March 2022

North Norfolk Local Plan Assessment of Identified Local Housing Need

savills.co.uk

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 Savills UK (Ltd) have been instructed to review the proposed housing requirement contained within the Proposed Submission Version (Regulation 19 Publication) ('the emerging Local Plan' (ELP)).

1.2 This housing requirement proposed in the ELP is predicated on the North Norfolk Local Housing Needs Assessment (November 2019). This advocates a departure from use of the Standard Method, as set out in national policy and guidance, arguing there are exceptional circumstance which justify an alternative approach.

1.3 This Assessment comprises the following:

- Section 2 of this review considers the policy background to the calculation of the identified local housing need; provides an overview of the approach taken to determining the housing need; and considers the approach taken in relation to national policy.
- Section 3 considers in detail whether there are exceptional circumstances in this case that justify an alternative approach to the Standard Method.
- Section 4 provides a summary of the findings of this review and conclusion on the approach taken by the ELP in respect of the identified local housing need.

2. The ELP's Proposed Approach

Policy Background

2.1 The introduction of the Standard Method for calculating local housing need through the NPPF 2018 – followed by clarification that alternatives should only be used in exceptional circumstances – marked a fundamental change in the calculation of housing need for the purposes of town planning.

2.2 Prior to this, the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012) had called for Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to meet their objectively assessed housing needs, without expressly setting out precisely how this should be calculated. Instead, the NPPF 2012 required LPAs to prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs), working with neighbouring authorities across administrative boundaries, to determine housing needs. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which accompanied the NPPF 2012 provided a suggested methodology, which urged use of official projections as a starting point. This guidance went on to suggest that LPAs could consider local circumstances that might have impacted on the official projections, and which thus may justify local changes. The guidance suggested the initial starting point should be adjusted to account for market signals, but without specifying how this should be quantified.

2.3 The thrust of the NPPF 2012 and its accompanying guidance was very much about seeking to identify a demographically 'correct' housing needs figure. This was despite the guidance acknowledging that the process of establishing housing needs was "*not an exact science*"[1]; and that the application of uplifts based on market signals was a very subjective exercise with different LPAs taking very different approaches.

2.4 Rather than directing LPAs to seek to identify a 'correct' housing needs figure, the NPPF 2018 and the introduction of the Standard Method for calculating Local Housing Need (LHN) represented a shift towards the calculation of local housing needs as a policy-driven response to the national housing crisis, aimed at boosting housing land supply, and providing consistency and certainty. Such an interpretation is evident through both current PPG as well as the Government's response to the consultation on the proposed methodology for calculating local housing need, as well as confirmed through S78 appeal decisions[2].

2.5 The NPPF 2018 also stressed that the Standard Method should be used for determining local housing needs, unless exceptional circumstances justified a departure from this approach. Again, this represented a very

[1] Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 2a-014-20140306

[2] See for example, paragraph 36 of Appeal Decision APP/P1560/W/18/3194826 (Lifehouse Spa and Hotel, Frinton Road, Thorpe-le-Soken) Decision date: 11 June 2019

different approach to the NPPF 2012 and its accompanying guidance, which was far more supportive of individual LPAs testing the official projections in order to determine their own housing needs.

2.6 The current NPPF and accompanying PPG continues to make it clear that the Standard Method, and the 2014-based Sub-National Household Projections (SNHPs), should be used as the starting point in determining the minimum housing needs, and thus for Local Plan housing requirements, unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach.

2.7 PPG makes it clear that the 2014-based SNHPs should be used for the purposes of calculating the Standard Method LHN, despite two sets of official projections (2016 and 2018-based) having subsequently been published and providing more up-to-date data. The explanation for this stance, as set out in the PPG, confirms that the Standard Method is a policy-driven approach to calculating housing need:

> "*The 2014-based household projections are used within the standard method to provide stability for planning authorities and communities, ensure that historic under-delivery and declining affordability are reflected, and to be consistent with the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes*."[3]

2.8 The NPPF 2018 was published in July of that year. In September 2018, 2016-based SNHPs were released. Applying these projections to the Standard Method would have resulted in a significant reduction to the calculated housing need that LPAs would be required to deliver (although for a minority of LPAs, applying the 2016-based SNHPs to the Standard Method would have resulted in an increase in the housing need) and would have been inconsistent with the Government's goal of delivering 300,000 additional homes per year by the mid-2020s.

2.9 In response to this, the Government published a Technical Consultation on Updates to National Planning Policy and Guidance (the 'Technical Consultation Paper'). This confirmed that, in light of the updated SNHPs, the Government had considered whether it needed to revise its objective of the delivery of 300,000 homes per year, or the Standard Method, but concluded that it did not. In deciding to retain the goal of 300,000 additional homes per year, the Government noted:

- The Office of National Statistics' (ONSs') view that the lower projections did not mean fewer homes were needed;
- Household projections are constrained by housing supply;

[3] Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 2a-005-20190220

- Historic under-delivery meant that there was a case for supporting delivery in excess of projections;
- Declining housing affordability, and a more responsive supply of homes would help address the effects of increasing demand;
- Population changes are only one aspect of determining housing demand – factors such as rising incomes and changing social preferences are also relevant.

2.10 Within this Technical Consultation Paper, the Government also noted that the change in the 2016-based SNHPs was driven by a combination of both lower household projections and changes in household formation rates, with the former responsible for the majority of the reduction.

2.11 The Technical Consultation Paper confirmed that the Government intended to specify that the 2014-based SNHPs should be used in the Standard Method, rather than the more up-to-date 2016-based projections; and that the 2016-based projections would not constitute exceptional circumstances justifying a departure from this approach.

2.12 A summary of responses to the Technical Consultation Paper, together with the Government's response to issues raised, was published in February 2019[4]. This noted that the majority of respondents (55%) disagreed with the Government's proposal to continue use of the 2014-based projections; and, separately, over half (53%) disagreed with the suggestion that the 2016-based SNHPs could not be used to justify a lower housing need. The Government's response was that it nevertheless remained of the view use of the 2014-based SNHPs represented the most appropriate approach, despite explicitly confirming that it did not doubt the methodological basis of the 2016-based SNHPs.

2.13 PPG was subsequently updated to confirm that the 2014-based SNHPs, and not the 2016-based SNHP, should be used the Standard Method LHN.

2.14 In summary, in relation to use of the 2016-SNHPs, in full knowledge that the 2016-based SNHPs projected a lower household growth, the Government has made it clear that LPAs should continue to use the 2014-based SNHPs to calculate the Standard method LHN. It is equally clear that this is a policy-driven stance aimed at seeking to boost housing land supply, rather than to identify a demographically correct housing need figure.

[4] Government response to the technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance A summary of consultation responses and the Government's view on the way forward (February 2019)

2.15 In terms of how the official projections are to be used in the Standard Method, the PPG[5] confirms that the projected annual average household growth over a 10-year period (10 consecutive years, with the current year as the starting point) provides the baseline of the local housing need calculation.

2.16 The Standard Method encompasses an adjustment to account for affordability, with the PPG confirming the most recent median workplace-based affordability ratios published by ONS should be used in the formula specified to determine the precise adjustment.

2.17 The PPG[6] confirms that the calculation of the LHN figure is capped at 40% above either the average annual housing requirement figure set out in the existing policies (where these are less than 5 years old / have been reviewed within 5 years and found not to require updating); or, where the relevant strategic policies for housing were adopted more than 5 years ago, whichever is higher of the projected annual household growth over 10 years, or the annual housing requirement in the most recently adopted strategic policies.

2.18 The application of a cap is further confirmation that the calculation of local housing need through the Standard Method is not an attempt to determine a 'correct' figure, but rather that it is a policy-driven process. In the case of the cap, the PPG confirms this is applied to *"ensure the minimum local housing need figure calculated using the standard method is deliverable as possible"*[7].

2.19 In overview, the NPPF encompasses a policy-driven approach to determining minimum housing needs which entails use of a Standard Method, which itself has been formulated with a view to not just ensuring consistency between LPAs, but also to assist the objective of boosting housing land supply. The use of the 2014-based SNHPs, as opposed to more up-to-date projections, is mandated not because the Government doubts the validity of the more recent projections, but because the use of the 2014-based SNHPs again assist with the Government's objectives, nationwide. The NPPF stresses that a departure from the Standard Method should only be in exceptional circumstances. Clearly, to allow otherwise would undermine the Government's housing delivery objectives.

The ELP and the North Norfolk Local Housing Needs Assessment (November 2019)

2.20 The ELP states that the District's housing need / requirement is around 480 dwellings per annum (dpa) – 9,600 dwellings over the 20-year plan period. At paragraph 7.1.4 of the ELP, it states:

> "*The current standard national methodology is based on Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections with a 2014 start date. The Authority does not consider that these 2014 based projections accurately*

[5] Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 2a-004-20201216

[6] Ibid

[7] Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 2a-007-20190220

reflect likely future growth rates in the District because they project forward higher rates of annual growth than were subsequently shown to have actually occurred. The Office of National Statistics published revised projections with a base date of 2016 and the Council considers these to be a more robust basis for establishing the future requirement for homes in the District."

2.21 The ELP goes on to confirm that the figure of 480 dpa is based on applying the Standard Method (including use of the latest (2020) affordability ratio data), but using the 2016-based, rather than 2014-based, SNHPs.

2.22 The ELP refers to the North Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NN SHMA), Opinion Research Services, 2019 as providing justification for this approach. We have inferred that this is the same document as the North Norfolk Local Housing Needs Assessment (November 2019) (NN LHNA 2019), as the link titled 'Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2019 Update)' on the Councils' Local Plan evidence base document library webpage links to the NN LHNA 2019, which appears to be a 2019 update to the Central Norfolk SHMA (June 2017) (CN SHMA 2017). In fact, the NN LHNA 2019 is not an 'update' to the CN SHMA 2017, as presented on the webpage, but an Assessment based on an entirely different methodology, that entirely replaces the previous Assessment.

2.23 The LHNA 2019 is dated November 2019, and as such was published after the Government had confirmed its position on use of the 2014-based SNHPs as part of the Standard Method. The LHNA 2019 acknowledges that the 2014-based SNHPs should be used in the Standard Method, and that an alternative approach will only be appropriate in exceptional circumstances and as part of the plan-making process.

2.24 However, the LHNA 2019 goes on to claim that there are exceptional circumstances that justify departure from using the 2014-based SNHPs.

2.25 In summary, the LHNA 2019's rationale for this is that Unattributable Population Change (UPC) has distorted the 2014-based SNHPs to the point that they no longer provided robust figures to use as a baseline for determining local housing needs.

2.26 UPC is the difference between the 2011 estimate of population in the rolled forward mid-year estimates, and the population identified in the 2011 Census. UPC can cause issues with population projections, because population estimates up to 2011 (revised following the Census) don't always align with the migration estimates (which were not revised). The 2014 SNHPs are informed by recent historic trends for the period 2009-14. As such, it includes data points for 2009-2011, which have the potential to be impacted by UPC.

2.27 In the case of North Norfolk, UPC is -2,807[8], i.e. the Census estimated there were 2,807 fewer residents in the District than the mid-year estimates had suggested. The LHNA 2019 clearly considers this to represent an issue with using the Standard Method to determine the local housing need for the District:

> *"The scale of the UPC for North Norfolk indicated very serious problems with the 2014 based population projections which underwrite the 2014 based households projections*." (paragraph 1.28)

2.28 Citing concerns with how UPC has distorted the 2014-based SNHPs for North Norfolk, the LHNA 2019 proposes use of 2016-based SNHPs to determine the baseline for calculating the Standard Method LHN. The LHNA 2019 notes that the Government's guidance expressly confirms the 2014-based SNHPs should be used, and that 2016-based SNHPs do not constitute exceptional circumstances. However, it seeks to justify its approach, stating:

> *"Whilst there are some uncertainties about the new method for calculating household formation that ONS has introduced for the 2016-based household projections, the 2016-based sub national population projections are based on a method that is largely consistent with that used for the 2014-based population projection but using more up-to-date data and based on improved mid-year population estimates."* (paragraph 1.23).

2.29 The LHNA 2019 also highlights, within the table provided as Figure 2, that the 2016-based SNHPs are informed by migration trends for 2011-2015, i.e. beyond the period affected by UPC.

2.30 There are were well-established and acknowledged concerns with the use of the 2016-based SNHPs to determine future housing needs. One of the key criticisms of the 2016-based projections regarding their potential use in plan-making is they use just two data points (2001 and 2011) to project headship rates up to 2021, after which they are assumed to be constant (previous projections drew upon data going back to 1971). The period 2001 – 2011 saw very low levels of housebuilding, and a dramatic worsening of affordability. Consequently, this period saw a significant increase in the number of concealed families, and young adults delaying moving into their own homes. This resulted in significant concerns that the household formation rates used in the 2016-based SNHPs had been suppressed, particularly within the 25-44 age cohort; and consequently the 2016-based SNHPs understate the actual extent of housing needs.

