Hearing Statement Response – Shalford Parish Council

STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTION TO THE EXAMINATION OF THE NEA LOCAL PLAN

MATTER 2 - Employment provision for the proposed garden communities

Following the publication of significant new evidence (EXD/052) Shalford Parish Council felt that a fuller hearing statement composed by Mr Robin Miller of Understanding Data Ltd on their behalf was the most appropriate way to answer the Inspector's important questions on the Employment evidence.

Understanding Data has acted around demographic change, housing market trends and economic trends and assessments:

at examinations in:

Bradford, Warwick, Cornwall, East Devon, Basingstoke and Deane, North Tyneside, Fylde, Barnsley Welwyn Hatfield, Leeds, Mid Devon and South Kesteven.

and throughout Local Plan evidence stages in:

Isles of Scilly, Tandridge, York, East Lindsey and Harrogate;

on behalf of community groups, private developers and local authorities.

Word Count for 6,7, & 8 = 3000 (excluding questions)

6. Is there clear justification for selecting the comparator locations identified on p55 of EXD/052, rather than other comparator locations?

6.1. We note that the comparator locations (CL) listed in EXD/052 (2018) are:

- West Essex; Cambridgeshire; Milton Keynes; Buckinghamshire; Oxfordshire; Berkshire; West Surrey; East Surrey[1].

6.2. On page 6 of EB0081(2019) West and East Surrey are merged into Surrey.

6.3. It is further noted that more analysis based "comparator locations" were set out in EB009 (2017). These were split between:

West of North Essex Economic Area	Central East of North Essex Economic Area
Brentwood	BANES*
Chelmsford	Brighton & Hove
Cherwell	Canterbury
Horsham	Cheltenham
Rugby	Winchester

*Bath and North East Somerset

6.4. There is no discussion in EXD/052 /EB081 as to why these original areas are no longer deemed helpful.

6.5. The current areas (introduced in EXD/052) do not appear to be CLs based on an assessment of common characteristics, but rather a direction of travel.

6.6. In this sense the key question is, do they provide a realistic benchmark for the economic growth of North Essex?

6.7. EXD/052 on page 8 states

"These areas all presently enjoy higher GVA per capita than North Essex. Nevertheless, on the basis of the foregoing discussion, we believe they represent a level of economic success to which the North Essex sub-region can reasonably aspire, given its location and potential linkages."

And on page 52

"Overall North Essex is not currently enjoying the same level of prosperity as some other areas within the 'arc of prosperity' that makes up the economic core of the Greater South East beyond London."

6.8. The CEBR work does not contain an assessment or present evidence that shows that the three NEGCs can lead to a modest transformation of the whole economy of North Essex, let alone to the extent of closing the gap with a grouping of locations which EXD/052 acknowledges is one of the most prosperous areas outside London in the UK.

6.9. In terms of the detail that the CLs inform – it seems that they are used in the following ways:

[1] On page 6 of EB0081 2019) West and East Surrey are merged into Surrey.

- to act as a target for the whole local economy through a target for GVA per capita and shifts to the employment to population ratio,
- to set the share of employment across sectors for the NEGCs

6.10. The CLs are not used to universally inform the KPI section of EXD/052 (pages 139-140) – for instance for economic inactivity and qualifications, the "greater SE" is used as a target. This is not explained.

6.11. By looking at the detail in GVA per capita and productivity measures it is possible to assess the logic and robustness of using the comparator locations as a target for growth in North Essex arising from the NEGCs.

6.12. The main use of the CLs is to set the target for shifts in GVA per capita. Comparative data is set out for this measure below.

6.13. This is not a good measure[2] (even if it is a simple one) to show the progress of improving productivity – which seems to be the actual aim. GVA is a workplace-based concept, allocating the incomes of workers to where they work, whereas the population (per head or per capita) is a residence-based measure.

