

BCC Response Statement

Response to Inspector's Preliminary Comments Regarding Housing Provision dated 26 August 2010

The Inspector's comments dated are shown *in italics* below. The Council response is shown in normal type face.

1. With the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy it is for the Council to determine the appropriate level of housing provision and to support that figure with evidence to be tested at Examination. The Council is suggesting a change to the submitted Core Strategy to indicate a reduction in the firm commitment to housing delivery to 26,400, with an aspiration for 30,000. In the light of the statements of the Council and others I have several concerns. I highlight these now so that the Council can consider the most appropriate way of proceeding.

The Council proposes that the Core Strategy aspires to the delivery of 30,000 homes, as reflected in its spatial strategy, with a delivery target minimum of 26,400 homes. The DCLG letter of 6 July confirms that it is for local authorities to determine housing levels and to justify the approach.

2. The Council's statement is commendably succinct, but provides only a brief assessment of some of the factors identified in PPS3 (paragraph 33) to be taken into account in assessing the need and demand for housing in the city (against which to compare or balance housing land supply considerations).

Although PPS3 remains extant, some caution must be applied in using paragraph 33 as the abolition of the regional structure means that the paragraph can no longer achieve its previous overall purpose (it led inevitably to paragraph 34 which describes a process which has now ended). Paragraph 32 has to be read in conjunction with paragraph 33 and refers to taking into account local and national policies.

The letter and guidance from the DCLG of 6 July makes no specific reference to paragraph 33, only to justifying levels 'in line' with PPS3. It is noted that existing PPSs are due to be replaced in the future by the National Planning Framework.

At Appendix 1 of this note the Council sets out a response to all the matters raised in PPS3 paragraph 33. This shows that, where relevant, the issues and evidence sources identified have been taken into account in determining an appropriate level of housing for Bristol.

I am unclear what conclusion the Council draws from the SHMA on market demand.

See Appendix 1.

The Council indicates considerable caution should be applied to the use of the most recent household projections. It is unclear what significance the Council attaches to the earlier household projections which informed the EIP Panel's recommendation for 30,000 dwellings (2003 based figures) and, in part, the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to 36,500 dwellings (2004 based figures). In both cases the recommended housing provision fell short of the projections.

It can be concluded that both the Panel, and the then Secretary of State were content to indicate a housing figure for Bristol that fell short of household projections. Household projections are useful evidence but they are not the sole determinant of housing levels in development plans. For Bristol the appropriate approach is for the Council to make a choice about housing provision based on a balance between objectives for providing new homes, establishing sustainable patterns of development, identifying deliverable supply, addressing other key planning aims and taking into account the views of the local community. This is consistent with the approach indicated by the Government in the 6 July letter and in other statements.

There is no reference to any of the advice from the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit. Although the unit has been closed, I am not aware that the reference to it has been deleted from PPS3. Its previously published advice is still available at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/nhpau/keypublications/reports/>

The fact that the NHPAU has been closed is material to these considerations. The DCLG website confirms that the documents available to view are archived. (*'The National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU) is now closed. This information is being maintained for archive/historical purposes only.'*) It is questionable whether archived advice from a former body can appropriately be taken into account when considering the current issues for housing levels in Bristol. The NHPAU no longer exists and its current advice cannot be sought.

The particular reference to the advice of the NHPAU was about 'the impact of the proposals for affordability **in the region**' (Council's emphasis) and this statement was clearly drafted in the context of an approach to housing provision which included a regional structure. That structure no longer exists and the Government has said that housing levels are for local decision.

Given the size and significance of Bristol City within the West of England sub region, I consider that the assessment of appropriate housing provision should be informed by discussion with adjoining authorities (this is my reading of the first sentence of paragraph 33 even when Regional has been deleted).

Paragraph 33 cannot straightforwardly be applied in the new context by removing the words associated with RSS. Paragraph 33 may have intended to only refer to LAs and RPBs working with each other as part of the regional structure. It cannot be known whether it implied LAs should work together in circumstances with no regional structure. There is no reference in paragraph 33 to the assessment of appropriate housing provision being informed by discussion with adjoining authorities. Neither is there such a reference in the DCLG letter of 6 July.

Paragraph 33 makes references to sub-regional and regional level of housing provision. The Government has confirmed that the level of housing is to be determined by local authorities. There are no policy structures for determining sub-regional and regional level of housing set out by the Government.