2.31 The LHNA 2019 appears to seek to address this concern by emphasising that the issue of supressed household formation within the 2016-based SNHPs is not applicable in the case of North Norfolk, stating:

[8] ONS

> "*The difference between the 2014 based and 2016 based household projections is entirely down to lower population projections for North Norfolk and not changes to headship rates which has the household projections for other local authorities fall*"

2.32 In short, it appears to suggest that the 2016-based SNHPs are appropriate to use in the case of North Norfolk, as the reduced household growth they suggest for the District is said to be a result of lower population projections, as opposed to revised household formation rates.

2.33 The LHNA 2019 appears to attach great weight to two S78 appeal decisions in justifying its decision to depart from use of the 2014-based SNHPs: one relating to a site within North Norfolk ('the Fakenham appeal'); and one relating to a site in Central Bedfordshire ('the Clifton appeal').

2.34 In both appeals, UPC was cited as a reason for doubting the appropriateness of using the 2014-based SNHPs to inform housing need / requirement calculations.

2.35 Moving past the approach to determining the baseline, the LHNA 2019 applies an uplift to account for affordability in line with the Standard Method, using the most recent ONS median workplace-based affordability ratio available to it at the time (2018 affordability ratio of 9.94).

2.36 The LHNA 2019 explains that this results in an adjustment factor of 37.1%.

2.37 Applying this to the annual average household growth over a ten-year period with the then-current year of 2019 as the starting point (as per the Standard Method) but using the 2016-based SNHPs, the LHNA 2019 concludes that 456 dpa represents an appropriate calculation of North Norfolk's LHN.

2.38 The ELP reports at paragraph 7.1.4 that 480 dpa represents a 'minimum housing requirement' for North Norfolk, explaining that this is based on applying the Standard Method to the 2016-based SNHPs (as advocated by the LHNA 2019) but using the latest (2020) affordability ratio data. The ELP goes on to state that this figure (a total of 9,600 homes over the plan period) is the 'minimum target to be provided'. At paragraph 23.0.2 the ELP refers to this figure as the 'minimum housing requirement'.

Concerns with the LHNA 2019 and ELP approach to considering housing requirement

2.39 There are a number of concerns with the approach the LHNA 2019, and consequently the ELP, have taken to determining local housing needs, as we discuss below.

Rejection of 2014-based SNHP

2.40 It appears clear that North Norfolk is subject to UPC, and that this has affected its 2014-based SNHPs. However, the presence of UPC is in no way exceptional – quite the opposite. What the LHNA 2019 fails to make clear is that every LPA area is subject to UPC, to varying degrees and in either direction (i.e. the Census estimated there were fewer residents in one area than the mid-year estimates had suggested in some Local Authorities, but more residents in others).

2.41 The LHNA 2019 refers to the scale of UPC, implying that it is exceptionally large in the case of North Norfolk. However, and as explored further within Section 3 below, it is not at all exceptional when compared to other LPA areas.

2.42 The rejection of the use of the 2014-based SNHPs also undermines one of the Government's key objectives in the calculation of housing needs – consistency. This is a particularly important consideration for two reasons:

- Firstly, North Norfolk is not an island, and there are clear implications for other LPA areas – particularly those with strong functional relationships – if a different approach to determining its housing needs is taken from that used elsewhere and for its neighbours.

- Secondly, as noted above, UPC is a negative value in some areas (including North Norfolk) but a positive value in others. However, whilst LPAs have sought to argue for a lower housing need figure due to UPC, we are not aware of any that have suggested that a positive UPC supports a higher housing need figure than the official, 2014-based SNHPs suggest. Clearly, if LPAs are permitted to reduce a housing needs figure due to UPC, but there is no reciprocal uplift in other LPA areas, then overall there will be a shortfall in housing provision. This is particularly relevant given that the causes of UPC are principally due to issues with internal migration estimates (with births and deaths data being very reliable), i.e. it is not the case that there are fewer people overall than official figures suggest – simply they may be distributed slightly differently than the data suggests.

2.43 Separately, the rejection of the 2014-based SNHPs by the LHNA 2019 – indeed, the approach taken by the LHNA 2019 as a whole – suggests a failure to recognise that use of the Standard Method is a policy-driven approach intended to help boost housing supply, and to ensure consistency.

2.44 As discussed earlier within this Section, the Technical Consultation Paper makes clear that the Government is well-aware of potential issues with the 2014-based SNHPs, but has nevertheless made a policy-based decision to require their use, unless exceptional circumstances apply (to reiterate, as explained within Section

3 of this review, the issue with vis-à-vis North Norfolk and the 2014-based SNHP cannot feasibly be considered exceptional).

2.45 There is nothing within the NPPF or PPG which expressly suggests UPC can constitute an exceptional circumstance sufficient to justify departure from the use of the 2014-based SNHPs, despite it being a well-recognised issue with the 2014-based projections and one that is applicable – to varying degrees – to all LPAs. Lack of any national policy or guidance support for UPC being sufficient to justify departing from the 2014-based SNHPs is entirely logical, for the reasons discussed above. Put differently, all Authorities are subject to UPC, to varying degrees and in both directions; that to allow UPC to justify reduced housing requirements for certain LPAs, without compensatory uplifts being required in others, would result in a net shortfall in housing against needs; that the Standard Method is a policy-driven approach to determining housing need aimed at increasing housing land supply; and the aim of the Standard Method to ensure consistency and provide certainty).

Use of 2016-based SNHPs

2.46 As noted above, there are well-recognised concerns with the 2016-based SNHPs relating to suppression of household formation, and the resultant projections understating housing needs.

2.47 The LHNA 2019 seeks to allay any fears that such concerns are applicable to North Norfolk, suggesting that in the District's case the lower household projections for North Norfolk are the result of lower population projections, and not changes to headship rates.

2.48 We consider in Section 3 whether this situation is exceptional to North Norfolk, and whether it can thus justify departure from use of the 2014-based SNHPs - as set out in Section 3, it is not exceptional.

2.49 However, and in any case, it is not clear that such circumstances would justify use of the 2016-based SNHPs.

2.50 As set out above, in expressly confirming that the 2016-based SNHPs did not constitute exceptional circumstances to depart from use of the 2014-based SNHPs in its Technical Consultation Paper, the Government recognised that the 2016-based SNHPs' lower household projections were caused by a combination of both lower and household projections and changes in household formation rates. Indeed, it noted that the majority of the difference was due to a lower projected population increase. Again, despite Government recognising the issue, there is nothing in national policy or guidance to suggest that the 2016-based projections are appropriate to use if it can be demonstrated that, for a particular LPA, the difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHP is a result of differences in that projected. Again this is entirely logical, given the stated aims of the Standard Method (i.e. consistency and boosting the supply of housing).

2.51 Irrespective of all of the above, even if one were to accept that it were appropriate to use more up-to-date recent projections that had not been affected by UPC, then the 2016-based projections are no longer the most up-to-date.

2016-based SNHPs are no longer the most up-to-date

2.52 The NPPF[9] confirms that "*the preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and* ***up-to-date*** *evidence*". (emphasis added).

2.53 Typically, this would not necessarily apply to the calculation of housing requirement, as the PPG expressly confirms the need to use the 2014-based SNHPs. However, in the event that it is considered necessary to depart from the Standard Method, then it would be incumbent on the LPA to utilise the most up-to-date projections to inform the ELP.

2.54 The LHNA 2019 explains that UPC and its impact on the 2014-based SNHPs was a key reason for utilising alternative projections. It was noted that the 2016-based SNHPs drew upon data for 2011-2016 and thus were not affected by the UPC in the same way as the 2014-based SNHPs. The LHNA 2019 also noted that the 2016-based projections represented – at that time – the most up-to-date projections.

2.55 Subsequently however, the 2018-based projections have been released. These represent the most-up-date projections currently available.

2.56 The 2018-based projections were based on data for 2013-2018. Therefore, as with the 2016-based projections, they are not subject to the UPC concerns that the LHNA 2019 expressed in relation to the 2014-based projections.

2.57 The 2018-based SNHPs followed a very similar methodology to the 2016-based SNHPs and are therefore considered comparable.

2.58 As with the 2016-based SNHPs, the 2018-based SNHPs again only use two points (2001 and 2011) to project headship rates up to 2021, after which they assume this to be constant. As such, they are subject to the same concerns that rendered the 2016-based SNHPs deeply problematic for use in estimating future housing needs.

2.59 However, the LHNA 2019 suggests that concerns with suppression of household formation in the 2016-based SNHPs are not applicable to North Norfolk. If this is the case, then such concerns would not apply to the 2018-based SNHPs.

[9] Paragraph 31

2.60 As such, if one were to accept that the LHNA 2019 is correct, that sufficient exceptional circumstances apply to justify a departure from the 2014-based SNHPs, and that it is appropriate for housing needs, and the ELP housing requirement to be calculated using the latest SNHPs – projections not affected by UPC – then it is clear that the 2018-based SNHPs should be used, not the 2016-based SNHPs.

2.61 Curiously, the ELP (at paragraph 7.1.4) appears to recognise the need to apply the latest affordability ratio data to the LHNA 2019's proposed approach to calculating the local housing need / requirement, but fails to consider the need to use the latest SNHPs.

2.62 Calculating a housing need figure for North Norfolk using the approach advocated by the LHNA 2019, but using the most recent SNHPs and affordability ratio data results in the following:

A	Households 2022 (2018-based SNHPs)	49,648
B	Households 2032 (2018-based SNHPs)	53,910
C	Change in projected households 2022–2032 (2018-based SNHPs) (B-A)	4,262
D	Average annual change in households 2022–2032 (2018-based SNHPs) (C/10)	426
E	Median workplace-based affordability ratio (2020, published 2021 ONS)	9.07
F	Adjustment factor ((E - 4) / 4) x 0.25 + 1	1.317
G	**Local housing need (D x F)**	**561**

2.63 In summary, if one is to accept that the 2014-based SNHPs are exceptionally erroneous, warranting use of the most recent projections unaffected by UPC, then use of the latest projections generates a local housing need figure of 561 dpa, materially higher than the 480 dpa identified in the ELP.

Reliance on S78 appeal decisions

2.64 The LHNA 2019 seemingly places considered reliance on two appeal decisions to support its approach, citing the Fakenham appeal and the Clifton appeal, as discussed earlier.

2.65 Any reliance on any S78 appeal decision to inform the evidence base in the preparation of a new Local Plan is inherently problematic for a number of reasons.

2.66 Such decisions are made in relation to a specific proposal, having regard to evidence that has been presented at a particular appeal at a specific point in time.

2.67 Moreover, appeals are considered in the context of the current Development Plan at that time, and the requirement for the proposal to be determined in accordance with this unless material considerations indicate

otherwise. Conversely, preparation of a new Local Plan entails, of course, the preparation of a new Development Plan.

2.68 In respect of the issue of housing need / requirement, where this is considered in planning appeals, it is in relation to a single proposed development and invariably the issue of whether or not the 'tilted balance' should be applied as per paragraph 11d of the NPPF to the specific appeal proposal in question.

2.69 This is a wholly different context to the issue of establishing local housing needs or a housing requirement in plan-making, which has far-reaching implications over a significant period of time for not only the LPA in question, but also potentially the wider housing market area.

2.70 Clearly, a decision to not use the 2014-based SNHPs in the case of a specific appeal proposal, having regard to its specific circumstances and the evidence presented in its case, will have very different repercussions in terms of the stated objectives of the Standard Method (to assist in significantly boosting housing land supply, provide certainty and consistency) than failure to apply in the context of plan-making.

2.71 Additionally, it should be recognised that the NPPF expressly requires exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated if strategic policies on housing requirement are to be informed by a departure from the Standard Method. The NPPF goes on to state that alternatives to the Standard Method should only be considered through the plan-making process, but does not specify that decision-makers must conclude exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated in the context of determining planning applications.

2.72 Furthermore, it is necessary to consider the specific policy context in which planning appeals were determined.

2.73 In this respect, it should be recognised that the Fakenham appeal was determined on 5 July 2017 – before the introduction of the Standard Method and the Government's policy-driven approach to determining housing needs.

2.74 In the case of the Fakenham appeal, the potential introduction of the Standard Method was touched upon, but the Inspector concluded it could be given no weight at that time:

> "*LPEG's standard methodology recommendations were not endorsed by the recent Housing White Paper and DCLG's commitment to consult on a standard methodology cannot be taken to mean the LPEG methodology. There is no certainty as to whether LPEG's recommendations will be accepted so, as things stand, they carry no real weight as a consideration in the calculation of OAN*" (paragraph 27 of the Inspector's decision letter).

2.75 In respect of the Clifton appeal, this related to a site within Central Bedfordshire. The degree of UPC in Central Bedfordshire is vastly greater than that in North Norfolk, as discussed further in Section 3 below, and the appeal was determined prior to the publication of the 2018-based SNHPs.