Table 1 GVA per capita data

	2017 £
North Essex	20,357
Comparator Locations (EXD/52)(EB81)	
Milton Keynes	46074
Berkshire	40343
West Surrey	35780
Oxfordshire	34103
East Surrey	30725
Cambridgeshire CC	29935
Buckinghamshire CC	29923
West Essex	26491
Average	34172

	2017 £
North Essex	20,357
Comparator Locations (EB009)	
Oxfordshire	34103
West Sussex (North East)	31059
Warwickshire	30738
Central Hampshire	28721
BANES*	28051
Brighton and Hove	27081
Gloucestershire	26712
Heart of Essex	25854
Average	29040

*Bath and North East Somerset, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire

Data from ONS – GVA Regional gross value added (income approach) reference tables

2 https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/labourproductivity/articles/regionalandsubregionalproductivityintheuk/latest
"When assessing regional economic performance, it is recommended to use the productivity measures in this article (GVA per hour worked or GVA per job filled) rather than GVA per head. This is particularly important when there are large net commuting flows into or out of an area.

The reason for this is that the productivity measures (GVA per hour worked or GVA per job filled) provide a direct comparison between the level of economic output and the direct labour input of those who produced that output. This is not the case, however, for GVA per head, as the GVA per head measure includes people not in the workforce (including children, pensioners and others not economically active) in the calculation and can also be very heavily biased by commuting flows. This is because if an area has a large number of in-commuters, the output these commuters produce is captured in the estimate of GVA, but the commuters are not captured in the estimate of residential population. In this situation, a GVA per head measure would be artificially high if used as a proxy for economic performance or welfare of a region."
Further discussion of these issues can be found on a recent ONS blog post titled "Mind the Gap".
https://blog.ons.gov.uk/2018/11/23/mind-the-gap-why-the-uk-might-not-be-the-most-regionally-unequal-country/

6.14. North Essex has the lowest GVA per capita – however the difference, using 2017 data between North Essex and the new "CLs" is £13,815 and between North Essex and the original locations it is £8,683.

6.15. Looking at GVA per capita where the UK figure is converted to 100 shows North Essex has worsened over time with the rank in 1997 being 103rd out of 179 areas and the value 83.9 (UK = 100), by 2017 this had fallen to 74.9 and 109th out of 179 rank.

Table 2 GVA per capita indices

	GVA per capita UK = 100
Milton Keynes	169.5
Berkshire	148.4
West Surrey	131.6
Oxfordshire	125.5
East Surrey	113
Buckinghamshire	110.1
Cambridgeshire	110.1
West Essex	97.5
North Essex	74.9

Data from ONS – GVA Regional gross value added (income approach) reference tables

6.16. Many of the CLs are amongst the top performing local economies outside of London. All the CLs (apart from West Essex) rank in the UK's top 31 areas (out of 179 areas). North Essex is currently ranked 109.

6.17. This becomes even starker when considering productivity measures such as GVA per filled job.

Table 3 Productivity across the Comparator Locations (EB009) & (EXD/052 /EB081)

	2017 £
North Essex	48459
Comparator Locations (EXD/52)(EB81)	
Milton Keynes	69380
Berkshire	69135
East Surrey	65127
West Surrey	64278
Buckinghamshire CC	61048
Oxfordshire	57125
Cambridgeshire CC	52984
West Essex	52137
Average	61402

	2017 £
North Essex	48459
Comparator Locations (EB009)	
Oxfordshire	57125
Bath and North East Somerse	56219
Central Hampshire	54812
West Sussex (North East)	53893
Warwickshire	53237
Gloucestershire	51664
Heart of Essex	49055
Brighton and Hove	48934
Average	53117

Data from both charts from Sub-regional productivity: labour productivity indices by UK NUTS2 and NUTS3 subregions Using GVA per filled job measure

6.18. It should be noted that even with the original CLs, only Brighton and Hove and Heart of Essex have comparable levels of GVA per filled job. The difference between North Essex and the average of these original areas is £4,658 and with the "new" areas it is £12,943.

Key issues

6.19. No evidence is presented that shows that similar new communities to the NEGCs have had anything like the impact such a significant impact.

6.20. The CLs are a completely different size and scale, both in terms of the overall population and size of the economy, e.g. the CLs are on average twice the size of the North Essex economy in total GVA.

6.21. The 80% shift is set out in current prices, e.g. . North Essex will have shifted from 59% (2017) of the CL average to 80% in 2036. This would amount to a GVA per capita of over £27,000.

6.22. The CL average is not going to remain at £34,172 (2017 figure) until 2036. There is every expectation that growth in the "arc of prosperity" will match or exceed that in North Essex.