That said, the approach to housing in the sub region under the previous system was undertaken in the context of cross boundary liaison, including the preparation of the SHMA. Bristol City Council proposes to retain its overall aspiration for the delivery of 30,000 homes which is consistent in general terms with the approach that was emerging through the former RSS process.

The Core Strategy can only make provision within Bristol. It is not a vehicle for determining appropriate levels in surrounding areas. However, in terms of consistency of approach across boundaries, the current positions of neighbouring authorities are set out in the Council's statement of 20 August (in response to the Inspector's questions about Green Belt). The Core Strategy's approach to Green Belt appears to be complementary to the approaches emerging in the neighbouring authorities. There is no indication that the level and distribution of homes proposed in Bristol, or the approach to the Green Belt, would detract from the ambitions of the neighbouring authorities as they are currently known.

No observations were received from the neighbouring authorities about the proposals for housing set out in the published Core Strategy (although there was a representation from Bath and North East Somerset raising concerns about the Green Belt contingency in southeast Bristol). The Council proposes that the overall aspiration for 30,000 homes is retained. This is consistent with the publication version.

The changes proposed to the Core Strategy, including the approach to housing, would be subject to a further period of consultation if the Inspector determines this is the appropriate course of action following the hearing sessions.

In proposing changes to the housing requirements in the emerging RSS the Secretary of State set out a number of (evidence based) reasons for increasing housing provision above that recommended by the Panel (CDE51 RS2 pp49-57). Which of these considerations do the Council consider remain relevant to assessing housing provision in the city?

It is not considered appropriate to attach significant weight to either the figure advanced by the Secretary of State in July 2008 or to the reasoning around that figure. RSSs have now been revoked and the emerging RSS for SW England has been abandoned. The figure advanced by the then Secretary of State was not subject to further scrutiny.

The statements in pages 49 to 57 now have very limited relevance. They set out overall regional considerations, referring to the entire South West region from Swindon to Penzance. The reasons are couched in the context of RSS (including a reference to early review of RSS which will not now occur).

There are references to the then Government's Housing Green Paper which included objectives inconsistent with the recent revocation of RSS.

There is no specific reference to Bristol in pages 49 to 57. It is not clear whether any consideration was given by the Secretary of State to the capacity of Bristol to deliver the number indicated. No evidence was put forward to support this.

Page 51 says that the now abandoned RSS needed to take account of the direction of travel of the then Government's strategic housing and planning policy objectives. It is appropriate for the current direction of travel to be reflected in the Bristol Core Strategy.

More generally, how has consideration of housing provision been related to expectations of economic growth within the city and wider considerations of sustainability such as the potential to reduce in-commuting by providing more housing closer to the main centre of employment in the sub region.

Whilst these considerations are of interest and relevance, they are not expressly set out in paragraph 33. The reference to the economy in that paragraph is to the needs of the regional economy.

The sustainability appraisal has identified positive impacts from the approach set out in the publication version of 30,000 homes focussed on land within the built up area of the city. The Core Strategy aspires to deliver 30,000 homes within the built up area in Bristol which will contribute to the potential to reduce in-commuting by providing additional housing closer to the sources of employment within the city.

3. The Council's statement is clear as to the reasons for suggesting a reduction in expected delivery of housing from within the urban area (because of flood risk and uncertainty of public funding for some regeneration projects). But in the absence of any substantive assessment of housing need and demand, I cannot see how the Council has made a balanced judgement as to whether or not there are the exceptional circumstances to justify changing the Green Belt boundary to accommodate some additional housing provision. The Council refers to the Secretary of State's letter of 6 July 2010 that the

Government is committed to the protection of the Green Belt, but the test in PPG2 for changing Green Belt boundaries remains the same as before.

The Council continues to expect the level of 30,000 to be achieved, including development in the regeneration areas which remains a priority. It has amended the delivery target for the reasons set out below (response to paragraph 4).

The DCLG letter which reflects the Government's overall approach to the Green Belt is a material consideration of considerable weight. The text of the news release on the DCLG website replicated at Appendix 2 illustrates the close association between the decision to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies and the Government's attitude to the Green Belt.