2.76 Having regard to the above, we consider that any reliance on S78 appeals – including the Fakenham and Clifton appeals – needs to be treated with significant caution in determining an appropriate housing need, or housing requirement, for the purposes of plan-making in North Norfolk.

Implications for the Housing Market Area and beyond

2.77 To reiterate, North Norfolk is not an island.

2.78 The Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017 was commissioned by the Central Norfolk local authorities (Norwich City, Broadland, Breckland, North Norfolk and South Norfolk, together with the Broads Authority Executive Area) to identify the functional Housing Market Areas covered by the five local authorities. Unsurprisingly, it identified strong relationships between North Norfolk and its neighbours. It identified a functional housing market area that encompassed Norwich City and Broadland administrative areas, most of South Norfolk, Breckland and North Norfolk, a part of Mid Suffolk and very small parts of Great Yarmouth and Waveney District.

2.79 How have authorities within this functional housing market area sought to determine their housing requirements for the purposes of plan-making?

2.80 The Greater Norwich Local Plan is being prepared in respect of Norwich, Broadland and South Norfolk. This Local Plan has reached the Regulation 19 and the Publication (Regulation 19) Draft Local Plan confirms that it has used the Standard Method – including use of the 2014-based SNHPs – to determine the housing needs and requirements of the three authorities.

2.81 Mid Suffolk is preparing a Joint Local Plan in conjunction with Babergh District Council. The Joint Local Plan has reached examination stage, and the submitted version's housing needs and requirements have been determined using the Standard Method, including the 2014-based SNHP. Whilst a number of issues have been identified through its examination, necessitating a review of issues such as a settlement hierarchy and spatial distribution of housing, there are no apparent concerns in respect of the approach to calculating housing needs or housing requirement.

2.82 There is therefore a discrepancy between how the housing need figure and housing requirement set out in the ELP is proposed to be calculated, and how those for North Norfolk's neighbours within the functional housing market area have been calculated in preparation of their Local Plans.

2.83 The discrepancy is potentially particularly problematic given that the concerns with the 2014-based projections relate to UPC, which in turn is thought to be a result of errors in internal migration data.

2.84 This begs the question as to what the implications of this might be for neighbouring areas' projections – if the 2014-based projections overstate household growth in North Norfolk, do they understate that of other areas within the functional housing market area? If not, if fewer people will move into North Norfolk than the 2014-based projections suggest, where will such people be located instead, and do these areas require any uplifts in their housing requirement calculations to account for this?

2.85 These are exactly the sort of complex issues which can arise where inconsistent approaches to determining housing requirements can engender, and which the Standard Method seeks to avoid.

Overview

2.86 The NPPF 2018 introduced a policy-driven approach to calculating housing needs and requirements for the purposes of planning, as part of measures to address the national housing crisis and help boost housing land supply. It marked a fundamental shift in the approach to determining housing requirements, and a move away from trying to identify a demographically 'correct' housing needs figure, recognising that the approach to calculating housing needs is not an exact science. The Standard Method is also intended to ensure consistency in the approach to calculating housing needs, and thus provide certainty.

2.87 Current national policy is very clear that the Standard Method, including the 2014-based SNHPs, should be used to determine housing requirements, and that – for plan-making – alternative approaches should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

2.88 The Government makes clear that use of the 2014-based SHNPs is a policy response aimed at seeking to help meet objectives around housing delivery and provide consistency and certainty. Notwithstanding this, the ELP seeks to depart from use of the 2014-based SNHPs, suggesting that there are exceptional circumstance which justify use of alternative projections instead of those that national policy and guidance specifically prescribe.

2.89 The exceptional circumstances claimed by NNDC amount to UPC and its impact on the 2014-based projections. The LHNA 2019 implies the level of UPC in North Norfolk is exceptional. This is considered in detail within Section 3 below, but in short it is evidently not exceptional when compared to other LPA areas.

2.90 The PPG expressly confirms the 2016-based SNHPs do not constitute exceptional circumstances that justify departure from the Standard Method / 2014-based SNHPs. There are well recognised issues with the 2016-based SNHPs in terms of their use for the purposes of planning, given concerns around suppressed household formation. Nevertheless, the LHNA 2019 proposes use of the 2016-based SNHPs, and a variation of the

Standard Method whereby these projections are used in place of the 2014-based SNHPs. This results in a significantly lower housing requirement being identified. The LHNA 2019 argues that issues with the 2016-based SNHPs and household formation suppression do not apply in the case of North Norfolk. It is also noted that concerns with UPC in North Norfolk do not apply to the 2016-based SNHPs.

2.91 The LHNA 2019 predates publication of the 2018-based SNHPs. As with the 2016-based SNHPs, these projections are subject to concerns in respect of household formation suppression. However, as with the 2016-based SNHPs, they are not subject to the same concerns due to UPC that the LHNA 2019 had with 2014-based SNHPs. Unlike the 2016-based SNHPs, the 2018-based SNHPs are currently the most up-to-date.

2.92 In short, the 2016-based SNHPs are neither the projections that national policy and guidance states should be used, nor are they the most up-to-date projections.

2.93 For the reasons set out in Section 3 below, we do not consider there are exceptional circumstances that justify departure from the use of the 2014-based SNHPs. However, if there were to be considered exceptional circumstances, then this would still not justify use of the now out-of-date 2016-based SNHPs. If it were to be considered appropriate to depart from use of the 2014-based SNHPs, and to use more up-to-date projections to which concerns around UPC did not apply, then the 2018-based SNHPs should be used. This results in a minimum housing need of 561 dpa.

3. Exceptional circumstances

3.1 As discussed in Section 2 of this review, the LHNA 2019 identified issues with the 2014-based SNHPs that it considers justifies use of alternative projections, notwithstanding national policy and guidance.

3.2 The LHNA 2019 correctly observed that North Norfolk is subject to UPC.

3.3 The LHNA 2019 also implies that concerns that the 2016-based SNHPs understate housing need due to suppression of household formation are not applicable in North Norfolk, going on to emphasise that the difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs is the result of differences population projections for the District (as opposed to household formation rates).

UPC

3.4 As noted above in Section 2, in respect of UPC, it is important to recognise that all LPAs are subject to UPC, by varying degrees and in either direction. Having regard to the NPPF, it is necessary to consider whether North Norfolk's UPC is exceptional.

3.5 North Norfolk's UPC is -2,807.

3.6 A list of all LPAs for which UPC data is available via ONS has been ranked by scale of their UPC, and provided as Appendix A hereto.

3.7 Table 1 of Appendix A shows that of the 326 LPAs, North Norfolk has the 121st greatest UPC in absolute terms.

3.8 It is recognised that the populations of LPA areas vary considerably, and thus absolute values may not necessarily be the best way to consider to what degree UPC is an issue in any one area. As such, Table 2 of Appendix A ranks Local Authorities by UPC relative to their 2011 Census population. This shows that of the 326 Authorities, North Norfolk has the 81st highest UPC when considered relative to its population.

3.9 121 out of 326 in absolute terms, and 81st out of 326 when considering UPC in relative terms – North Norfolk's UPC can in no way be considered exceptional, rather the opposite.

3.10 Another way to consider whether there is anything exceptional about North Norfolk's UPC would be to consider it in relation to the standard deviation of the data.

3.11 The standard deviation of data shows how dispersed data is in relation to the average (mean) of the data set. A low standard deviation indicates that values tend to be focussed around the mean, whereas a high standard deviation demonstrates indicates a greater dispersion of values. In short, it measures how spread out the

values are. The degree to which a particular value differs from the standard deviation can help indicate whether that value is anomalous. Conventionally, data that is two standard deviations from the mean (i.e. a figure greater than two times the standard deviation) is considered statistically significant.

3.12 The mean UPC is just 318. One would anticipate the national average to be a low figure – given that UPC can be negative or positive, and the primary cause is issues with internal migration, it would be expected that overall the values would 'cancel themselves out'.

3.13 The standard deviation of UPC is 6,214. This suggests a very dispersed data set; and that the majority of values within the data set will be within 6,214 of the mean, i.e. between -5,896 and 6,532. North Norfolk's UPC is comfortably within the middle of this range suggesting again that the District is not at all exceptional in relation to UPC.

3.14 Turning to the distribution of data in relative terms, the mean is -0.08%. The standard deviation of UPC as a percentage of total population is 4.22%. The figure for North Norfolk is just 2.76% – again, well within a single standard deviation. If North Norfolk had an exceptional UPC, we would expect it to be more than two standard deviations from the mean, i.e. to have a value of less than -8.30% or more than 8.28%.

3.15 Separately, if one were to accept that North Norfolk's UPC was exceptional, one would have to accept that at least 80 other LPAs rendered them exceptional cases, warranting departure from the Standard Method / use of the 2014-based SNHPs.

3.16 North Norfolk's UPC is evidently not exceptional. Its use as justification for departing from the use of the 2014-based SNHPs and determining a lower housing need / requirement is diametrically opposed to national policy.

Difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs

3.17 The 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs project different population growths for all LPAs. As discussed earlier, the Government was aware that the cause in addition to household formation rates, lower levels of projected population increase were one of the factors that resulted in the 2016-based SNHPs suggesting a lower increase in households. It was not the case that it was merely due to suppressed household formation in the 2016-based SNHPs. Indeed, the lower population projections were the cause for the majority of the reduction in the increase in projected households.

3.18 Looking at the entirety of the period covered by these projections, the 2014-based SNHPs project North Norfolk's population will increase by 14,369 between 2014 and 2039. The 2016-based SNHPs project an increase of 10,186. The difference between the projections for their respective 25-year periods for North Norfolk amounts to 4,183.

3.19 In respect of the period 2022-2032 (the relevant period for calculation of local housing need in accordance with the Standard Method), the 2014-based SNHPs project North Norfolk's population will increase by 6,249. The 2016-based SNHPs project an increase of 4,492 for the same period. The difference between the two is 1,757.

3.20 As with UPC, if one is to determine whether this is exceptional, it is necessary to compare North Norfolk's position with other LPAs.

3.21 Appendix B provides tables enabling a comparison with other Authorities. Appendix B Table 1 ranks the 326 Local Authorities by difference in increase in population between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs for the 25-year period addressed by the SNHP. North Norfolk's difference is the 156th largest. Looking at the difference in projected population for the period 2022-2032, North Norfolk's is the 154th largest. In absolute terms, the difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs for North Norfolk is entirely unexceptional.

3.22 As with the consideration of UPC, it is relevant to consider the degree of difference between the population projections relatively to the size of the LPA area. As such, we have considered the difference in projected population change relative to the LPA area's population as per the 2011 Census. The difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs for the period 2022-2032 for North Norfolk equates to 1.73% of its 2011 Census population. For the 25-year period addressed by the SNHP, the difference equates to 4.11%.

3.23 Appendix B Table 3 ranks LPAs by relative difference between the 2014 and 2016-based projections. Out of 326 Authorities, North Norfolk has the 130th largest difference in relative terms for the 25-year period; and the 126th largest for the period 2022-2032.

3.24 The average (mean) difference between increase projected by the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs for their respective 25-year period is 6,996 (this includes negative and positive values, but unlike UPC there is nothing to suggest these should cancel each other out – the 2016-based SNHPs project a greater increase for the vast majority of Authorities); and the standard deviation for this data set is 9,129. As such North Norfolk's increase is below average but not exceptionally below average, lying well within a single standard deviation of the mean average.

3.25 In relative terms, the average (mean) increase between the two projections is 4.09%; and the standard deviation 4.69%. The difference between projections in relative terms for North Norfolk is only marginally above average, and well within a single standard deviation – entirely unexceptional.

3.26 It could not be feasibly argued that the difference between the 2016-based and 2014-based SNHPs for North Norfolk is in anyway 'exceptional'. As such, any argument that North Norfolk's 2016-based SNHPs could have been exceptionally caused by population change is not considered valid.

4. Overview & Conclusion

Overview

4.1 The NPPF sets out a policy-driven approach to the calculation of housing needs – one which seeks to boost housing land supply, as well as provide consistency and certainty. The Standard Method prescribes use of the 2014-bassed SNHPs, despite these not being the most up-to-date projections. The Government has been clear that this is due to such projections aligning with it housing delivery objectives. National policy and guidance stresses that alternative approaches should only be used where justified by exceptional circumstances.

4.2 The housing requirement proposed by the ELP, informed by the LHNA 2019, is based on an alternative approach to that set out in national policy and guidance.

4.3 The LHNA 2019 suggested that North Norfolk's UPC constitutes exceptional circumstances that justify an alternative approach to the Standard Method, claiming UPC distorted the 2014-based SNHPs to the point that they no longer provided robust figures to use as a baseline for determining local housing need. The ELP states that the Council "*does not consider that these 2014 based projections accurately reflect likely future growth rates in the District because they project forward higher rates of annual growth than were subsequently shown to have actually occurred".*

4.4 The LHNA 2019 suggested that the 2016-based SNHPs should be used instead, on the basis they present more up-to-date projections (the most up-to-date projections available at the time the LHNA 2019 was prepared) and that they used data that would not have been impacted by UPC.