6.23. To increase to 80% of the CL average GVA per capita by 2036 would involve growth across North Essex at the rate of some of UK's most successful and productive areas, over a prolonged period and at consistent rates. Even areas which have had significant external funding investments have struggled to catch up and improve productivity measures.

6.24. Cornwall and Isles of Scilly has had three periods of the highest funding available from the EU and national match funding. The total investment, aimed purely at achieving economic productivity improvements, has been in the region of £2.5billion.

6.25. Total GVA has grown above the level of many more productive areas in the period 1997-2017[3]. For GVA per capita (and productivity measures) the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly economy has not closed the gap meaningfully.

Cornwall & Isles of Scilly

	1997	2017	
Gva per capita rank	152	142	out of 179
Gva per capita index	69.8	67.9	UK =100

	2002	2017	
Gva per filled job rank	165	167	out of 168
Gva per filed job £	26943	37601	

Summary

6.26. The CLs used to express targets arising from the NEGC developments are too large (total economy and population) to provide a robust target, even an aspirational one. This leads to an overstating of the possible economic benefits arising from the NEGCs.

6.27. As the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly example shows, making significant changes to "lagging behind" economies are a significant challenge. Having realistic benchmark areas is key to setting realistic targets.

[3] Key investments have included projects whose main aim was improving productivity and closing the gap on GVA, 3 main innovation centres, infrastructure improvements, and development of a new University.

7. Is it reasonable to assume that, in the inward investment-led scenario, North Essex increases its employment-to-population ratio to that of the comparator regions by 2036 (para 2.4 of EB/081, p116 of EXD/052)?

7.1. No. In EXD/052 the data in Table 7 (page 30) and Table 31 (page 119) sets out population and employment estimates for 2036 arising from the investment led scenario. Table 5 below shows this table with the employment/population ratio (e/p ratio) calculated.

Table 4 Employment / Population ratios calculated from EXD/052 Table 31

	Employment / Population ratio
Trend Growth	34.1
Trend and future growth	35.8
Traditional D	35.8
Traditional I/I	35.8
Traditional P	35.9
Innovative D	35.9
Innovative I/I	36.0
Innovative P	36.1
Traditional Life	37.8
Innovative	37.9
Traditional Invest	43.5
Innovative Invest	43.5
Comparators	43.5
GSE excl London	40.1
GB	44.2

7.2. What Table 31 (EXD/052) shows is that the e/p ratio for North Essex is exactly the CL level by 2036 under the inward investment led scenarios.

Do the North Essex population and employment figures look realistic ?

7.3. EB081 states at Para 2.4:

"In 2016 North Essex's employment-to-population ratio was 38.5% and under this scenario it increases to 43.5% in 2036."

7.4. The components of why this figure is 38.5% are not sourced by CEBR. The population in 2016 is known and was 482,200 (ONS). The closest "jobs figure" is from Business Register and Employment Survey (BRES) data for 2016 – the total for North Essex is 185,000 (giving 38.4%).

7.5. BRES is not a good expression of total or full employment[4]. Jobs Density from ONS gives a fuller measure of total jobs by area. To illustrate the difference the table below shows the BRES and Jobs density data and the respective e/p ratios.

[4] See Appendix 1

Table 5 BRES and Total Jobs derived Employment / Population ratios

	Population	Total Jobs measure		BRES (partial)	
	2017	2017	e/p ratio	2017	e/p ratio
Berkshire	905,800	579,000	**63.9**	517,000	**57.1**
Buckinghamshire CC	535,900	285,000	**53.2**	241,000	**45.0**
Milton Keynes	267,500	196,000	**73.3**	182,000	**68.0**
Oxfordshire	682,400	433,000	**63.5**	374,000	**54.8**
Surrey	1,185,300	654,000	**55.2**	578,000	**48.8**
Cambridgeshire CC	648,200	381,000	**58.8**	343,000	**52.9**
West Essex	304,500	163,000	**53.5**	140,000	**46.0**
Comparator Locations	4,529,600	2,691,000	**60.2**	2,375,000	**53.2**
North Essex	486,500	219,000	**45.0**	189,000	**38.8**
Difference			15.2		14.4

7.6. What is important is that the gap between the CLs and North Essex is consistent and considerable across both measures at 15.2 from total jobs and 14.4 from BRES.