It is noted that PPG2 does not appear to be based on the assumption that maintaining the boundaries has to be justified. It states:

'Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances.....detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally.....Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision' (PPG2 paragraphs 2.6 and 2.7)

The emphasis is on permanence. It is change which must be justified by exceptional circumstances.

In preparing the Core Strategy the Council has fully considered the desirability of adjustment of the existing Green belt boundary and made a balanced judgement. The publication version did not propose an adjustment to Green Belt, unless this was required as a long term contingency to meet the housing level imposed by the now abandoned RSS. In the absence of the RSS this exceptional contingency is not required.

Having regard to the range of issues associated with the provision of new homes, the results of stakeholder engagement over a lengthy period, the Government's clear intentions of a locally driven approach and its stated attitude to Green Belt, the Council is satisfied that there are no exceptional circumstances which warrant a change to the Green Belt boundary.

In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Core Strategy's current reference to a contingency for developing there is considered unsound and so the Council has suggested that it should be removed.

4. Although the Council emphasises that it retains an aspiration for 30,000 dwellings, the figure of 26,440 is proposed as the new minimum base line commitment which would be used for assessing the 5 year land supply. From what I have read, I could not accord much significance to an aspirational

figure. The Council's suggested minimum of 26,400 would represent a significant change to the submitted plan. It is a change which would need to be the subject of Sustainability Appraisal as well as wider consultation in due course. As previously emphasised, I can only recommend a change to the submitted document if I find it unsound.

Considerable significance should be attached to the Council's aspiration for 30,000 homes. Whilst it is not the base delivery target, it underpins the spatial strategy and will inform the approach taken to the allocation of sites in the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD and in the Bristol Central Area Action Plan. The combination of this aspiration and the potential for a contribution from small sites mean that the level of 30,000 homes has a strong likelihood of being achieved.

The target of 26,400 helps to ensure a sound land supply will continue to be maintained without creating the perverse risk of forcing the use of contingencies which the Core Strategy sustainability appraisal suggested would result in adverse impacts.

The Government has indicated that it will bring forward a system to incentivise the delivery of new homes. This may help to reinforce likelihood that the Council's overall aspiration will be met.

5. The evidence referred to by other parties strongly points to the city maximising housing provision subject only to considerations of housing land supply and deliverability. A number of parties seek an increase in housing provision from 30,000 to 36,500, reflecting the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the then emerging RSS. Whilst I recognise that this would move somewhat towards meeting household growth projections, in the light of all the evidence to date, I cannot see how such a figure could be delivered even with urban extensions in the Green Belt. At any hearing, I would wish to explore the capacity of the Green Belt within Bristol City to accommodate housing.

Information on the capacity to deliver homes in the Green Belt is set out in the capacity appraisal studies which were made available earlier in the examination process (Appendix 3 of Bristol City Council's Response to Inspector's Initial Questions 29 April 2010
<http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Environment-Planning/Planning/planning-policy-documents/bristol-development-framework/bdf-fsi/appendix-3-to-bristol-city-councils-response---development-capacity-of-the-main-green-belt-areas-in-bristol.en>)

6. I would ask the Council to reflect on my concerns about the evidence it has provided in relation to housing need and demand. I do not know whether additional evidence covering the matters I have highlighted would make a significant difference to the balance of considerations, but I want to give the Council the opportunity of further work. Housing provision is a critical part of

the soundness of the Core Strategy and the revocation of the RRS means that there is now a greater and more explicit burden on the Council to justify the figure in the Core Strategy.

The Council considers that, alongside the very clear statements from the Secretary of State, sufficient evidence is available to determine a suitable level for housing provision in Bristol's Core Strategy – and that the appropriate level is 30,000 homes with a delivery target of 26,400. Appendix 1 helps to set out how the various elements in PPS3 paragraph 33 are addressed. The DCLG letter does not refer to greater and more explicit burdens on Councils but it is clear that local authorities are responsible for establishing the right level of local housing provision for their area (without the burden of regional targets) and for defending that level at examination. It is clear from the guidance attached to the letter that the overall local housing ambition may change – although in the case of Bristol 30,000 remains the aspiration.

