



Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners

Planning Design Economics

Impact of DCLG 2003 Household

Projections on Household

Growth Estimates Study

Research for the North West
Regional Assembly

07 September 2006

Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd

Generator Studios
Trafalgar Street
Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 2LA

T 0191 261 5685
F 0191 261 9180
newcastle@nlpplanning.com
www.nlpplanning.com

Offices also in:
Cardiff
London
Manchester

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION..... 2

2.0 REVISED MODEL ADJUSTED FOR DCLG PROJECTIONS 5

 Introduction 5

 Methodology 5

 Regional Figures 5

 Cheshire Sub-Region..... 7

 Cumbria Sub-Region 8

 Greater Manchester Sub-Region 9

 Lancashire Sub-Region 10

 Merseyside Sub-Region..... 11

3.0 CONCLUSIONS..... 13

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In 2005, Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP) were part of a consultancy team commissioned by the North West Regional Assembly to develop a methodology to help determine the likely demand and need for housing in the region and its distribution across the region's Local Planning Authority areas. A range of scenarios were developed based upon different levels of economic performance and separate economic activity rates, with each scenario producing projections of household growth. The approach adopted by NLP also allowed the job-led growth¹ to be separated out to help determine the impact of economic growth upon the household projections.
- 1.2 The initial work undertaken by NLP provided baseline information which the Regional Assembly and partners then considered, in conjunction with a host of other factors, to allow them to determine the suggested housing allocations for inclusion in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).
- 1.3 This report sets out the findings of an additional run undertaken on the original model. This revised run updates the original model to take account of the DCLG 2003-based household projections released in March 2006 and to identify any differences arising from the revised figures.
- 1.4 Re-runs of the model have been undertaken at the regional level and for the sub-regions of the North West. For each geographical area all three levels of economic performance (Long Term, Recent and Improvement) and all three employment rates (Low, Medium and High) have been considered, resulting in nine revised scenarios for each area.
- 1.5 The original scale and distribution model developed by NLP forecasts that the number of households in the North West will have risen to 3,255,000 by 2021 as a result of indigenous household growth. This figure was derived by applying a forecast household size figure (source: ODPM) to the projected regional population in 2021². In contrast, the DCLG 2003-based household projections forecast that there will be

¹ The annual growth in households arising as a consequence of economic change

² Source: ONS 2003-based subnational population projections
MA2005\MA40251-004 REVISED HOUSING MODEL RUN (REPORT FORMAT)

3,290,000 households across the North West by 2021. This represents a difference of 35,000 households.

- 1.6 It is important to note, however, that the original household figures were developed through the use of assumptions regarding household size. The original run summed the indigenous households in 2021 for each of the sub-regions, giving a regional figure of 3,288,948. In this instance, the recently published DCLG projections would represent a difference of just 1,052 compared to the figures used in the original model.
- 1.7 The figures generated by the revised run undertaken and summarised within this report should be compared with the outcomes generated by the original run of the model. This will provide an understanding of how the scale and pattern of change projected by the DCLG figures differs from the outcomes arising from the original run. *The figures cited within this Briefing Note cannot be directly compared with the RSS figures. This is because the numbers generated by the NLP model provided a base to be considered alongside all other relevant information when determining the suggested housing figures for inclusion in the RSS.*
- 1.8 It should be noted that the results of the revised run do not represent the planning policy of the Regional Planning Body. This report is a Technical Paper only, which outlines the results of the additional run and has been produced for the sole purpose of aiding debate at the forthcoming RSS Examination in Public (EiP).

Original Household Figures: Data Issues

- 1.9 It should also be noted that some adjustments have been made to some of the household growth figures identified through the original model. This is due to an error in a calculation that has only recently been identified. The employment figures had to be adjusted to fit RSS timescales. This resulted in an error for the Recent and Improvement Scenarios for Merseyside and the Lancashire Recent Scenario.
- 1.10 Figure 1 shows that the estimated level of employment growth for the Recent scenario in Lancashire has increased from 25,000 to 67,600 and from 47,400 to 64,200 in Merseyside. For the Improvement scenario in Merseyside, estimated employment growth has reduced from 56,000 to 36,000.

Figure 1: Changes to Estimated Employment Growth Figures

| | Trend Scenario | Initial Estimated Employment Growth | Amended Estimated Employment Growth |
|------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Lancashire | Recent | 25,000 | 67,600 |
| Merseyside | Recent | 47,400 | 64,200 |
| Merseyside | Improvement | 56,000 | 36,000 |

1.11 The original distribution model has been adjusted to take account of the figures contained within Figure 1 to generate new total household growth figures for the three scenarios identified above. The amended values shown in Figure 2 below should hereafter be considered to represent the correct figures from the original run.