4.5 There are well recognised concerns with the 2016-based SNHPs for use in plan-making, around the suppression of household formation. However, the LHNA 2019 implies such concerns do not apply to North Norfolk, as the reason for the difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs is due to revised population projections, rather than changes to headship rates.

4.6 National policy and guidance does not support the deconstruction of official projections in order to try and justify a reduced housing requirement as a standard approach in plan-making. Instead, the NPPF makes clear that alternatives should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

4.7 All LPAs are subject to UPC, by varying degrees and in both directions. The fact that North Norfolk is subject to UPC is entirely typical. Furthermore, the scale of its UPC – both in absolute and relative terms – is entirely unexceptional when compared with other LPAs.

4.8 Neither national policy nor guidance suggest that the sole reason why the 2016-based SNHPs should not be used is due to the headship rates used. Nor do they indicate that if it can be demonstrated that the difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs is a result of the difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs, it is acceptable to use the 2016-based SNHPs to determine the housing requirement. The majority of the difference between the 2014 and 2016-based SNHPs is due to difference in population projections – it is not at all exceptional. Furthermore, when one considers the extent to which the 2014 and 2016-based projections differ for North Norfolk, specifically, it is not at all unusual when compared with that for other LPAs. Again, it is not exceptional.

4.9 A key concern with departing from use of the Standard Method / 2014-based SNHPs is that it introduces an inconsistency, and it has the potential to be particularly problematic when LPAs within the same housing market area take different approaches to the issue. Put simply, if one LPA is permitted to lower its housing numbers on the basis that it considers levels of migration into it will not be as great as projected, then it will be necessary to address the balance by uplifting numbers of another LPA. Otherwise there will be an overall deficiency. However, this does not appear to have been considered in the case of North Norfolk, with neighbouring LPAs simply using the Standard Method and 2014-based SNHPs.

4.10 The reasons given by the ELP and the LHNA 2019 are not at all exceptional, and the proposed departure from use of the 2014-based SNHPs to arrive at a lower housing requirement is contrary to the NPPF and counter to the objectives of the Standard Method. However, if one were to accept the arguments of the LHNA 2019: that North Norfolk is exceptional, and that more up-to-date SNHPs should be used – projections that did not use data affected by UPC – then clearly the 2018-based SNHPs should be used. Like the 2016-based SNHPs they do not rely on data that was affected by UPC. Unlike the 2016-based SNHPs they do, however, represent the most up-to-date projections available.

Conclusion

4.11 There are no exceptional circumstances that justify a departure from the Standard Method and 2014-based SNHPs, and the use of the 2016-based SNHPs instead. The Standard Method should be used for North Norfolk, resulting in an average annual housing need of 531 dpa (a total of 10,620 over the 20-year plan period).

4.12 If one were to apply the latest, 2018-based, SNHPs to the methodology as advocated by the LHNA 2019, this would result in an average annual housing need of 561 dpa (a total of 11,220 over the 20-year plan period).

Appendix A

Appendix A – Table 1

Local Authority UPC (absolute)

Leeds	-39,998	1
Westminster	-32,006	2
Brent	27,806	3
Birmingham	24,918	4
Newham	21,907	5
Camden	-21,312	6
Liverpool	20,596	7
Manchester	18,580	8
Greenwich	17,691	9
Hackney	17,012	10
Waltham Forest	16,987	11
Leicester UA	16,057	12
Coventry	-14,950	13
Kingston upon Thames	-14,843	14
Cambridge	14,802	15
Merton	-14,209	16
Southwark	-13,635	17
Brighton and Hove UA	12,073	18
Bournemouth UA	11,609	19
Bradford	11,560	20
Kirklees	10,929	21
Cornwall UA	-10,910	22
Wokingham UA	-10,672	23
Tendring	-10,542	24
Croydon	10,010	25
Southend-on-Sea UA	9,805	26
Doncaster	9,739	27
Shropshire UA	9,535	28
Wirral	9,388	29
Ealing	9,372	30
Walsall	9,372	31
Reading UA	9,327	32
North Somerset UA	-9,034	33
Wiltshire UA	8,913	34

Wandsworth	8,633	35
Welwyn Hatfield	-8,390	36
Bromley	-8,344	37
Sutton	-8,305	38
Haringey	8,256	39
Lancaster	-7,885	40
Trafford	7,878	41
Sandwell	7,819	42
Newcastle upon Tyne	-7,783	43
Bristol, City of UA	-7,504	44
Sunderland	-7,490	45
Gateshead	7,473	46
Hammersmith and Fulham	7,304	47
Richmond upon Thames	-7,229	48
Central Bedfordshire UA	-7,184	49
Guildford	-7,174	50
Wolverhampton	6,885	51
Slough UA	6,878	52
Barnet	-6,859	53
Wigan	6,732	54
Bedford UA	-6,692	55
St Edmundsbury	6,627	56
Kensington and Chelsea	-6,499	57
Watford	6,370	58
East Lindsey	-6,259	59
Runnymede	-6,152	60
Shepway	6,114	61
Ipswich	6,020	62
East Riding of Yorkshire UA	-5,983	63
Charnwood	-5,950	64
Aylesbury Vale	-5,855	65
Swindon UA	5,808	66
Milton Keynes UA	5,806	67
Halton UA	5,697	68
Islington	-5,691	69
Tower Hamlets	-5,512	70
Wycombe	5,482	71
South Gloucestershire UA	-5,411	72
Mid Sussex	5,326	73

Bracknell Forest UA	-5,146	74
Dudley	5,043	75
Kingston upon Hull, City of UA	-5,012	76
Bolton	4,996	77
Rochdale	4,938	78
Lambeth	4,830	79
Blackburn with Darwen UA	4,816	80
East Cambridgeshire	-4,756	81
Wakefield	-4,576	82
Bath and North East Somerset UA	-4,500	83
Tunbridge Wells	4,457	84
Darlington UA	4,345	85
Middlesbrough UA	-4,275	86
Woking	4,143	87
Canterbury	-4,117	88
Colchester	-4,081	89
Arun	-4,051	90
St. Helens	-4,020	91
South Northamptonshire	-4,002	92
City of London	-3,983	93
Wyre	-3,905	94
Redditch	3,849	95
Northumberland UA	3,843	96
Stafford	3,806	97
Stoke-on-Trent UA	3,700	98
South Tyneside	-3,693	99
Hounslow	3,689	100
Knowsley	-3,639	101
Southampton UA	-3,601	102
County Durham UA	3,577	103
Nottingham UA	-3,569	104
Stockport	-3,568	105
Oxford	3,499	106
Oadby and Wigston	-3,383	107
Richmondshire	3,364	108
North Lincolnshire UA	3,317	109
Hillingdon	-3,284	110
Havant	3,273	111
Mansfield	3,211	112

Harrow	3,199	113
Dover	3,153	114
Poole UA	3,088	115
Teignbridge	-2,954	116
Worcester	2,935	117
Exeter	-2,898	118
Torbay UA	-2,841	119
Oldham	2,824	120
North Norfolk	-2,807	121
Northampton	-2,786	122
Barking and Dagenham	-2,675	123
Wealden	2,671	124
Rushmoor	2,613	125
Newcastle-under-Lyme	-2,603	126
Norwich	-2,599	127
York UA	-2,568	128
Broxtowe	-2,541	129
Redcar and Cleveland UA	-2,493	130
New Forest	-2,417	131
Forest Heath	-2,415	132
Waveney	-2,394	133
Torridge	-2,382	134
Chesterfield	2,308	135
Basildon	2,283	136
North Dorset	2,282	137
St Albans	2,281	138
Rugby	2,257	139
Corby	2,241	140
Cherwell	-2,221	141
Derby UA	-2,196	142
Stevenage	2,195	143
Fareham	-2,161	144
Hastings	2,159	145
Peterborough UA	2,145	146
Cannock Chase	2,133	147
Sefton	-2,104	148
Wychavon	-2,062	149
High Peak	-2,036	150
Rushcliffe	-2,015	151

Broxbourne	2,013	152
Hambleton	1,957	153
West Dorset	1,957	154
Stockton-on-Tees UA	-1,885	155
Isle of Wight UA	-1,850	156
Barnsley	1,828	157
East Staffordshire	1,818	158
North Tyneside	1,804	159
North West Leicestershire	1,796	160
West Lancashire	-1,789	161
Cheshire East UA	1,745	162
East Hertfordshire	-1,729	163
South Oxfordshire	1,704	164
Gloucester	1,696	165
Mendip	-1,677	166
Barrow-in-Furness	-1,669	167
Lincoln	1,664	168
Eastbourne	1,660	169
Dacorum	1,644	170
Gosport	1,640	171
Crawley	-1,635	172
Three Rivers	-1,609	173
Epping Forest	-1,606	174
North East Lincolnshire UA	1,588	175
Lewes	-1,571	176
Breckland	-1,561	177
Pendle	-1,540	178
North Devon	1,526	179
Eastleigh	1,521	180
Ryedale	-1,505	181
Allerdale	1,499	182
Dartford	1,484	183
Boston	-1,471	184
Sheffield	1,470	185
Weymouth and Portland	1,449	186
Nuneaton and Bedworth	1,428	187
Hart	-1,421	188
Castle Point	-1,378	189
Stratford-on-Avon	-1,372	190

Wellingborough	-1,365	191
Forest of Dean	-1,359	192
Kettering	1,355	193
Mid Suffolk	1,329	194
Medway UA	1,313	195
Swale	-1,313	196
Rotherham	1,297	197
Herefordshire, County of UA	-1,270	198
Bury	-1,267	199
Hyndburn	-1,263	200
Scarborough	1,260	201
Horsham	-1,253	202
East Dorset	-1,249	203
South Staffordshire	1,248	204
Portsmouth UA	-1,238	205
Test Valley	1,228	206
Surrey Heath	1,227	207
Havering	-1,226	208
South Lakeland	-1,224	209
Chiltern	1,220	210
Ribble Valley	-1,214	211
Tewkesbury	-1,211	212
Daventry	-1,185	213
Maldon	-1,178	214
South Kesteven	-1,152	215
Fylde	-1,147	216
Carlisle	1,139	217
Staffordshire Moorlands	1,131	218
Babergh	1,121	219
Epsom and Ewell	1,109	220
East Hampshire	1,107	221
Warrington UA	-1,092	222
Maidstone	1,072	223
West Somerset	-1,064	224
Sedgemoor	-1,059	225
Chelmsford	1,047	226
Vale of White Horse	-1,034	227
Braintree	1,030	228
Worthing	1,027	229

Mid Devon	998	230
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	987	231
Cheltenham	973	232
South Cambridgeshire	-967	233
Thurrock UA	-946	234
Hinckley and Bosworth	-938	235
Burnley	932	236
Cotswold	-905	237
South Norfolk	870	238
Taunton Deane	-868	239
Spelthorne	865	240
South Holland	-864	241
Uttlesford	849	242
Rutland UA	-846	243
Copeland	842	244
Reigate and Banstead	-834	245
Ashfield	805	246
Derbyshire Dales	799	247
Enfield	789	248
Gedling	-760	249
Harrogate	760	250
Blaby	-696	251
Salford	-696	252
East Northamptonshire	666	253
Bolsover	651	254
Lewisham	-632	255
Fenland	-623	256
Suffolk Coastal	-620	257
Telford and Wrekin UA	615	258
Wyre Forest	-608	259
Winchester	604	260
West Oxfordshire	-572	261
Gravesham	571	262
Waverley	-565	263
Brentwood	532	264
Harlow	526	265
Lichfield	523	266
Windsor and Maidenhead UA	-520	267
Thanet	519	268

Chichester	-512	269
East Devon	-512	270
Adur	-504	271
Preston	495	272
West Devon	-492	273
Broadland	484	274
Basingstoke and Deane	-473	275
Plymouth UA	469	276
South Bucks	-464	277
Sevenoaks	-450	278
Calderdale	440	279
Malvern Hills	-434	280
Mole Valley	417	281
South Hams	396	282
Huntingdonshire	-385	283
Blackpool UA	381	284
North East Derbyshire	380	285
West Lindsey	-378	286
Hartlepool UA	376	287
South Ribble	-366	288
North Warwickshire	-351	289
Selby	-350	290
Tameside	347	291
Cheshire West and Chester UA	346	292
Tandridge	-344	293
Harborough	337	294
Redbridge	330	295
Isles of Scilly UA	306	296
Tonbridge and Malling	-293	297
Warwick	-272	298
Elmbridge	-264	299
Stroud	262	300
Purbeck	257	301
Ashford	251	302
South Derbyshire	-217	303
West Berkshire UA	-210	304
Rochford	204	305
Melton	190	306
North Hertfordshire	-189	307