7. If the Council does wish to respond to the matters I have highlighted, I do not expect the Council to be able to do so by 7 September. In any case, I and other parties would need time to assimilate any new material. There is the option of postponing the hearing for such further work to be undertaken. If that were to be done, I consider that it would be appropriate also to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal of the proposed change and wider consultation so that a resumed hearing could encompass all matters likely to arise. Consideration should then also be given to consulting on the other changes that the Council has now suggested in response to my concerns on other matters (subject to some revision between the schedules and of the detailed wording). The hearing would have to be postponed for several months.

See comments on paragraph 8 below regarding the extent of change suggested to the Core Strategy.

The Council has commenced a Sustainability Appraisal update based on the matters set out in the Schedules of Changes. Should the Inspector indicate that changes to the Core Strategy should be advertised following the hearings, the Council will publish a Sustainability Appraisal update alongside those changes.

The Council does not consider it necessary to produce further sustainability work at this stage in advance of the hearings. The overall spatial strategy is not proposed to be changed and the Sustainability Appraisal has addressed the impacts of that strategy.

8. If the hearing is to be cancelled/postponed the Programme Officer would need to notify participants during Thursday 2 September to avoid any participant not receiving the message in time. If the hearing is to continue, I still need to prepare an agenda, which should also be circulated by that date. However, I need to prepare the agenda within the next couple of days because of other commitments next week. If the Council decides quickly that it wishes to proceed with the hearing please let the PO know as soon as possible.

The Council does not consider it would be necessary or appropriate to postpone the hearings at this point. The DCLG letter/guidance of 6 July 2010 says that local planning authorities should continue to develop core strategies reflecting local people's aspirations and decisions on important issues such as climate change, housing and economic development.

The adjustments the Council is proposing for the Core Strategy are not so fundamental as to suggest a need for further evidence preparation or engagement. They have responded to the very clear steer provided by recent government announcements. In summary they:

- Retain an aspiration to deliver 30,000 homes, a level at which there has been broad community support and which was unanimously agreed by the Council.
- Confirm that the Green Belt will remain open – its nationally stated purpose. This approach has received community support.
- Remove a contingency for development of part of the Green Belt which was only included to facilitate what was a potentially emerging RSS housing level.
- Remove a contingency for use of some fit for purpose industrial land.
- Set a minimum delivery target which facilitates provision whilst avoiding the perverse use of undesirable contingencies.

Whilst retaining the overall integrity of the Core Strategy, the suggested amendments will facilitate the provision of development consistent with the Government's new approach to planning policy with its emphasis on local decision-making and incentives for delivery.

9. I am sure all parties recognise the somewhat uncharted waters this hearing has to address and the need for me to be fully informed on relevant matters. I apologise for the uncertainty this note will cause.

The table below shows how the Core Strategy's approach to housing has taken into account PPS3 Paragraph 33 in the context of recent changes to Government policy

Text of Paragraph 33	Council's Observations
<p>In determining the local, sub-regional and regional level of housing provision, Local Planning Authorities and Regional Planning Bodies, working together, should take into account:</p>	<p>Following the revocation of RSS there are no longer regional planning bodies, sub-regional housing levels and regional levels of housing.</p>
<p>Evidence of current and future levels of need and demand for housing and affordability levels based upon:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and sub-regional evidence of need and demand, set out in Strategic Housing Market Assessments and other relevant market information such as long term house prices. 	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment is a core document and has been taken into account. The document covers the four West of England unitary authorities, Mendip District and part of Wiltshire (former West Wiltshire). The SHMA had a strong focus on matters related to affordability. Paragraphs 3.4.1 to 3.4.7 of the Executive Summary of the SHMAA the complex factors associated with demand for new homes many of which are addressed more in the detail of provision rather than overall figures.</p> <p>The SHMA does not, perhaps cannot, provide a definitive guide to market demand for the housing market area or for Bristol alone. It appears to suggest continued demand, affected by a range of factors including the performance of the economy. Having regard to this information and the range of other factors, the Council considers that it is appropriate to aim for a level of housing growth of 30,000 homes, making sustainable use of previously developed land and focusing development within the built up area.</p> <p>(It is noted that in a conversation paper the former NHPAU explored concerns that in general SHMAs have not been effective in evaluating local demand. Following the closure of the unit the Council does not propose that this matter is explored further)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice from the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU)²¹ on the impact of the proposals for affordability in 	<p>The NHPAU has now closed and it is not possible to ascertain its advice on the proposals for Bristol's Core Strategy in</p>