Figure 2: Impact of Amended Employment Growth Figures upon Total Household Growth Projections

| | Total Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Lancashire Recent | | | Merseyside Recent | | | Merseyside Improvement | | |
| | Initial | Amended | Change | Initial | Amended | Change | Initial | Amended | Change |
| Low | 5.64 | 8.12 | 2.48 | 6.65 | 7.70 | 1.05 | 7.19 | 5.94 | -1.25 |
| Medium | 5.59 | 7.96 | 2.37 | 6.33 | 7.26 | 0.93 | 6.80 | 5.70 | -1.10 |
| High | 5.48 | 7.69 | 2.21 | 6.14 | 7.00 | 0.86 | 6.58 | 5.55 | -1.03 |

1.12 Figure 2 clearly shows that the amended figures have resulted in increased total household growth for the Lancashire Recent and Merseyside Recent scenarios. Household growth is projected to be lower for the Merseyside Improvement scenario; this is as a result of the decrease in estimated employment growth.

2.0 REVISED MODEL ADJUSTED FOR DCLG PROJECTIONS

Introduction

- 2.1 The original model used to inform the housing allocation included within the draft RSS has been updated by NLP to reflect the DCLG 2003-based household projections published in March 2006. The process through which the model was updated is outlined below. It should be noted that the same process was adopted for regional and sub-regional figures and was undertaken for all scenarios.

Methodology

- 2.2 In updating the model for both the North West and each of its constituent sub-regions, the number of households in 2021 forecast by the DCLG projections has been assumed to represent the number of indigenous households and was inputted accordingly into the model. In addition, a Chelmer run was commissioned to provide household estimates for all 9 scenarios for the North West and the sub-regions.
- 2.3 The DCLG household projections for 2021 were then subtracted from the Chelmer 2021 household projections to provide an indication of the level of job-led household growth anticipated over the period.
- 2.4 It should be noted that a separate Chelmer run was undertaken on the amended figures for the Lancashire Recent, Merseyside Recent and Merseyside Improvement scenarios once the aforementioned data error was identified. This was to ensure that all of the updated Chelmer run figures were based upon the correct base data.

Regional Figures

- 2.5 Figures 3 and 4 below provide a summary of the differences between the outputs arising from the original run and the revised run at the regional level. Total household growth per annum and average annual job-led household growth are displayed in separate tables which contain the following information in relation to all 9 scenarios:
- **Original** average annual household growth, as prescribed within the original run of the model

- **Revised** average annual household growth, amended to take account of the DCLG 2003-based household projections; and
- **Difference** between the two rates outlined above.

Total Household Growth

2.6 Figure 3 below shows how the original and revised runs of the model compare in terms of total household growth per annum. For ease of reference, where the difference between the two figures is negative (i.e. the revised total household growth figure is lower than the original) the values have been highlighted through the use of bold and italics.

Figure 3: Total Household Growth (Regional)

| | Total Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|---------|----------------------|----------|---------|----------------------|-------------|---------|----------------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 26,245 | 25,138 | <i>-1,107</i> | 37,161 | 34,467 | <i>-2,694</i> | 37,219 | 34,516 | <i>-2,703</i> |
| Medium | 18,209 | 18,242 | 33 | 28,655 | 27,169 | <i>-1,486</i> | 28,709 | 27,216 | <i>-1,493</i> |
| High | 5,226 | 7,149 | 1,923 | 14,915 | 15,429 | 514 | 14,965 | 15,472 | 507 |

2.7 It can clearly be seen from Figure 3 above that the impact of the revised run is mixed in terms of the level of total household growth per annum projected. Four of the nine scenarios forecast increased household numbers as a result of applying the DCLG projections, whereas the remaining five scenarios are anticipated to result in less household growth than forecast via the original run. The revised figures for total household growth per annum range from 7,149 for the High Long Term scenario to 34,516 for the Low Improvement scenario.

2.8 The table above shows that the revised run, which takes account of the DCLG projections, forecasts a higher rate of total household growth than the original run for all three economic scenarios when the high employment rate is assumed. In contrast, the revised run forecasts a lower level of total household growth compared to the original run for all three economic scenarios when the low employment rate is applied.

2.9 The DCLG household projections for the North West in 2021 are greater than the assumed number of households in 2021 in the original run of the model. Indigenous annual household growth is therefore greater for the revised run (21,915 per annum) than the original run (19,970 per annum). As a consequence, any reductions at the

regional level in the total annual household growth projected by the revised run are driven by a reduction in the level of job-led household growth.

Job-Led Household Growth

- 2.10 Figure 4 below shows the average annual level of job-led household growth forecast by the original and revised runs of the model. Once again, where the difference between the two is negative, this has been highlighted through the use of bold and italics.