Bromsgrove	-181	308
Great Yarmouth	-175	309
Bassetlaw	-162	310
Christchurch	155	311
Newark and Sherwood	-134	312
Luton UA	-122	313
North Kesteven	109	314
South Somerset	-107	315
Erewash	100	316
Solihull	-96	317
Craven	87	318
Rother	77	319
Hertsmere	69	320
Rossendale	60	321
Chorley	55	322
Tamworth	15	323
Bexley	13	324
Amber Valley	3	325
Eden	2	326

Appendix A – Table 2

Local Authority UPC (relative to Census 2011 population)

City of London	-53.7372	1
Westminster	-14.5759	2
Isles of Scilly UA	13.7590	3
Cambridge	12.0611	4
Camden	-9.6834	5
Kingston upon Thames	-9.2517	6
Brent	8.9052	7
Runnymede	-7.6421	8
Tendring	-7.6357	9
Welwyn Hatfield	-7.5772	10
Merton	-7.0853	11
Newham	7.0563	12
Watford	7.0268	13
Greenwich	6.9245	14
Wokingham UA	-6.8877	15
Hackney	6.8824	16
Waltham Forest	6.5400	17
Bournemouth UA	6.3282	18
Richmondshire	6.3130	19
Oadby and Wigston	-6.0433	20
Reading UA	6.0043	21
St Edmundsbury	5.9465	22
Lancaster	-5.7211	23
Shepway	5.6507	24
East Cambridgeshire	-5.6454	25
Southend-on-Sea UA	5.6262	26
Leeds	-5.3282	27
Guildford	-5.2144	28
Slough UA	4.8880	29
Leicester UA	4.8713	30
Southwark	-4.7226	31
Coventry	-4.7174	32

South Northamptonshire	-4.6837	33
East Lindsey	-4.5792	34
Redditch	4.5649	35
Halton UA	4.5314	36
Bracknell Forest UA	-4.5261	37
Ipswich	4.5016	38
North Somerset UA	-4.4483	39
Brighton and Hove UA	4.4231	40
Liverpool	4.4230	41
Sutton	-4.3454	42
Bedford UA	-4.2397	43
Woking	4.1641	44
Darlington UA	4.1152	45
Kensington and Chelsea	-4.1068	46
Forest Heath	-4.0225	47
Hammersmith and Fulham	4.0034	48
Tunbridge Wells	3.8674	49
Richmond upon Thames	-3.8549	50
Mid Sussex	3.7992	51
Gateshead	3.7300	52
Torridge	-3.7234	53
Manchester	3.6946	54
Corby	3.6376	55
Wyre	-3.6261	56
Charnwood	-3.5870	57
Walsall	3.4772	58
Trafford	3.4691	59
Aylesbury Vale	-3.3480	60
North Dorset	3.3072	61
Blackburn with Darwen UA	3.2616	62
Haringey	3.2308	63
Doncaster	3.2198	64
Wycombe	3.1880	65
Shropshire UA	3.1048	66
Middlesbrough UA	-3.0896	67
West Somerset	-3.0762	68
Mansfield	3.0712	69
Worcester	2.9743	70
Wirral	2.9352	71

Stafford	2.9077	72
Ryedale	-2.9002	73
Dover	2.8223	74
Central Bedfordshire UA	-2.8102	75
Wandsworth	2.8056	76
Newcastle upon Tyne	-2.7887	77
Swindon UA	2.7696	78
Rushmoor	2.7694	79
Ealing	2.7620	80
North Norfolk	**-2.7611**	**81**
Islington	-2.7588	82
Wolverhampton	2.7556	83
Croydon	2.7439	84
Canterbury	-2.7337	85
Sunderland	-2.7204	86
Havant	2.7098	87
Arun	-2.7041	88
Bromley	-2.6868	89
Stevenage	2.6054	90
Kirklees	2.5839	91
Bath and North East Somerset UA	-2.5635	92
Sandwell	2.5301	93
Knowsley	-2.4941	94
South Tyneside	-2.4925	95
Exeter	-2.4756	96
Barrow-in-Furness	-2.4169	97
Hastings	2.3943	98
Teignbridge	-2.3771	99
Colchester	-2.3506	100
Rochdale	2.3300	101
Oxford	2.3289	102
Milton Keynes UA	2.3234	103
Birmingham	2.3195	104
Broxtowe	-2.3153	105
St. Helens	-2.2918	106
Boston	-2.2766	107
Rutland UA	-2.2511	108
Rugby	2.2459	109
High Peak	-2.2378	110

Weymouth and Portland	2.2246	111
Chesterfield	2.2238	112
Bradford	2.2098	113
Cannock Chase	2.1859	114
Hambleton	2.1841	115
Torbay UA	-2.1655	116
Tower Hamlets	-2.1530	117
Broxbourne	2.1483	118
Ribble Valley	-2.1190	119
Wigan	2.1162	120
Newcastle-under-Lyme	-2.1013	121
Poole UA	2.0854	122
Waveney	-2.0753	123
South Gloucestershire UA	-2.0542	124
Cornwall UA	-2.0440	125
Gosport	1.9838	126
North Lincolnshire UA	1.9801	127
West Dorset	1.9713	128
Norwich	-1.9666	129
Kingston upon Hull, City of UA	-1.9569	130
Fareham	-1.9307	131
Barnet	-1.9184	132
North West Leicestershire	1.9174	133
Maldon	-1.9086	134
Wiltshire UA	1.8791	135
Redcar and Cleveland UA	-1.8444	136
Three Rivers	-1.8301	137
Rushcliffe	-1.8113	138
Wellingborough	-1.8047	139
Bolton	1.8017	140
East Riding of Yorkshire UA	-1.7877	141
Wealden	1.7876	142
Lincoln	1.7876	143
Wychavon	-1.7613	144
Bristol, City of UA	-1.7530	145
Pendle	-1.7192	146
Eastbourne	1.6716	147
Forest of Dean	-1.6533	148
North Devon	1.6238	149

West Lancashire	-1.6173	150
St Albans	1.6149	151
Lewes	-1.6099	152
Dudley	1.6098	153
East Staffordshire	1.5967	154
Lambeth	1.5863	155
Hyndburn	-1.5680	156
Castle Point	-1.5665	157
Cherwell	-1.5613	158
Allerdale	1.5543	159
Hart	-1.5503	160
Mendip	-1.5328	161
Crawley	-1.5273	162
Southampton UA	-1.5267	163
Dartford	1.5204	164
Daventry	-1.5179	165
Fylde	-1.5073	166
Stoke-on-Trent UA	1.4876	167
Epsom and Ewell	1.4749	168
Tewkesbury	-1.4720	169
Hounslow	1.4471	170
Kettering	1.4439	171
East Dorset	-1.4307	172
Barking and Dagenham	-1.4303	173
Surrey Heath	1.4205	174
Wakefield	-1.4018	175
Gloucester	1.3911	176
Mid Suffolk	1.3690	177
New Forest	-1.3672	178
Isle of Wight UA	-1.3368	179
Harrow	1.3302	180
Chiltern	1.3168	181
Northampton	-1.3111	182
Basildon	1.3048	183
York UA	-1.2984	184
Epping Forest	-1.2860	185
Mid Devon	1.2805	186
Babergh	1.2753	187
South Oxfordshire	1.2626	188

Stockport	-1.2597	189
Oldham	1.2542	190
East Hertfordshire	-1.2515	191
Northumberland UA	1.2151	192
Eastleigh	1.2086	193
Copeland	1.1922	194
Hillingdon	-1.1920	195
Breckland	-1.1915	196
South Lakeland	-1.1802	197
Nottingham UA	-1.1744	198
Staffordshire Moorlands	1.1635	199
Peterborough UA	1.1629	200
Scarborough	1.1588	201
South Staffordshire	1.1522	202
Nuneaton and Bedworth	1.1387	203
Stratford-on-Avon	-1.1355	204
Dacorum	1.1315	205
Derbyshire Dales	1.1237	206
Cotswold	-1.0880	207
Burnley	1.0709	208
Uttlesford	1.0608	209
Carlisle	1.0598	210
Test Valley	1.0523	211
North East Lincolnshire UA	0.9941	212
Stockton-on-Tees UA	-0.9827	213
Worthing	0.9781	214
South Holland	-0.9775	215
Swale	-0.9631	216
East Hampshire	0.9542	217
Horsham	-0.9526	218
Sedgemoor	-0.9215	219
West Devon	-0.9170	220
Spelthorne	0.9024	221
North Tyneside	0.8966	222
Hinckley and Bosworth	-0.8906	223
Derby UA	-0.8821	224
South Kesteven	-0.8589	225
Bolsover	0.8563	226
Vale of White Horse	-0.8483	227

Cheltenham	0.8414	228
Adur	-0.8217	229
Barnsley	0.7884	230
Taunton Deane	-0.7851	231
Sefton	-0.7680	232
East Northamptonshire	0.7667	233
Blaby	-0.7394	234
Brentwood	0.7205	235
South Norfolk	0.6988	236
Braintree	0.6982	237
County Durham UA	0.6973	238
South Bucks	-0.6919	239
Herefordshire, County of UA	-0.6916	240
Maidstone	0.6882	241
Bury	-0.6833	242
Ashfield	0.6735	243
Gedling	-0.6682	244
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	0.6672	245
Fenland	-0.6526	246
South Cambridgeshire	-0.6453	247
Harlow	0.6401	248
Chelmsford	0.6214	249
Wyre Forest	-0.6201	250
Reigate and Banstead	-0.6027	251
Portsmouth UA	-0.6026	252
Thurrock UA	-0.5977	253
Malvern Hills	-0.5809	254
Purbeck	0.5688	255
North Warwickshire	-0.5653	256
Gravesham	0.5611	257
West Oxfordshire	-0.5425	258
Warrington UA	-0.5387	259
Lichfield	0.5183	260
Winchester	0.5170	261
Havering	-0.5153	262
Rotherham	0.5033	263
Suffolk Coastal	-0.4976	264
Medway UA	0.4957	265
Mole Valley	0.4869	266

Harrogate	0.4789	267
South Hams	0.4739	268
Cheshire East UA	0.4707	269
Waverley	-0.4641	270
Chichester	-0.4491	271
West Lindsey	-0.4230	272
Selby	-0.4189	273
Tandridge	-0.4136	274
Hartlepool UA	0.4083	275
Harborough	0.3932	276
Sevenoaks	-0.3901	277
Broadland	0.3880	278
Thanet	0.3862	279
East Devon	-0.3842	280
North East Derbyshire	0.3835	281
Melton	0.3763	282
Telford and Wrekin UA	0.3686	283
Windsor and Maidenhead UA	-0.3584	284
Preston	0.3534	285
South Ribble	-0.3352	286
Christchurch	0.3235	287
Salford	-0.2968	288
Basingstoke and Deane	-0.2806	289
Blackpool UA	0.2682	290
Sheffield	0.2664	291
Enfield	0.2513	292
Rochford	0.2448	293
Tonbridge and Malling	-0.2420	294
Stroud	0.2317	295
South Derbyshire	-0.2286	296
Lewisham	-0.2282	297
Huntingdonshire	-0.2264	298
Calderdale	0.2155	299
Ashford	0.2120	300
Elmbridge	-0.2009	301
Warwick	-0.1975	302
Bromsgrove	-0.1931	303
Plymouth UA	0.1828	304
Great Yarmouth	-0.1796	305

Tameside	0.1579	306
Craven	0.1569	307
North Hertfordshire	-0.1482	308
Bassetlaw	-0.1434	309
West Berkshire UA	-0.1362	310
Redbridge	0.1173	311
Newark and Sherwood	-0.1165	312
Cheshire West and Chester UA	0.1050	313
North Kesteven	0.1004	314
Erewash	0.0891	315
Rossendale	0.0882	316
Rother	0.0849	317
Hertsmere	0.0687	318
South Somerset	-0.0660	319
Luton UA	-0.0599	320
Chorley	0.0511	321
Solihull	-0.0464	322
Tamworth	0.0195	323
Bexley	0.0056	324
Eden	0.0038	325
Amber Valley	0.0024	326

Appendix B

Appendix B – Table 1

Difference between 2014 and 2016-based SNPP for total period covered

Local Authority	Difference between 2014 and 2016-based SNPP	Rank
Brent	44024	1
Hounslow	42618	2
Ealing	41347	3
Barnet	40015	4
Newham	38560	5
Redbridge	38375	6
Enfield	36913	7
Croydon	36678	8
Harrow	35613	9
Hillingdon	34966	10
Bradford	34959	11
Tower Hamlets	33723	12
Lambeth	31214	13
Westminster	30266	14
Southwark	28472	15
Richmond upon Thames	27883	16
Wandsworth	27488	17
Leeds	25771	18
Waltham Forest	24813	19
Luton	24605	20
Merton	24412	21
Kirklees	24324	22
Haringey	21804	23
Oxford	21759	24
Lewisham	21736	25
Milton Keynes	21282	26
Barking and Dagenham	20990	27
Islington	20365	28
Hammersmith and Fulham	20160	29
Bournemouth	19339	30
County Durham	19189	31
Cornwall	19063	32