7.7. What is not explained or reasoned by CEBR is why the CL e/p ratio is expected to reduce considerably by 2036.

7.8. Under the BRES e/p ratio the CL figure is 53.2 (in 2017) – EXD/052 sets this out as 43.5 by 2036 without explanation.

7.9. The CL 2036 e/p ratio is likely to be higher than its current 53.2 value, which makes it far more challenging for the North Essex figure to rise to that level.

7.10. The decreasing CL e/p ratio is not set out or discussed and seems wholly unrealistic. Why would North Essex increase its ratio in a period where for CLs, where arguably greater focus on growth is due to happen, the ratio decreases significantly?

The role of commuting

7.11. It is possible to see a link between high levels of the e/p ratio and high levels of net inwards commuting. Tables 7 below uses Total Jobs from the Jobs density measure, as it includes all self-employed and HM Forces (which BRES doe not).

7.123. Looking nationally some authorities have got a ratio of close to or better than 1 to 1 (employment to population). These areas are very different in characteristics, known investment and productivity levels to both North Essex, and the scale of development proposed via the NEGCs.

7.13. Importantly the areas with high levels of e/p ratio appear to have strong net in commuting levels. The three areas across North Essex all have relatively high net outwards commuting.

7.14. Given the link between higher e/p ratios and net inwards commuting, that is a further challenge for the type of changes modelled to happen in North Essex.

Table 6 Wider employment / population ratios linked to high net inwards commuting

	Employment / Population Ratio	Net Commuters
City of London	81.6	824000
Westminster	3.1	824000
Camden	1.6	164000
Watford	1.1	4000
Kensington and Chelsea	1.1	35000
Islington	1.1	60800
Tower Hamlets	1.0	114000
Southwark	1.0	36500
Cambridge	0.9	35000
Crawley	0.9	24000
Oxford	0.9	29800
Hammersmith and Fulham	0.9	25000
North Warwickshire	0.8	8350
Welwyn Hatfield	0.8	15500
Exeter	0.8	26000
Manchester	0.8	106000
Milton Keynes	0.7	16000
Braintree	0.46	-16000
Colchester	0.53	-1800
Tendring	0.32	-10600
North Essex	0.45	

Commuting data from 2011 Census

Employment Data form ONS Jobs Density – total jobs and Population from ONS Population estimates.

Summary

7.15. The issues that seems to drive higher employment to population ratios is high productivity and typically very high levels of net inwards commuting. It is logical to link the ability to improve an area's employment to population ratio through its ability to increase inwards net commuting. Changing commuting patterns is notoriously difficult. The authorities within North Essex show net outwards commuting. It is difficult to see how the scale of jobs envisaged as being provided within the NEGCs would change this pattern.

7.16. The scale of these jobs – variously described in the documents as within the range of 1 to 1 from 7500 homes (to 2036) , or in EB081 Table 2, 65,50 jobs o 2033 are highly unlikely to make any significant impact on the e/p ratio of North Essex, or to lead to the North Essex ratio matching the CLs ratio.

7.17. What is set out in EXD052 and EB81 is the North Essex e/p ratio increasing from 38.5 % to 43.5% in 2036 – a fairly modest but still challenging shift.

7.18. The CLs' e/p ratio is however current 53.2% (BRES) or more accurately 60.2% (Total Jobs). There seems no evidence to support why the CLs would decrease to this extent given the planned investments and momentum they have. It is more likely that the e/p ratio for the CL area would increase further.

8. Is the percentage mix of employment sectors shown in Table 2 of EB/081 justified, having regard to the sectoral GVA shares identified in EXD/052, pp125-127?

8.1. Put simply, no.

8.2. To unpick this, it is important to understand both the GVA industry share and employment share of industry, in terms of recent and current performance. What changes have happened in North Essex?

