

**South Somerset district Council Hearing Statement issue 3; Supplementary statement requested by Inspector;
Economic Prosperity and Employment provision; Critique of Messr's Fysh and hartley
Issue 3 Statements**

**Annex 4 Response to comments received on Summary of Emails between SSDC and
ONS/BRES/NOMIS**

Three participants have responded to the email correspondence between SSDC and ONS (principally) and others undertaken to understand and justify the Council's use of ONS statistics in the production of employment provision figures and particularly for the distribution of job growth and therefore housing growth around the District. These are summarised with a response given in italics

Mr Hartley (H001)

1. BRES/ABI and APS not compatible and SSDC should have made adjustments
Adjustments were made and confirmed by correspondence with ONS
2. SSDC's addition of BRES figures and APS for self employed would lead to overcounting
Not the case as the Council have used BRES employee data and APS for self employed and the BRES employee data doesn't include self employed
3. 3,600 job growth in 2010 -11 resulting from accounting for self employed was exaggerated
Adjusted for when account taken of the working owners discontinuity (see answer to para 3.1.5 in the Fysh critique – annex1)
4. Census revealing 17% of self employed live in Yeovil means that percentage of employment identified for Yeovil is higher than it should be
Assumption made that self employed will work where the economy is not where their homes are.

Mr Smith on behalf of Mrs Sienkiewicz (H001)

5. 3,600 bounce back of job provision in 2010 – 11 is not credible and not properly evidenced through the email correspondence with ONS
New evidence published at end of 2012 that significant element of the annual job increase related to the working owners discontinuity. Nonetheless the data for the 2011 review date for the employment growth forecasts once the appropriate adjustment taken into account remains the same as used by the Council previously. (see answer to para 3.1.5 in the Fysh critique – annex1). Nationally there was an increase in job numbers despite the recession between 2010 – 2011 and other evidence of sizable annual job increases
6. Overprovision of employment land given that the identified strategic sites could accommodate most of the employment growth forecast.
This issue is addressed directly in the Economic Prosperity and Employment Provision Supplementary Statement 2

Cllr Fysh (H002)

7. SSDC haven't made adjustments identified in correspondence
Adjustments made and explained (see answer to para 3.1.5 in the Fysh critique – annex1)

8. HM Forces and agricultural workers not included in BRES/ABI and need to be incorporated in calculations.

HM forces housing needs are generally outside the methodology adopted by the Council. HM Forces are not appropriate to include in the calculations unless specifically identified for having their housing met in the general housing market. SSDC has done this via the 300 extra provision specifically identified from a firm request for support from the MOD (SSDC Supplementary Statement H007). If not specifically to be provided for then it is assumed that their housing needs will be met in barracks.

Agricultural workers have been added back into the job figures used as the base date in 2011 to apply the forecasts of growth from the Bakers report to (see answer to para 3.1.8 in the Fysh critique – annex1)

9. BRES captures VAT registered self employed and APS must be used by way of specific methodology to establish numbers of self employed not registered for VAT

BRES employees data doesn't include self employed. The APS has been used for self employed and is inclusive.