Sutton	18940	33
Sheffield	18864	34
Bromley	18769	35
Kingston upon Thames	18628	36
Camden	18499	37
South Cambridgeshire	18444	38
Birmingham	18156	39
Cambridge	16729	40
Hackney	16106	41
Reigate and Banstead	16037	42
York	15392	43
Central Bedfordshire	15163	44
St Albans	14946	45
Greenwich	14768	46
East Riding of Yorkshire	14525	47
Medway	14405	48
Wigan	14250	49
Basingstoke and Deane	14176	50
Huntingdonshire	13763	51
Slough	13685	52
Swindon	13681	53
Wycombe	13673	54
Northampton	13620	55
Leicester	13493	56
Derby	13340	57
Crawley	13141	58
Manchester	13094	59
Newcastle upon Tyne	12809	60
Liverpool	12636	61
Poole	12493	62
Watford	12352	63
West Oxfordshire	12187	64
Guildford	11999	65
Windsor and Maidenhead	11930	66
Eastleigh	11850	67
Kensington and Chelsea	11630	68
North Hertfordshire	11612	69
Trafford	11511	70
Southampton	11469	71

New Forest	11454	72
Bexley	10824	73
Sandwell	10586	74
Calderdale	10489	75
Dacorum	10423	76
Plymouth	10287	77
North Tyneside	10158	78
Hertsmere	10064	79
Peterborough	10013	80
Brighton and Hove	9932	81
Cheshire East	9838	82
Epping Forest	9741	83
Salford	9659	84
Spelthorne	9578	85
Middlesbrough	9577	86
Cherwell	9555	87
Stockton-on-Tees	9553	88
Portsmouth	9470	89
Epsom and Ewell	9200	90
Bury	9193	91
Braintree	9117	92
Sunderland	8966	93
Sevenoaks	8893	94
Lancaster	8885	95
Maidstone	8786	96
Warrington	8715	97
Bracknell Forest	8608	98
East Cambridgeshire	8519	99
Elmbridge	8255	100
Waverley	8253	101
Bedford	8058	102
Bristol, City of	8026	103
Nottingham	8019	104
Northumberland	7965	105
Bolton	7864	106
Tunbridge Wells	7350	107
Woking	7319	108
Norwich	7243	109
North East Lincolnshire	7207	110

Uttlesford	7148	111
Gravesham	7084	112
East Hertfordshire	6958	113
Tonbridge and Malling	6686	114
Wolverhampton	6675	115
Cheltenham	6602	116
Runnymede	6477	117
South Bucks	6310	118
Havering	6257	119
Broxbourne	6104	120
Preston	6101	121
Ashford	6064	122
Tandridge	5965	123
Lewes	5936	124
Warwick	5910	125
Harlow	5861	126
Mole Valley	5824	127
Charnwood	5802	128
Southend-on-Sea	5674	129
Wirral	5637	130
Three Rivers	5518	131
South Norfolk	5466	132
Stevenage	5450	133
East Staffordshire	5443	134
East Devon	5414	135
Shropshire	5325	136
Tameside	5312	137
Welwyn Hatfield	5308	138
Herefordshire, County of	5264	139
Rushmoor	5241	140
South Somerset	5097	141
Chelmsford	5088	142
North Somerset	5044	143
Knowsley	4889	144
Tendring	4794	145
Vale of White Horse	4791	146
Stratford-on-Avon	4788	147
Boston	4761	148
Wokingham	4580	149

Melton	4530	150
Cannock Chase	4477	151
Kingston upon Hull, City of	4430	152
East Lindsey	4259	153
Forest Heath	4219	154
North Lincolnshire	4216	155
North Norfolk	**4182**	**156**
Amber Valley	4162	157
Stafford	4127	158
South Oxfordshire	4119	159
Broxtowe	4113	160
Stockport	4036	161
Rugby	4015	162
Great Yarmouth	4008	163
Lichfield	4007	164
South Kesteven	4003	165
South Tyneside	4003	166
West Devon	3932	167
North West Leicestershire	3931	168
North Dorset	3901	169
Tamworth	3889	170
Lincoln	3810	171
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3804	172
Surrey Heath	3802	173
Telford and Wrekin	3741	174
Hartlepool	3661	175
City of London	3649	176
Bath and North East Somerset	3625	177
East Dorset	3620	178
St Edmundsbury	3596	179
Thurrock	3571	180
Isle of Wight	3570	181
Fenland	3544	182
Swale	3514	183
North Kesteven	3510	184
Brentwood	3477	185
Wychavon	3455	186
Winchester	3424	187
North Devon	3420	188

Thanet	3408	189
Suffolk Coastal	3392	190
Rushcliffe	3372	191
Sedgemoor	3367	192
East Hampshire	3355	193
Dudley	3298	194
South Derbyshire	3282	195
Erewash	3275	196
Christchurch	3252	197
Mid Sussex	3136	198
Chiltern	3130	199
Hart	3088	200
Darlington	3016	201
Pendle	3016	202
Wealden	3014	203
Broadland	3013	204
Mansfield	3009	205
South Holland	2999	206
Arun	2966	207
Hambleton	2950	208
Copeland	2913	209
Fareham	2911	210
Solihull	2901	211
Worthing	2886	212
Oadby and Wigston	2868	213
Shepway	2833	214
Blackpool	2826	215
Gateshead	2671	216
Chesterfield	2634	217
Kettering	2630	218
Malvern Hills	2627	219
Reading	2579	220
St. Helens	2528	221
Tewkesbury	2452	222
Dartford	2448	223
Gloucester	2394	224
Forest of Dean	2373	225
Rochdale	2329	226
Rotherham	2326	227

Harrogate	2313	228
Walsall	2244	229
Selby	2164	230
South Lakeland	2145	231
Derbyshire Dales	2145	232
Cheshire West and Chester	2129	233
Worcester	2126	234
Teignbridge	2122	235
High Peak	2112	236
Redditch	2097	237
Gedling	2095	238
South Staffordshire	2085	239
Mid Suffolk	2061	240
Adur	1977	241
Carlisle	1972	242
Wiltshire	1949	243
Colchester	1914	244
Mid Devon	1870	245
Coventry	1847	246
Eastbourne	1812	247
Halton	1785	248
Richmondshire	1780	249
Rossendale	1755	250
Redcar and Cleveland	1743	251
Scarborough	1729	252
Corby	1685	253
Dover	1644	254
Torridge	1622	255
Oldham	1576	256
West Dorset	1570	257
Chorley	1501	258
South Ribble	1477	259
Waveney	1450	260
South Hams	1436	261
Cotswold	1432	262
Fylde	1399	263
Chichester	1392	264
Stoke-on-Trent	1306	265
Wakefield	1296	266

Ryedale	1291	267
Purbeck	1258	268
Ashfield	1207	269
South Northamptonshire	1178	270
Exeter	1157	271
Bromsgrove	1147	272
North East Derbyshire	1132	273
Hyndburn	1059	274
Bassetlaw	990	275
Sefton	937	276
Aylesbury Vale	915	277
Burnley	914	278
Bolsover	828	279
Castle Point	827	280
North Warwickshire	822	281
Barnsley	798	282
South Gloucestershire	757	283
Newcastle-under-Lyme	757	284
Ribble Valley	753	285
Barrow-in-Furness	748	286
Wellingborough	713	287
Craven	711	288
Newark and Sherwood	626	289
East Northamptonshire	622	290
Rochford	621	291
Babergh	613	292
Eden	609	293
West Lancashire	581	294
Test Valley	559	295
Daventry	547	296
Harborough	542	297
Basildon	528	298
Gosport	508	299
Hastings	506	300
Wyre	450	301
Breckland	449	302
Staffordshire Moorlands	430	303
Mendip	412	304
Canterbury	390	305

Blackburn with Darwen	346	306
Ipswich	330	307
Taunton Deane	330	308
Wyre Forest	246	309
Nuneaton and Bedworth	228	310
West Lindsey	209	311
West Berkshire	206	312
Hinckley and Bosworth	192	313
Maldon	176	314
West Somerset	159	315
Rother	145	316
Blaby	121	317
Havant	105	318
Torbay	79	319
Doncaster	71	320
Allerdale	64	321
Weymouth and Portland	44	322
Horsham	38	323
Rutland	35	324
Isles of Scilly	8	325
Stroud	2	326

Appendix B – Table 2

Difference between 2014 and 2016-based SNPP for 2022-2032

Brent	16429	1
Ealing	16109	2
Hounslow	15692	3
Redbridge	15230	4
Barnet	15005	5
Enfield	14625	6
Croydon	14344	7
Harrow	14173	8
Bradford	14166	9
Newham	13751	10
Hillingdon	12916	11
Lambeth	11934	12
Richmond upon Thames	10740	13
Wandsworth	10645	14
Southwark	10041	15
Waltham Forest	9974	16
Tower Hamlets	9783	17
Kirklees	9627	18
Westminster	9615	19
Merton	9405	20
Luton	9277	21
Lewisham	8502	22
Leeds	8302	23
Haringey	8018	24
Barking and Dagenham	7977	25
Milton Keynes	7872	26
Oxford	7818	27
County Durham	7453	28
Sutton	7413	29
Bromley	7366	30
South Cambridgeshire	7127	31
Hammersmith and Fulham	7106	32

Sheffield	6836	33
Cornwall	6763	34
Kingston upon Thames	6576	35
Bournemouth	6444	36
Islington	6385	37
Reigate and Banstead	6238	38
Wigan	6235	39
St Albans	6198	40
East Riding of Yorkshire	5687	41
Birmingham	5655	42
Cambridge	5622	43
Liverpool	5598	44
Hackney	5594	45
Basingstoke and Deane	5542	46
York	5517	47
Wycombe	5432	48
Medway	5423	49
Huntingdonshire	5394	50
Slough	5320	51
Central Bedfordshire	5238	52
Swindon	5191	53
Derby	5145	54
Crawley	5113	55
Greenwich	5105	56
West Oxfordshire	5064	57
Poole	4986	58
Windsor and Maidenhead	4899	59
Northampton	4841	60
New Forest	4835	61
North Hertfordshire	4738	62
Watford	4729	63
Eastleigh	4634	64
Camden	4612	65
Sandwell	4518	66
Kensington and Chelsea	4479	67
Leicester	4456	68
Bexley	4385	69
Trafford	4325	70
Calderdale	4269	71

Dacorum	4220	72
Epping Forest	4185	73
Newcastle upon Tyne	4130	74
Plymouth	4116	75
Hertsmere	4093	76
Guildford	4072	77
North Tyneside	4070	78
Stockton-on-Tees	4038	79
Middlesbrough	4026	80
Spelthorne	3976	81
Cherwell	3903	82
Cheshire East	3873	83
Braintree	3850	84
Sevenoaks	3781	85
Bury	3754	86
Sunderland	3620	87
Salford	3601	88
Elmbridge	3588	89
Peterborough	3585	90
Epsom and Ewell	3537	91
Southampton	3499	92
Brighton and Hove	3456	93
Bolton	3437	94
Waverley	3349	95
Portsmouth	3310	96
Tunbridge Wells	3291	97
Warrington	3253	98
Maidstone	3248	99
Wolverhampton	3245	100
Lancaster	3190	101
Northumberland	3182	102
East Cambridgeshire	3181	103
North East Lincolnshire	3127	104
Bracknell Forest	3120	105
Woking	3021	106
Gravesham	2829	107
Bedford	2799	108
Manchester	2779	109
East Hertfordshire	2726	110

Havering	2717	111
Warwick	2689	112
Tonbridge and Malling	2659	113
Broxbourne	2638	114
Mole Valley	2612	115
Tandridge	2551	116
Uttlesford	2532	117
South Bucks	2530	118
Norwich	2435	119
Wirral	2430	120
Lewes	2411	121
Cheltenham	2387	122
Harlow	2381	123
East Devon	2372	124
Tameside	2356	125
Southend-on-Sea	2348	126
Runnymede	2321	127
Stevenage	2316	128
Ashford	2302	129
Coventry	2292	130
Three Rivers	2279	131
Preston	2259	132
Rushmoor	2231	133
Wiltshire	2230	134
Nottingham	2213	135
East Staffordshire	2135	136
Chelmsford	2097	137
Bath and North East Somerset	2082	138
Shropshire	2068	139
Dudley	2054	140
South Somerset	2028	141
Herefordshire, County of	1996	142
Stratford-on-Avon	1991	143
Bristol, City of	1970	144
Vale of White Horse	1956	145
North Somerset	1953	146
Cannock Chase	1922	147
Kingston upon Hull, City of	1899	148
Melton	1862	149