GVA Share

8.3. Using ONS GVA by industry data it is possible to see the changes that have happened across the last twenty years.

Table 8 ONS GVA SHARE by industry

ONS GVA SHARE	1997	2007	2017	1997-17	2007-17
Agriculture, mining, electricity, gas, water and waste	4.6	2.3	3.2	-1.4	0.9
Manufacturing	16.9	10.4	10.1	-6.8	-0.3
Construction	8.1	10.1	10.0	1.8	-0.2
Distribution; transport; accommodation and food	19.1	21.0	18.9	-0.2	-2.1
Information and communication	2.0	3.4	3.6	1.6	0.2
Financial and insurance activities	4.4	6.4	4.3	-0.1	-2.1
Real estate activities	20.2	16.4	17.4	-2.8	1.0
Business service activities	7.5	8.0	10.2	2.7	2.2
Public administration; education; health	14.1	18.2	18.5	4.4	0.3
Other services and household activities	3.0	3.7	3.8	0.9	0.1
All industries	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Data sourced from ONS Regional gross value added (income approach) reference tables

8.4. There have been some changes over time, reflecting the fluctuations of the national economic cycle, and local reactions to specific investments or challenges. Focusing on the last ten years sees the following key changes

8.5. Growth in the GVA share from: +4.1%

- Business Service activities
- Real estate activities and
- Agriculture, mining, utilities

8.6. Decline in the GVA share from: - 4.2%

- Financial and Insurance activities and
- Distribution, transport accommodation and food.

8.7. Pages 125-127 of EXD/052 set out in Table 27 the difference between the current (2016) and the predicted economies of North Essex and the comparator locations GVA shares by broad category and Table 28 highlights the difference between these.

8.8. The workings to the forecasts are not shown, neither are the detail of the assumptions, or the input trend period for these forecasts.

8.9. The CEBR model view of the North Essex economy differs from the ONS GVA share as follows.

Table 9 CEBR GVA share and ONS GVA share

	ONS 2016	CEBR 2016	CEBR AND ONS @ 2016
Agriculture, mining, electricity, gas, water and waste	3.1	3.4	0.3
Manufacturing	10.1	10.4	0.3
Construction	9.7	10.4	0.7
Distribution; transport; accommodation and food	18.9	19.8	0.9
Information and communication	3.6	3.8	0.2
Financial and insurance activities	4.0	3.9	-0.1
Real estate activities	18.2	15.4	-2.8
Business service activities	10.1	10.5	0.4
Public administration; education; health	18.4	18.4	0.0
Other services and household activities	3.8	4.1	0.3
All industries	100.0	100.1	

Source ONS Regional gross value added and CEBR data from EXD/052 page 125

8.10. This table looks at 2016 ONS GVA data to compare directly with the CEBR 2016 data – 2017 GVA share data is available and used in Table X.

8.11. It is not clear why the model CEBR uses diverges from the published official statistics from ONS, in particular for real estate activities. .

8.12. How do the CEBR 2016-2036 changes in Table compare to what has happened in the twenty years from 1997-2017?

Table 10 ONS GVA historic share changes and CEBR modelled future changes

	ONS actual 2007-17	CEBR Modelled 2016-36
Agriculture, mining, electricity, gas, water and waste	0.9	-0.4
Manufacturing	-0.3	-1.9
Construction	-0.2	0.5
Distribution; transport; accommodation and food	-2.1	0.7
Information and communication	0.2	1.8
Financial and insurance activities	-2.1	-0.8
Real estate activities	1.0	-3.4
Business service activities	2.2	4.2
Public administration; education; health	0.3	-1.2
Other services and household activities	0.1	-0.6

Data from ONS Regional gross value added and CEBR data from EXD/02 page 125

8.13. There is some consistency in the ONS and CBR past against future comparison. For example, growth in the GVA share of Business services activities.

8.14. However, differences are not explained or justified. Changing local trends is not straightforward and may well reflect wider structural issues.

Employment

8.15. EB/081 Page 6 is quite clear in how it has adjusted the potential employment share of future activity within the NEGCs – it has applied the share from the comparator locations

"2.8 A mix of industrial sectors was assumed for each Garden Community based on an assessment of their relative strengths and economic opportunities. Percentage of jobs in each of the ten high-level sectors under the Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC07) by Garden Community is shown in Table 2. These are based on adjustments to sectoral employment shares for the comparator regions implied by Cebr's in-house forecasts for GVA4 by sector per local authority."

8.16. Other than aspiration, no evidence is presented to justify the use or appropriateness of assuming that job profiles within the NEGCs will match the CLs' GVA share. The economies are very different in scale, make up and productivity. Assuming that this mix is replicable without evidence where similar approaches have worked appears very optimistic. It is not explained why the CEBR think that local factors and trends (in both GVA share by sector and existing employment share by sector) can be so easily changed.

How does the proposed employment share fit with the employment share across North Essex?

