

**EXAMINATION OF THE BROMSGROVE DISTRICT PLAN (BDP)  
OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEEDS  
FURTHER QUERIES FROM THE INSPECTOR – 7 July 2014**

---

As I advised at the initial hearing sessions, I am in the process of preparing my Interim Conclusions in respect of Matters O1 and O2. There are a number of matters upon which I seek further clarification before I can finalise my paper. These relate to the employment forecasts for Bromsgrove District set out in the NWHN report<sup>1</sup> (table 2.1) and the labour market figures contained in the Bromsgrove District Employment Land Review (ELR)<sup>2</sup>. It would assist my consideration if you could address the following points:

1. Paragraph 2.2.2 of the NWHN report states that briefing notes on the projection methodologies for the three individual employment forecasters can be provided separately. Can these please be added to the evidence base, with copies sent to me via the PO?
2. Specifically, it is not clear from the NWHN report how the three employment forecasting methodologies have addressed the matter of commuting. It is noted from the ELR that Bromsgrove is both a significant exporter of labour and a major importer of labour – with the balance being in favour of out-commuting. How has this, in practice, been reflected in the three employment forecasts? In particular, do the employment totals set out in table 2.1 of the NWHN paper include a deduction to take account of net out-commuting?
3. In addition, I have two queries in respect of the ELR:
  - (a) It is not entirely clear which of the three sets of projections that are summarised in table 8.5 (ONS, WCC and the model) have been taken forward to generate the employment land requirement shown in tables 8.18 and 8.19. Can this be clarified?
  - (b) If it is the model's projections that have been used for that purpose then it would be helpful to have a more detailed breakdown of the relevant projections along the lines of those provided for the other two scenarios in tables 8.10 and 8.11. However, those two tables omit a final line of figures for the total labour market. Presumably this can be generated by the various additions and subtractions included within the table. However, for completeness and for reasons of transparency total figures (for each year) should be included in these tables respect of all three scenarios.
4. In general terms, I would also welcome the Council's comments on the relationship between the labour market evidence presented in the ELR and that set out in the NWHN report. Do these two documents present a consistent picture?

As advised at the second hearing session, I am hoping to issue my interim conclusions by 18 July 2014. As such, I would welcome an early response – ideally by close of play (5pm) on **Monday 14 July 2014**. If this timescale is likely to cause problems, or if you have any other queries regarding the above, then please let me know via the PO.

Michael J Hetherington  
Inspector

---

<sup>1</sup> Document ref. CDB13.3.

<sup>2</sup> Document ref. CD8.1b.