

**Examination of the Hartlepool Local Plan
Inspector's request for additional clarification on future jobs and
housing need. 17 November 2017**

In light of the discussion at Matter3 on Housing Need and the predicament of the TVCA forecaster who did the analysis for Hartlepool having now left the TVCA I would be grateful if the Council could further clarify the following points in a brief note:

- (1) The relationship of the assumed 15% in-commuting to the current 1:1 net out commuting ratio. Has there been an assumption within scenario D2 that net out-commuting would reduce and if so by what factor? Allied to this is there any positive evidence (such as notes in any Duty to Cooperate meetings or other correspondence) that neighbouring authorities have recognised the approach in Hartlepool?
- (2) Transparency on the assumptions on economic activity rates and unemployment. EX/HBC/24 provides no additional commentary in Appendix A and Table 2.1 on employment levels need to support the 70% figure. It is also not clear whether or not there has been any local adjustment to the OBR economic activity rates. My impression from the discussion under Matter 3 is that for scenario D2 to be realised, unemployment would need to decrease (to what % level?) and economic activity rates improve. It remains unclear what assumptions have been used. Can the Council clarify please?
- (3) It was illustrated by GVA (for Wynyard) in oral evidence that reductions in unemployment (from the current +10% to 6.5% - the 2005/06 level) would yield 1,400 workers and a balancing of commuting from 1.1 to 1.0 would yield a further 3,557 workers. Does this align with or corroborate the Council's assumptions of how the growth in future jobs could be supported by a predominantly 'indigenous' but aging workforce?

Thank you for your cooperation.

David Spencer

Inspector