Knowsley	1858	150
South Oxfordshire	1855	151
Amber Valley	1780	152
Great Yarmouth	1763	153
North Norfolk	**1758**	**154**
Telford and Wrekin	1747	155
Boston	1739	156
Lichfield	1724	157
East Lindsey	1709	158
South Norfolk	1704	159
Tamworth	1678	160
Surrey Heath	1639	161
North Devon	1636	162
Tendring	1628	163
North West Leicestershire	1622	164
North Lincolnshire	1615	165
East Dorset	1614	166
Hartlepool	1611	167
Broxtowe	1607	168
Chiltern	1603	169
Wychavon	1598	170
West Devon	1596	171
South Tyneside	1596	172
Colchester	1583	173
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1565	174
Blackpool	1564	175
Stafford	1538	176
Wokingham	1535	177
Isle of Wight	1526	178
Brentwood	1523	179
Stockport	1522	180
St Edmundsbury	1522	181
Harrogate	1505	182
North Dorset	1503	183
Rugby	1483	184
Welwyn Hatfield	1480	185
Gateshead	1477	186
East Hampshire	1456	187
Solihull	1432	188

Charnwood	1431	189
Erewash	1401	190
Broadland	1393	191
Christchurch	1387	192
Thanet	1373	193
South Kesteven	1362	194
Forest Heath	1354	195
Darlington	1354	196
Hart	1351	197
Fenland	1348	198
Thurrock	1343	199
Shepway	1322	200
Oadby and Wigston	1322	201
Aylesbury Vale	1305	202
Pendle	1295	203
Copeland	1291	204
Suffolk Coastal	1258	205
Swale	1247	206
Walsall	1226	207
Rushcliffe	1222	208
North Kesteven	1215	209
Lincoln	1214	210
Chesterfield	1213	211
Rotherham	1190	212
Mansfield	1188	213
Hambleton	1171	214
Worthing	1151	215
Fareham	1151	216
Winchester	1124	217
Cheshire West and Chester	1083	218
Sedgemoor	1082	219
South Holland	1082	220
Forest of Dean	1070	221
South Staffordshire	1041	222
Exeter	1038	223
Malvern Hills	1036	224
Derbyshire Dales	1034	225
St. Helens	1021	226
South Derbyshire	1012	227

Mid Sussex	1009	228
South Lakeland	987	229
Wealden	981	230
Arun	972	231
Redditch	963	232
Teignbridge	951	233
City of London	939	234
Redcar and Cleveland	918	235
Kettering	907	236
High Peak	883	237
Dartford	875	238
Scarborough	869	239
Richmondshire	799	240
Reading	795	241
Adur	775	242
Worcester	768	243
Mid Devon	746	244
Carlisle	743	245
Gedling	737	246
Mid Suffolk	734	247
Eastbourne	731	248
Gloucester	729	249
Selby	728	250
Halton	707	251
Tewkesbury	700	252
Stoke-on-Trent	689	253
South Ribble	682	254
Dover	677	255
Cotswold	657	256
West Dorset	652	257
Rossendale	650	258
South Hams	633	259
Wakefield	615	260
Hyndburn	605	261
Rochdale	573	262
Torridge	567	263
Ryedale	555	264
Purbeck	551	265
North East Derbyshire	532	266

Canterbury	517	267
Fylde	467	268
Newcastle-under-Lyme	458	269
Burnley	450	270
Chichester	449	271
South Northamptonshire	447	272
Barrow-in-Furness	437	273
Bromsgrove	426	274
Bassetlaw	408	275
Hastings	408	276
Corby	400	277
Waveney	394	278
Newark and Sherwood	385	279
Ashfield	383	280
Oldham	375	281
Craven	358	282
Test Valley	348	283
Breckland	312	284
East Northamptonshire	311	285
Bolsover	310	286
Wellingborough	306	287
Ipswich	283	288
Taunton Deane	280	289
Daventry	249	290
Ribble Valley	247	291
Staffordshire Moorlands	244	292
Eden	240	293
Barnsley	240	294
Doncaster	201	295
Blackburn with Darwen	191	296
North Warwickshire	190	297
Hinckley and Bosworth	185	298
Rother	172	299
West Somerset	165	300
Wyre	162	301
Chorley	161	302
West Lancashire	157	303
Maldon	154	304
Basildon	134	305

Gosport	134	306
Babergh	132	307
Havant	124	308
Stroud	117	309
Castle Point	111	310
Mendip	109	311
Horsham	100	312
Sefton	86	313
Rutland	81	314
West Lindsey	78	315
Harborough	64	316
Allerdale	47	317
West Berkshire	37	318
Nuneaton and Bedworth	37	319
South Gloucestershire	37	320
Blaby	21	321
Isles of Scilly	15	322
Wyre Forest	14	323
Rochford	9	324
Torbay	2	325
Weymouth and Portland	2	326

Appendix B – Table 3

Difference between 2014 and 2016-based SNPP for total period covered, relative to Local Authority 2011 Census population

Local Authority	Relative difference between 2014 and 2016-based SNPP*	Rank
City of London	49.233	1
Hounslow	16.718	2
Richmond upon Thames	14.869	3
Harrow	14.808	4
Oxford	14.482	5
Brent	14.099	6
Westminster	13.783	7
Redbridge	13.638	8
Cambridge	13.631	9
Watford	13.625	10
Tower Hamlets	13.172	11
Hillingdon	12.692	12
Newham	12.420	13
South Cambridgeshire	12.309	14
Crawley	12.275	15
Epsom and Ewell	12.235	16
Ealing	12.185	17
Merton	12.173	18
Luton	12.083	19
Enfield	11.758	20
Kingston upon Thames	11.611	21
Reigate and Banstead	11.590	22
West Oxfordshire	11.558	23
Barking and Dagenham	11.223	24
Barnet	11.192	25
Hammersmith and Fulham	11.050	26
St Albans	10.581	27
Bournemouth	10.542	28
Lambeth	10.252	29
East Cambridgeshire	10.112	30

Croydon	10.054	31
Hertsmere	10.026	32
Spelthorne	9.992	33
Sutton	9.910	34
Islington	9.872	35
Southwark	9.862	36
Slough	9.726	37
Waltham Forest	9.553	38
Eastleigh	9.416	39
South Bucks	9.409	40
North Hertfordshire	9.108	41
Melton	8.972	42
Wandsworth	8.933	43
Uttlesford	8.932	44
Guildford	8.722	45
Haringey	8.532	46
Milton Keynes	8.517	47
Poole	8.437	48
Basingstoke and Deane	8.411	49
Camden	8.405	50
Windsor and Maidenhead	8.222	51
Huntingdonshire	8.094	52
Runnymede	8.046	53
Wycombe	7.951	54
Lewisham	7.849	55
Epping Forest	7.800	56
York	7.782	57
Sevenoaks	7.710	58
Bracknell Forest	7.571	59
Boston	7.369	60
Woking	7.357	61
Kensington and Chelsea	7.349	62
West Devon	7.329	63
Dacorum	7.173	64
Tandridge	7.171	65
Harlow	7.132	66
Forest Heath	7.027	67
Gravesham	6.961	68
Middlesbrough	6.921	69

Mole Valley	6.801	70
Christchurch	6.787	71
Waverley	6.779	72
Cherwell	6.717	73
Bradford	6.683	74
Swindon	6.524	75
Hackney	6.516	76
Broxbourne	6.514	77
New Forest	6.479	78
Stevenage	6.469	79
Lancaster	6.447	80
Northampton	6.410	81
Tunbridge Wells	6.378	82
Elmbridge	6.281	83
Three Rivers	6.276	84
Braintree	6.180	85
Lewes	6.083	86
Bromley	6.044	87
Central Bedfordshire	5.931	88
Greenwich	5.780	89
Kirklees	5.751	90
Cheltenham	5.709	91
North Dorset	5.654	92
Maidstone	5.640	93
Rushmoor	5.555	94
Tonbridge and Malling	5.521	95
Norwich	5.480	96
Medway	5.438	97
Peterborough	5.428	98
Derby	5.359	99
Calderdale	5.137	100
Oadby and Wigston	5.123	101
Ashford	5.121	102
Bedford	5.105	103
Trafford	5.069	104
Tamworth	5.058	105
North Tyneside	5.048	106
East Hertfordshire	5.037	107
Stockton-on-Tees	4.980	108

Bury	4.958	109
Southampton	4.862	110
Welwyn Hatfield	4.793	111
East Staffordshire	4.780	112
Brentwood	4.709	113
Bexley	4.650	114
Portsmouth	4.610	115
Newcastle upon Tyne	4.589	116
Cannock Chase	4.588	117
North East Lincolnshire	4.512	118
Wigan	4.479	119
Surrey Heath	4.402	120
South Norfolk	4.390	121
Preston	4.356	122
East Riding of Yorkshire	4.340	123
Warrington	4.299	124
Warwick	4.291	125
North West Leicestershire	-4.196	126
East Dorset	4.146	127
Copeland	4.125	128
Salford	4.119	129
North Norfolk	**4.114**	**130**
Great Yarmouth	4.113	131
Lincoln	4.093	132
Leicester	4.093	133
East Devon	-4.062	134
Plymouth	4.009	135
Rugby	3.995	136
Hartlepool	3.975	137
Lichfield	3.971	138
Stratford-on-Avon	3.963	139
Vale of White Horse	3.931	140
Broxtowe	3.748	141
County Durham	3.741	142
Fenland	3.713	143
North Devon	3.639	144
Brighton and Hove	3.639	145
Cornwall	3.571	146
Malvern Hills	3.516	147

Charnwood	3.498	148
Tendring	-3.472	149
South Derbyshire	3.457	150
Leeds	3.433	151
Sandwell	3.425	152
Sheffield	3.419	153
Amber Valley	3.397	154
South Holland	3.393	155
Chiltern	3.378	156
Hart	3.369	157
Pendle	3.367	158
Knowsley	-3.351	159
Richmondshire	3.340	160
Hambleton	3.292	161
Sunderland	3.257	162
Southend-on-Sea	3.256	163
North Kesteven	3.234	164
St Edmundsbury	3.226	165
Adur	3.223	166
Stafford	3.153	167
South Somerset	3.144	168
East Lindsey	3.116	169
South Oxfordshire	3.052	170
Rushcliffe	3.032	171
Chelmsford	3.020	172
Derbyshire Dales	3.016	173
South Kesteven	2.985	174
Tewkesbury	2.980	175
Wokingham	2.956	176
Wychavon	-2.951	177
Winchester	2.931	178
Sedgemoor	2.930	179
Erewash	2.917	180
East Hampshire	2.892	181
Forest of Dean	-2.886	182
Mansfield	-2.878	183
Herefordshire, County of	2.867	184
Darlington	2.857	185
Bolton	2.836	186

Kettering	2.803	187
Purbeck	2.784	188
Worthing	2.748	189
Corby	2.734	190
Suffolk Coastal	-2.723	191
Liverpool	-2.714	192
South Tyneside	2.701	193
Wolverhampton	2.672	194
Cheshire East	2.654	195
Nottingham	2.639	196
Havering	2.630	197
Shepway	2.618	198
Manchester	2.604	199
Fareham	2.600	200
Selby	2.590	201
Isle of Wight	2.580	202
Rossendale	2.578	203
Swale	2.578	204
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2.571	205
Chesterfield	2.538	206
Thanet	2.535	207
Torridge	2.535	208
Northumberland	2.518	209
North Lincolnshire	2.517	210
Dartford	2.508	211
Ryedale	-2.488	212
Redditch	2.487	213
North Somerset	2.484	214
Tameside	2.417	215
Broadland	2.415	216
Mid Devon	2.400	217
High Peak	2.322	218
Thurrock	2.256	219
Telford and Wrekin	-2.243	220
Mid Sussex	2.237	221
Worcester	2.155	222
Mid Suffolk	2.123	223
South Lakeland	2.069	224
Bath and North East Somerset	-2.065	225

Wealden	2.017	226
Blackpool	1.989	227
Arun	1.980	228
Gloucester	1.964	229
South Staffordshire	1.925	230
Bristol, City of	1.875	231
Gedling	1.842	232
Fylde	1.838	233
Carlisle	1.835	234
Eastbourne	1.824	235
Wirral	1.762	236
Shropshire	1.734	237
Kingston upon Hull, City of	1.729	238
Cotswold	1.722	239
South Hams	1.719	240
Teignbridge	-1.708	241
Birmingham	1.690	242
Reading	1.660	243
Scarborough	1.590	244
West Dorset	1.582	245
Dover	1.471	246
Harrogate	1.457	247
St. Helens	1.441	248
Stockport	1.425	249
Halton	1.420	250
Solihull	1.403	251
Chorley	1.395	252
South Northamptonshire	1.379	253
South Ribble	1.352	254
Gateshead	1.333	255
North Warwickshire	-1.324	256
Ribble Valley	1.315	257
Hyndburn	1.315	258
Redcar and Cleveland	1.289	259
Craven	1.282	260
Waveney	-1.257	261
Bromsgrove	-1.223	262
Chichester	1.221	263
Eden	1.160	264