Figure 4: Job-Led Household Growth (Regional)

| Job-Led Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 6,274 | 3,223 | <i>-3,051</i> | 17,191 | 12,552 | <i>-4,639</i> | 17,248 | 12,601 | <i>-4,647</i> |
| Medium | -1,762 | -3,673 | <i>-1,911</i> | 8,684 | 5,254 | <i>-3,430</i> | 8,739 | 5,301 | <i>-3,438</i> |
| High | -14,744 | -14,766 | <i>-22</i> | -5,056 | -6,486 | <i>-1,430</i> | -5,005 | -6,443 | <i>-1,438</i> |

- 2.11 It can be seen from Figure 4 above that the difference column is negative for all nine scenarios at the regional level, illustrating that the revised run of the model results in a lower level of job-led growth.
- 2.12 The revised figures for job-led household growth per annum range from -14,766 for the High Long Term scenario to 12,601 for the Low Improvement scenario.

Cheshire Sub-Region

Total Household Growth

- 2.13 The original run of the model forecast that indigenous household growth in Cheshire would equate to 3,061 households per annum, whereas the revised run indicates that indigenous household growth in the sub-region will be approximately 2,832 per annum. This represents a decrease of 229 indigenous households per annum.
- 2.14 Figure 5 below shows that the revised run of the model, which takes into account the DCLG 2003-based household projections results in a lower forecast level of total household growth per annum for all 9 scenarios in the Cheshire sub-region. This is driven in part by the lower indigenous household growth discussed above but also by changes to the level of job-led household growth.

2.15 The revised total household growth per annum figures for the sub-region range from 1,940 for the High Long-Term scenario to 4,960 for the Low Improvement scenario.

Figure 5: Total Household Growth (Cheshire)

| Total Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|----------|---------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 5,360 | 3,494 | -1,866 | 6,657 | 4,562 | -2,095 | 7,139 | 4,960 | -2,179 |
| Medium | 4,415 | 2,715 | -1,700 | 5,665 | 3,744 | -1,921 | 6,130 | 4,128 | -2,002 |
| High | 3,477 | 1,940 | -1,537 | 4,680 | 2,931 | -1,749 | 5,127 | 3,300 | -1,827 |

Job-Led Household Growth

2.16 The revised run also forecasts a lower average annual level of job-led household growth compared to the original run for all 9 scenarios, as illustrated in Figure 6 below. The revised job-led household growth per annum figures for Cheshire range from -892 for the High Long Term scenario to 2,128 for the Low Improvement scenario.

Figure 6: Job-Led Household Growth (Cheshire)

| Job-Led Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|----------|---------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 2,299 | 662 | -1,637 | 3,596 | 1,730 | -1,866 | 4,079 | 2,128 | -1,951 |
| Medium | 1,355 | -117 | -1,472 | 2,604 | 912 | -1,692 | 3,070 | 1,296 | -1,774 |
| High | 416 | -892 | -1,308 | 1,619 | 99 | -1,520 | 2,067 | 468 | -1,599 |

Cumbria Sub-Region

Total Household Growth

2.17 Figure 7 below highlights that the revised run of the model projects a higher level of total household growth per annum than the original run for each of the 9 scenarios. This is in part due to the higher levels of job-led housing growth shown in Figure 8 below. However, the revised run of the model also forecasts a higher average annual level of indigenous household growth (1,679) compared to the original run (1,538). This represents an increase of 141 households per annum.

2.18 The figures projected by the revised run range from 119 for the High Long Term Scenario to 1,955 for the Low Recent scenario.

Figure 7: Total Household Growth (Cumbria)

| | Total Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|----------|----------------|------------|----------|---------------------|------------|
| | Original | Long Term Revised | Difference | Original | Recent Revised | Difference | Original | Improvement Revised | Difference |
| Low | 920 | 1,263 | 343 | 1,740 | 1,955 | 215 | 1,429 | 1,692 | 263 |
| Medium | 468 | 881 | 413 | 1,259 | 1,549 | 290 | 959 | 1,296 | 337 |
| High | -435 | 119 | 554 | 299 | 738 | 439 | 21 | 504 | 483 |

Job-Led Household Growth

2.19 It can be seen from Figure 8 below that the revised run of the model forecasts a higher level of annual job-led household growth in Cumbria than the original run over the period to 2021. The figures projected by the revised run vary from -1,561 for the High Long Term scenario to 276 for the Low Recent scenario.