BCC/Issue Housing Green Belt 31 August 2010

<p>the region.</p>	<p>respect of the impact of the proposals for affordability in the region.</p>								
<p>• The Government's latest published household projections and the needs of the regional economy, having regard to economic growth forecasts.</p>	<p>Various projections of household formation and job formation are set out for information at Appendix 3 for information.</p> <p>The abandoned RSS included a regional growth assumption of 3.2% GVA per annum. This no longer appears to be the projected level of growth for the South West. At the regional level, the South West Observatory's March 2010 'South West Economy Projections' now provides the following forecast of GVA annual growth rates in the South West:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="798 745 1358 813"> <tr> <td>2008-09</td> <td>2009-10</td> <td>2010-15</td> <td>2015-30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-5.9%</td> <td>1.4</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>2.4</td> </tr> </table> <p>Various other projections are shown at Appendix 3.</p> <p>These figures are consistent with observations made earlier in the examination process on the appropriateness of the 3.2% rate over the plan period given the intervening recession.</p> <p>The Council considers that its proposals make an appropriate and deliverable contribution to meeting future needs for housing that give appropriate weight to the maintenance of the Green Belt, whilst having regard to population and economic projections.</p>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-15	2015-30	-5.9%	1.4	2.4	2.4
2008-09	2009-10	2010-15	2015-30						
-5.9%	1.4	2.4	2.4						
<p>Local and sub-regional evidence of the availability of suitable land for housing using Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments and drawing on other relevant information such as the National Land Use Database 22 and the Register of Surplus Public Sector Land.</p>	<p>The Council's SHLAA has informed the identification of an appropriate level for housing in the Core Strategy. That document drew on all relevant sources including NLUD.</p>								
<p>The Government's overall ambitions for affordability across the housing market, including the need to improve affordability and increase housing supply.</p>	<p>The Secretary of State's comments on revocation of the RSSs and the accompanying news release on the DCLG web site suggest that the Government no longer retains a target for the development of 3 million new homes by 2020. The Government has clearly stated that it is for local authorities to decide the right level of homes for their areas. It has also announced an intention to provide incentives for</p>								

BCC/Issue Housing Green Belt 31 August 2010

	housing delivery.
A Sustainability Appraisal of the environmental, social and economic implications, including costs, benefits and risks of development. This will include considering the most sustainable pattern of housing, including in urban and rural areas.	The sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy has had regard to these matters in accordance with the relevant guidance and was based on a housing figure of 30,000 homes.
An assessment of the impact of development upon existing or planned infrastructure and of any new infrastructure required.	Evidence related to infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Document.

Eric Pickles puts stop to flawed Regional Strategies today

Published 6 July 2010

Local Government Secretary Eric Pickles is today putting a swift end to Whitehall's grip on local planning policy by scrapping Regional Strategies and their centrally imposed building targets that failed to increase housebuilding. Regional targets intended to build 3 million homes nationally by 2020 were put in place by the previous Government despite fears that they would force councils to cut into the Greenbelt. However, the reality is that construction has slowed down so much the country is facing the lowest peacetime housebuilding rates since 1924.

A statement laid in parliament today will revoke Regional Strategies with immediate effect. Councils will now have the freedom to prepare their local plans without having to follow top-down targets from regional quangos and bureaucrats that prescribe exactly what, where and when to build.

Mr Pickles also pledged that direct and substantial benefits for councils who support construction would be the centrepiece of this radical restoration of local power. The money will be used to help ensure more new homes are built for local people, and matched with more new jobs and investment.

From today, power will be handed back to councils and communities to make their own decisions on planning that can get the country building again.

Communities will, once again, be able to solve local housing challenges in a way that makes sense for them. In return councils will be offered powerful new incentives that ensure they benefit from development they welcome.

Communities and Local Government Secretary Eric Pickles said:

"Communities will no longer have to endure the previous government's failed Soviet tractor style top-down planning targets - they were a terrible, expensive, time-consuming way to impose house building and worst of all threatened the destruction of the Green Belt.

"I promised to get rid of them and today I'm revoking regional plans with immediate effect - hammering another nail in the coffin of unwanted and an unaccountable regional bureaucracy. They were a national disaster that robbed local people of their democratic voice, alienating them and entrenching opposition against new development.