North East Derbyshire	1.142	265
Colchester	-1.102	266
Rochdale	-1.099	267
Bolsover	1.089	268
Barrow-in-Furness	1.083	269
Dudley	1.053	270
Burnley	1.050	271
Ashfield	1.010	272
Exeter	-0.989	273
Wellingborough	0.943	274
Castle Point	-0.940	275
Rotherham	0.902	276
Bassetlaw	0.876	277
Walsall	0.833	278
Rochford	-0.745	279
East Northamptonshire	-0.717	280
Daventry	0.701	281
Oldham	-0.700	282
Babergh	-0.698	283
Cheshire West and Chester	-0.646	284
Harborough	0.633	285
Gosport	-0.614	286
Newcastle-under-Lyme	-0.611	287
Coventry	-0.583	288
Hastings	0.561	289
Newark and Sherwood	-0.544	290
West Lancashire	0.525	291
Stoke-on-Trent	0.525	292
Aylesbury Vale	-0.523	293
Test Valley	-0.479	294
West Somerset	0.460	295
Staffordshire Moorlands	0.442	296
Wyre	0.418	297
Wiltshire	0.411	298
Wakefield	-0.397	299
Mendip	0.377	300
Isles of Scilly	-0.367	301
Barnsley	0.344	302
Breckland	-0.343	303

Sefton	-0.342	304
Basildon	-0.302	305
Taunton Deane	-0.299	306
South Gloucestershire	0.287	307
Maldon	0.285	308
Canterbury	-0.259	309
Wyre Forest	-0.251	310
Ipswich	-0.247	311
Blackburn with Darwen	-0.235	312
West Lindsey	0.234	313
Hinckley and Bosworth	-0.183	314
Nuneaton and Bedworth	-0.182	315
Rother	0.160	316
West Berkshire	0.134	317
Blaby	-0.128	318
Rutland	-0.092	319
Havant	0.087	320
Weymouth and Portland	-0.068	321
Allerdale	0.067	322
Torbay	-0.060	323
Horsham	-0.029	324
Doncaster	-0.024	325
Stroud	-0.002	326

* Calculated as change in population projected by 2014-based SNPP, minus change projected by 2016-based SNPP, as a percentage of Local Authority population (Census 2011)

Appendix B – Table 4

Difference between 2014 and 2016-based SNPP for 2022-2032, relative to Local Authority population (2011 Census)

Local Authority	Relative difference between 2014 and 2016-based SNPP*	Rank
City of London	12.670	1
Hounslow	6.156	2
Harrow	5.893	3
Richmond upon Thames	5.727	4
Redbridge	5.412	5
Brent	5.262	6
Watford	5.217	7
Oxford	5.204	8
West Oxfordshire	4.803	9
Crawley	4.776	10
South Cambridgeshire	4.756	11
Ealing	4.748	12
Epsom and Ewell	4.704	13
Merton	4.690	14
Hillingdon	4.688	15
Enfield	4.659	16
Cambridge	4.581	17
Luton	4.555	18
Reigate and Banstead	4.508	19
Newham	4.429	20
St Albans	4.388	21
Westminster	4.379	22
Barking and Dagenham	4.265	23
Barnet	4.197	24
Spelthorne	4.148	25
Kingston upon Thames	4.099	26
Hertsmere	4.077	27
Croydon	3.932	28
Lambeth	3.919	29
Hammersmith and Fulham	3.895	30

Sutton	3.879	31
Waltham Forest	3.840	32
Tower Hamlets	3.821	33
Slough	3.780	34
East Cambridgeshire	3.776	35
South Bucks	3.773	36
North Hertfordshire	3.717	37
Melton	3.687	38
Eastleigh	3.682	39
Bournemouth	3.512	40
Southwark	3.478	41
Wandsworth	3.459	42
Windsor and Maidenhead	3.376	43
Poole	3.367	44
Epping Forest	3.351	45
Basingstoke and Deane	3.288	46
Sevenoaks	3.278	47
Huntingdonshire	3.172	48
Uttlesford	3.163	49
Wycombe	3.159	50
Milton Keynes	3.150	51
Haringey	3.138	52
Islington	3.095	53
Lewisham	3.070	54
Tandridge	3.067	55
Mole Valley	3.050	56
Woking	3.037	57
West Devon	2.975	58
Guildford	2.960	59
Middlesbrough	2.910	60
Dacorum	2.905	61
Harlow	2.898	62
Christchurch	2.894	63
Runnymede	2.884	64
Tunbridge Wells	2.856	65
Kensington and Chelsea	2.830	66
Broxbourne	2.815	67
York	2.789	68
Gravesham	2.780	69

Waverley	2.751	70
Stevenage	2.749	71
Cherwell	2.744	72
Bracknell Forest	2.744	73
New Forest	2.735	74
Elmbridge	2.730	75
Bradford	2.708	76
Boston	2.691	77
Braintree	2.610	78
Three Rivers	2.592	79
Swindon	2.475	80
Lewes	2.471	81
Bromley	2.372	82
Rushmoor	2.365	83
Oadby and Wigston	2.361	84
Lancaster	2.314	85
Northampton	2.278	86
Kirklees	2.276	87
Hackney	2.263	88
Forest Heath	2.256	89
Tonbridge and Malling	2.196	90
Tamworth	2.182	91
North Dorset	2.178	92
Stockton-on-Tees	2.105	93
Camden	2.096	94
Calderdale	2.091	95
Maidstone	2.085	96
Derby	2.067	97
Cheltenham	2.064	98
Brentwood	2.062	99
Central Bedfordshire	2.049	100
Medway	2.047	101
Bury	2.025	102
North Tyneside	2.023	103
Greenwich	1.998	104
East Hertfordshire	1.973	105
Cannock Chase	1.970	106
Wigan	1.960	107
North East Lincolnshire	1.958	108

Warwick	1.953	109
Ashford	1.944	110
Peterborough	1.944	111
Trafford	1.905	112
Surrey Heath	1.897	113
Bexley	1.884	114
East Staffordshire	1.875	115
East Dorset	1.849	116
Norwich	1.842	117
Copeland	1.828	118
Great Yarmouth	1.810	119
East Devon	-1.780	120
Bedford	1.773	121
Hartlepool	1.749	122
North Devon	1.741	123
North West Leicestershire	-1.731	124
Chiltern	1.731	125
North Norfolk	**1.729**	**126**
Lichfield	1.709	127
East Riding of Yorkshire	1.699	128
Stratford-on-Avon	1.648	129
Preston	1.613	130
Portsmouth	1.611	131
Vale of White Horse	1.605	132
Warrington	1.605	133
Plymouth	1.604	134
Salford	1.536	135
Richmondshire	1.500	136
Southampton	1.483	137
Newcastle upon Tyne	1.480	138
Rugby	1.476	139
Hart	1.474	140
Broxtowe	1.464	141
Sandwell	1.462	142
Derbyshire Dales	1.454	143
County Durham	1.453	144
Amber Valley	1.453	145
Pendle	1.445	146
Fenland	1.413	147

Malvern Hills	1.387	148
South Oxfordshire	1.374	149
South Norfolk	1.369	150
St Edmundsbury	1.365	151
Wychavon	-1.365	152
Leicester	1.352	153
Southend-on-Sea	1.347	154
Welwyn Hatfield	1.336	155
Sunderland	1.315	156
Hambleton	1.307	157
Lincoln	1.304	158
Forest of Dean	-1.302	159
Wolverhampton	1.299	160
Darlington	1.282	161
Knowsley	-1.274	162
Cornwall	1.267	163
Brighton and Hove	1.266	164
Adur	1.263	165
East Hampshire	1.255	166
South Somerset	1.251	167
East Lindsey	1.250	168
Erewash	1.248	169
Chelmsford	1.245	170
Bolton	1.240	171
Sheffield	1.239	172
South Holland	1.224	173
Shepway	1.222	174
Purbeck	1.220	175
Liverpool	-1.202	176
Bath and North East Somerset	-1.186	177
Tendring	-1.179	178
Stafford	1.175	179
Chesterfield	1.169	180
Redditch	1.142	181
Havering	1.142	182
Mansfield	-1.136	183
North Kesteven	1.119	184
Broadland	1.117	185
Leeds	1.106	186

Isle of Wight	1.103	187
Blackpool	1.101	188
Rushcliffe	1.098	189
Worthing	1.096	190
Herefordshire, County of	1.087	191
South Tyneside	1.077	192
Tameside	1.072	193
Ryedale	-1.069	194
South Derbyshire	1.066	195
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1.058	196
Telford and Wrekin	-1.047	197
Cheshire East	1.045	198
Fareham	1.028	199
Thanet	1.022	200
South Kesteven	1.015	201
Suffolk Coastal	-1.010	202
Northumberland	1.006	203
Wokingham	0.991	204
High Peak	0.970	205
Kettering	0.966	206
North Lincolnshire	0.964	207
Winchester	0.962	208
North Somerset	0.962	209
South Staffordshire	0.961	210
Mid Devon	0.957	211
Rossendale	0.954	212
South Lakeland	0.952	213
Harrogate	0.948	214
Sedgemoor	0.942	215
Swale	0.915	216
Colchester	-0.912	217
Dartford	0.897	218
Exeter	-0.887	219
Torridge	0.886	220
Selby	0.871	221
Charnwood	0.863	222
Tewkesbury	0.851	223
Thurrock	0.849	224
Scarborough	0.800	225

Cotswold	0.790	226
Worcester	0.778	227
Teignbridge	-0.765	228
Wirral	0.760	229
South Hams	0.758	230
Mid Suffolk	0.756	231
Hyndburn	0.751	232
Aylesbury Vale	-0.746	233
Kingston upon Hull, City of	0.741	234
Gateshead	0.737	235
Eastbourne	0.736	236
Nottingham	0.728	237
Coventry	-0.723	238
Mid Sussex	0.720	239
Solihull	0.692	240
Carlisle	0.691	241
Redcar and Cleveland	0.679	242
Shropshire	0.673	243
Isles of Scilly	0.661	244
West Dorset	0.657	245
Wealden	0.656	246
Dudley	0.656	247
Corby	0.650	248
Arun	0.649	249
Gedling	0.648	250
Craven	0.646	251
Barrow-in-Furness	0.633	252
South Ribble	0.625	253
Fylde	0.614	254
Dover	0.606	255
Gloucester	0.598	256
St. Helens	0.582	257
Halton	0.562	258
Manchester	0.553	259
Stockport	0.537	260
North East Derbyshire	0.537	261
Birmingham	0.526	262
South Northamptonshire	0.523	263
Burnley	0.517	264

Reading	0.512	265
West Somerset	0.477	266
Wiltshire	0.470	267
Rotherham	0.462	268
Bristol, City of	0.460	269
Eden	0.457	270
Walsall	0.455	271
Bromsgrove	-0.455	272
Hastings	0.452	273
Ribble Valley	0.431	274
Bolsover	0.407	275
Wellingborough	0.405	276
Chichester	0.394	277
Newcastle-under-Lyme	-0.370	278
Bassetlaw	0.361	279
East Northamptonshire	-0.358	280
Canterbury	-0.343	281
Waveney	-0.342	282
Newark and Sherwood	-0.335	283
Cheshire West and Chester	-0.329	284
Ashfield	0.321	285
Daventry	0.319	286
North Warwickshire	-0.306	287
Test Valley	-0.298	288
Stoke-on-Trent	0.277	289
Rochdale	-0.270	290
Taunton Deane	-0.253	291
Staffordshire Moorlands	0.251	292
Maldon	0.250	293
Breckland	-0.238	294
Rutland	0.216	295
Ipswich	-0.212	296
Rother	0.190	297
Wakefield	-0.188	298
Hinckley and Bosworth	-0.176	299
Oldham	-0.166	300
Gosport	-0.162	301
Babergh	-0.151	302
Wyre	0.150	303

Chorley	0.150	304
West Lancashire	0.142	305
Blackburn with Darwen	0.130	306
Castle Point	-0.127	307
Stroud	-0.103	308
Barnsley	0.103	309
Havant	0.103	310
Mendip	0.099	311
West Lindsey	-0.087	312
Basildon	-0.077	313
Horsham	-0.076	314
Harborough	0.075	315
Doncaster	0.066	316
Allerdale	0.049	317
Sefton	-0.031	318
Nuneaton and Bedworth	0.029	319
West Berkshire	-0.024	320
Blaby	-0.022	321
Wyre Forest	-0.014	322
South Gloucestershire	0.014	323
Rochford	0.011	324
Weymouth and Portland	-0.002	325
Torbay	-0.001	326

* Calculated as change in population projected by 2014-based SNPP, minus change projected by 2016-based SNPP, as a percentage of Local Authority population (Census 2011)