and costs, and may fail to deliver promised efficiencies or savings.

Preservation of local identity and independence

Maintaining local identity, community ties, and council independence is crucial; mergers, especially with Stoke-on-Trent, threaten effective governance and local representation.

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

Common themes across offline non-named consultee responses include support for rationalisation into unitary authorities to improve efficiency, accountability, and service delivery, alongside consistent emphasis on maintaining strong local identity and ensuring decision-making remains close to communities. Health and social care stakeholders highlight alignment with existing service footprints and support a North Staffordshire geography. Parish councils and sector bodies stress the importance of strengthening the role of local councils and avoiding a “democratic deficit” in larger authorities. Financial sustainability and resilience are recurring considerations, with some respondents raising concerns about the ability of smaller unitary authorities to withstand financial shocks and others highlighting risks associated with merging areas with existing financial pressures, particularly relating to Stoke-on-Trent. Respondents also note potential transition risks, including disruption to partnerships and services, while identifying opportunities for improved strategic planning, clearer accountability, and economic growth under reorganisation. Some respondents raise concerns about the consultation process itself, including calls for greater evidence, longer engagement, and broader options. Overall, views are mixed, with no single proposal commanding unanimous support.

Boundary Change:

Question 10: 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 11 were asked in relation to proposal 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands).

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>
Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
Neighbouring Principal Council 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	50%	50%	0%
Strategic Authority proposal 2 Unitary	0	0%	0%	0%	0%

(Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Health Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	3	0%	67%	33%	0%
Police and Fire and Rescue Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Education Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	0%	0%	50%	50%
Other Public Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voluntary and Community Sector 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
Business Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
National Bodies 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Other named consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Named Consultees 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	15	20%	33%	40%	7%

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>
Individual living in affected area 2	1229	23%	65%	9%	3%

Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)					
Individual living outside affected area 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	47	28%	57%	9%	6%
Organisations 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	52	23%	60%	10%	8%

Total Responses Question 10

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	1343	23%	64%	10%	3%

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

<i>Respondent type</i>	<i>Total Named consultees</i>	<i>Total Individuals living in area</i>	<i>Total individuals not in area</i>	<i>Total Organisation</i>
Total all responses 2 Unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands)	11	497	25	32

51. We also received 69 responses by email and post. 12 were from named consultees, 12 were from individuals living in area, 21 were from individuals not in area or did not specify their location, 36 were from organisations. A summary of the views relevant to this question shared in these responses is included within the summaries below.

Summary of Local Government Boundary Commission (The Commission) Response

52. The Commission provided observations on the evidence provided to support the boundary change request within the 2 unitary (Staffordshire Moorlands) proposal, drawing on its Principal Area Boundary Review expertise. It considered the evidence in the proposal as it related to the identity and interests of local communities, and the promotion of effective and convenient

local government. The Commission observed that, while some evidence was provided to support the proposal in a general sense, there was less detail to support the specific boundary changes requested

Summary of named consultee responses

53. Principal Councils

Principal councils recognised the change would provide more balanced populations and service demand, and that moving Stone and parts of Uttoxeter would reflect travel to work patterns in the north. However, responses noted concern that the proposal is not supported by other Councils creating implementation uncertainty. They also raised concern that the boundary change would negatively impact community identities and does not reflect resident views. Concerns about the complexity and cost incurred from a boundary change.

54. Neighbouring principal councils

The majority of neighbouring principal councils did not express a view on the proposed boundary change modification, with one neighbouring council broadly disagreeing with this option.

55. Health Bodies

There was a mix of neutral views alongside some concerns regarding the proposed boundary change modification which could risk service delivery though increased complexity and cost. Some support for improving alignment with health body geographies, and potential to support integrated care for communities.

56. Police and Fire

Respondent provided a preference for any of the 2 unitary authorities to best support collaboration and information sharing.

57. Other public sector

Respondent did not comment on the boundary change proposal specifically.

58. Education Bodies

Support for a north-south split from education bodies, though without strong views on the boundary change modification option.

59. Voluntary and Community Sector

Some moderate support for boundary change modification option, though reassurance regarding engagement with local communities would be welcomed. Rural engagement was flagged as a concern.

60. Business Bodies

Support for all 2 unitary proposals, with a preference for a north-south configuration. No comments regarding the boundary change modification option.

Comments against the criteria

61. **For criterion 1: A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government:**
There was broad support for the north-south split being a sensible footprint for the area, and for working smaller and larger authorities. Some support for a boundary change to deliver a more balanced population, with some support for moving Stone and parts of Uttoxeter to reflect travel to work patterns in the north of Staffordshire. Others raised concerns it was not a coherent proposal and split existing districts and economic areas.
62. **For criterion 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks:**
There was a limited commentary from named consultees on boundary change modification, with some limited support that it would strengthen financial resilience by rebalancing service demand, council tax and business rate bases across Staffordshire. Concerns were raised about the cost and complexity of a boundary change, which would reduce the scale of potential savings and efficiencies.
63. **For criterion 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens:**
There was broad support for a north-south configuration to support service delivery, with some concerns the boundary change could increase complexity, cost and quality of service delivery through transition. Some support for improving alignment with health body geographies, and potential to support integrated care for communities.
64. **For criterion 4: Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views:**
There was some concern the proposal is not supported widely by principal councils, which could hinder implementation, although one named consultee acknowledged some strengths of this proposal.
65. **For criterion 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements:**
There was limited commentary on the boundary change proposal in the context of devolution, though one named consultee raised concerns the lack of consensus on this proposal could complicate devolution.
66. **For criterion 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment:**
Some concerns were expressed that the boundary change proposal does not have sufficient community and resident support, while another named consultee raised concerns about rural engagement. Some concern about community engagement and how this would be delivered alongside town and parish councils.
67. **The themes identified by the AI tool were as follows:**

Proposal lacks justification and risks negative impacts The proposal does not provide a strong case for improved public services or financial sustainability, with unclear benefits, increased costs, and efficiency concerns.

Preference for existing boundaries Retaining current boundaries or smaller councils is preferable, as major changes are unnecessary or undesirable and the current system is satisfactory.

Opposition to merging with Stoke-on-Trent Merging with Stoke-on-Trent is undesirable due to concerns about its financial management, potential dominance, and negative consequences for other areas.

Improved alignment enhances services Aligning council boundaries with natural communities, economic corridors, and service areas will improve service delivery, planning, and better reflect local ties.

Boundary changes threaten local identity and representation Altering boundaries will erode local identity, reduce representation, split established communities, and centralize decision-making, making councils less responsive to local needs.

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

Views mirrored response received from named consultees. Supporters noted the change would create a more balanced geography, better reflect economic and travel-to-work links, address existing boundary anomalies and strengthen democratic representation. While opponents highlighted that the proposed splitting of existing district areas would weaken community identity, particularly in Stone and surrounding Stafford parishes, create additional complexity, cost and service disruption, and reduce alignment with existing partnerships and local governance arrangements. Concerns were also raised about the integration of rural and urban areas, local representation, accountability and the practical delivery of services, while some respondents did not express a clear view on boundary change or focused instead on the wider reorganisation proposals.