"Regional Strategies built nothing but resentment - we want to build houses. So instead we will introduce powerful new incentives for local people so they support the construction of new homes in the right places and receive direct rewards from the proceeds of growth to improve their local area."

Mr Pickles made the announcement in a keynote speech to the Local Government Association conference where he told Town Halls they were back in charge of local affairs.

Councils will now be free to protect Green Belt surrounding 30 towns across the country. The targets system forced them to redraw Green Belt boundaries and designate large areas of countryside for new development. Communities will now have the power to prevent encroachment on the Green Belt and decide themselves where they want to build.

Decentralisation Minister Greg Clark said:

"Today is another significant step in the Coalition Government's drive to transfer powers from remote bureaucracies to local communities. Regional edicts, which allowed communities no say, injected poison into the planning system which stymied development. By allowing communities to shape their neighbourhoods and to share in the benefits, we are beginning to restore the idea that development can be a force for good, rather than something to be resisted at all costs."

Notes to editors 1. Communities Secretary Eric Pickles confirmed today in a Written Parliamentary Statement that Regional Strategies will be revoked with immediate effect, as set out in the Coalition Agreement. In the longer term the legal basis for Regional Strategies will be abolished through the Localism Bill that will be introduced in the current Parliamentary session. A copy of the written statement can be found at:

www.communities.gov.uk/statements/newsroom/regionalstrategies.

2. Regional Strategies have been revoked through Section 79 (6) of The 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act.

Accompanying the Parliamentary Statement is guidance for Local Authorities that covers the period between the revocation of Regional Strategies and legislation to abolish them altogether. A copy of the statement and guidance can be found at:

www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/letterregionalstrategies.

3. The abolition of regional strategies provides a clear signal of the importance attached to the development and application of local spatial plans, in the form of Local Development Framework Core Strategies and Development Plan Documents. Local plans drawn up with the help of the community will become the basis for local planning decisions, and future reform will make it easier for local councils to agree and amend local plans with their local community, in a way that maximises the involvement of neighbourhoods. The introduction of incentives to replace building targets will be a top priority for the new Government and take place early in the spending review.

4. Towns and areas that were planning to make Green Belt cuts and reviews because of Whitehall-imposed targets will now be able to make their own decisions where new development is built. They include: Bath, Bedworth, Bournemouth, Bristol, Bromsgrove, Broxbourne, Cheltenham, Chertsey, Coventry, Gloucester, Guildford, Harlow, Hatfield, Hemel Hempstead, Leeds, Lichfield, Maidenhead, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Nottingham, Nuneaton,

BCC/Issue Housing Green Belt 31 August 2010

Oxford, Redditch, Redhill, Reigate, Rushcliffe, Stevenage, Solihull, Tunbridge Wells, Welwyn, and Woking and Worcester and in West Yorkshire beyond Leeds.

Population, household and employment projections

Projections of employment change in Bristol 2006-26

	Annual average % GVA 2006-26	Employment Change 2006-26
Cambridge Econometrics (Jan 2008)	3.2	42,500
Cambridge Econometrics (Jan 2008)	2.8	35,600
Oxford Economics Central (June 2010)	2.3	21,900
Oxford Economics Stronger (June 2010)	2.7	37,100
Oxford Economics Weaker (June 2010)	2.0	13,300

Sources: Regional Assembly / Roger Tym and Partners / Cambridge Econometrics - RSS Employment Land Provision: Spatial Implications (http://www.swcouncils.gov.uk/ngcontent.cfm?a_id=4381&tt=swra)

South West Observatory / Oxford Economics South West Growth Scenarios (2010-2030) (<http://economy.swo.org.uk/publications/simulations-projections-and-forecasts/sw-growth-scenarios/>)

Projections of population change in Bristol 2006-26

	Population Change 2006- 26
ONS 2003-based	29,500
ONS 2004-based	39,600
ONS Revised 2004-based	53,800
ONS 2006-based	109,300
ONS 2008-based	134,500

Source: Office for National Statistics – Sub-national Population Projections (SNPP) for England (<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/product.asp?vlnk=997>)

Projections of household change in Bristol 2006-26

	Household Change 2006- 26
ODPM 2003-based	29,000
DCLG Revised 2004-based	42,000
DCLG 2006-based	63,000

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government - Household estimates and projections (<http://www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingresearch/housingstatistics/usingstatisticsby/householdestimates/>)