8.17. It is important to recognise the scale of change that is being claimed. The NEGCs are expecting 6550 jobs in the period to 2033[5] (from EB/081 – it is noted that EXD052 showed employment and population to 2036 making direct comparisons difficult) in the context of three local authorities with over 219000 total jobs, currently forecast to rise by around 51000 jobs (EB/018).

8.18. The change attributed to these jobs (to GVA per capita or the employment population ratio) is modelled to have highly significant changes to the whole economy of North Essex, by assuming aspirational change of sector and the ensuing productivity increases from attracting these jobs.

Table 11 Share of employment at 2018

	North Essex	Comparator Locations	Diff CL to NE
Agriculture, mining, electricity, gas, water and waste	3.3	2.3	-1.0
Manufacturing	7.8	6.0	-1.7
Construction	5.9	5.0	-0.9
Distribution; transport; accommodation and food	29.3	25.9	-3.4
Information & communication	2.1	7.0	4.9
Financial & insurance	2.5	2.3	-0.2
Property	1.8	1.6	-0.3
Business service activities	14.2	21.7	7.5
Public administration; education; health	28.6	23.4	-5.2
Arts, entertainment, recreation & other services	4.1	4.7	0.6

[5] From 7500 homes – not one job per home.

Source Business Register Employment Survey (BRES)

8.19. The comparator locations have higher employment shares in Business services and Information and Communication sectors.

Summary

8.20. Recent changes to the shares of GVA employment by sector do not seem to influence the NEGC growth trajectory.

8.21. The profile of the likely employment mix of jobs within the NEGCs seems unduly optimistic and arises from applying GVA sector change (from the CLs) to an employment base for North Essex that in itself does not reflect that does the local latest data.

8.22. The results of this aspirational manipulation is then used to justify the economic benefits GVA per capita and e/p ratio from the NEGCs developments for the wider economy.

8.23. The change expected in North Essex as a result of the development of the NEGCs is not justified or evidenced.

Appendix 1

BRS and Job density – estimating employment

The BRES[6] Employment figure includes employees plus the number of working owners.

BRES therefore includes self-employed workers if they are registered for VAT or Pay-As-You-Earn (PAYE) schemes. **Self-employed people not registered for these, along with HM Forces and Government Supported trainees are excluded.**

This report has used total jobs from the Jobs density Measure[7] (ONS) which includes

The total number of jobs is a workplace-based measure of jobs and comprises:

- employees (from the Business Register and Employment Survey),
- self-employment jobs (from the Annual Population Survey),
- government-supported trainees (from DfES and DWP) and
- HM Forces (from MoD).

The number of jobs in an area is composed of jobs done by residents (of any age) and jobs done by workers (of any age) who commute into the area.

Total Jobs and Employment Comparison

	2016 BRES Employment	2016 Jobs Density Total Jobs	2017 BRES Employment	2017 Jobs Density Total Jobs	2018 BRES Employment
Braintree	58000	65,000	60000	70,000	58000
Colchester	85000	101,000	87000	102,000	87000
Tendring	41000	45,000	42000	47,000	42000
North Essex	184000	211,000	189000	219,000	187000
Epping Forest	55000	59,000	54000	62,000	55000
Harlow	42000	46,000	41000	48,000	42000
Uttlesford	42000	47,000	45000	53,000	45000
West Essex	139000	152,000	140000	163,000	142000
Cambridgeshire	335000	373,000	343000	381,000	344000
Buckinghamshire	244000	281,000	241000	285,000	244000
Milton Keynes	184000	200,000	182000	196,000	185000
Oxfordshire	377000	427,000	374000	433,000	378000
Surrey	591000	674,000	578000	654,000	582000
Bracknell Forest	65000	73,000	63000	71,000	63000
Reading	105000	120,000	105000	120,000	107000
Slough	84000	93,000	83000	92,000	85000
West Berkshire	100000	110,000	98000	108,000	100000
Windsor and Maidenhead	86000	96,000	82000	93,000	86000
Wokingham	87000	95,000	86000	95,000	89000
Berkshire	527000	587,000	517000	579,000	530000

[6] https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/construct/components/simpleapicomponent.aspx?menuopt=78&subcomp=

[7] https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/construct/components/stdComponent.asp?menuopt=1&subcomp=