Figure 8: Job-Led Household Growth (Cumbria)

| | Job-Led Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|----------|----------------|------------|----------|---------------------|------------|
| | Original | Long Term Revised | Difference | Original | Recent Revised | Difference | Original | Improvement Revised | Difference |
| Low | -618 | -417 | 201 | 202 | 276 | 74 | -109 | 13 | 122 |
| Medium | -1,071 | -799 | 272 | -279 | -131 | 148 | -579 | -384 | 195 |
| High | -1,974 | -1,561 | 413 | -1,240 | -941 | 299 | -1,518 | -1,176 | 342 |

Greater Manchester Sub-Region

Total Household Growth

2.20 The original run of the model forecast that indigenous household growth in Greater Manchester would equate to 8,034 households per annum, whereas the revised run indicates that indigenous household growth in the sub-region will be approximately 7,876 per annum. This represents a decrease of 158 indigenous households per annum.

2.21 Figure 9 below indicates that the revised run of the model projects a lower level of annual household growth than the original run for 8 of the 9 scenarios. The lower level of indigenous household growth is a contributing factor in the reduced level of total annual household growth, although job-led growth, examined in Figure 10 also appears to be driving the reduction.

2.22 The figures projected by the revised run range from 3,105 for the High Long Term scenario to 13,298 for the Low Improvement scenario.

Figure 9: Total Household Growth (Greater Manchester)

| Total Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|----------|---------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 10,537 | 9,459 | -1,078 | 14,022 | 12,433 | -1,589 | 15,035 | 13,298 | -1,737 |
| Medium | 8,053 | 7,338 | -715 | 11,416 | 10,209 | -1,207 | 12,393 | 11,043 | -1,350 |
| High | 3,094 | 3,105 | 11 | 6,213 | 5,768 | -445 | 7,120 | 6,541 | -579 |

Job-Led Household Growth

- 2.23 The revised run also forecasts a lower average annual level of job-led household growth compared to the original run for the same 8 scenarios, as illustrated by Figure 10 below.
- 2.24 It can be seen from the table that the revised annual average job-led household growth figures range from -4,772 for the High Long Term scenario to 5,422 for the Low Improvement scenario.

Figure 10: Job-Led Household Growth (Greater Manchester)

| Job-Led Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|----------|---------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 2,503 | 1,582 | -921 | 5,987 | 4,557 | -1,430 | 7,000 | 5,422 | -1,578 |
| Medium | 19 | -538 | -557 | 3,381 | 2,333 | -1,048 | 4,359 | 3,167 | -1,192 |
| High | -4,940 | -4,772 | 168 | -1,821 | -2,109 | -288 | -915 | -1,335 | -420 |

Lancashire Sub-Region

Total Household Growth

- 2.25 The revised run of the model forecasts indigenous household growth of 4,791 per annum in Lancashire. This represents a decrease of 228 households per annum in comparison with the figure projected by the original model (5,019).
- 2.26 It can be seen from Figure 11 below that the revised run of the model projects a lower level of annual household growth than the original model for all 9 scenarios. The revised total annual household growth figures projected by the revised run range from 759 for the High Long Term scenario to 6,250 for the Low Improvement scenario.

Figure 11: Total Household Growth (Lancashire)

| | Total Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------|----------------|---------------|----------|---------------------|---------------|
| | Original | Long Term Revised | Difference | Original | Recent Revised | Difference | Original | Improvement Revised | Difference |
| Low | 6,431 | 4,450 | -1,981 | 8,181 | 5,904 | -2,277 | 8,595 | 6,250 | -2,345 |
| Medium | 4,866 | 3,093 | -1,773 | 8,021 | 5,773 | -2,248 | 6,875 | 4,820 | -2,055 |
| High | 2,053 | 759 | -1,294 | 7,752 | 5,547 | -2,205 | 3,917 | 2,360 | -1,557 |

Job-Led Household Growth

2.27 Figure 12 below shows that the revised run of the model forecast a lower average annual level of job-led household growth compared to the original run for all 9 scenarios. The table also shows that the average annual job led household growth projected by the revised run ranges from -4,032 for the High Long Term scenario to 1,459 for the Low Improvement scenario.

Figure 12: Job-Led Household Growth (Lancashire)

| | Job-Led Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------|----------------|---------------|----------|---------------------|---------------|
| | Original | Long Term Revised | Difference | Original | Recent Revised | Difference | Original | Improvement Revised | Difference |
| Low | 1,412 | -340 | -1,752 | 3,161 | 1,113 | -2,048 | 3,575 | 1,459 | -2,116 |
| Medium | -153 | -1,697 | -1,544 | 3,002 | 983 | -2,019 | 1,856 | 29 | -1,827 |
| High | -2,966 | -4,032 | -1,066 | 2,733 | 757 | -1,976 | -1,102 | -2,431 | -1,329 |

Merseyside Sub-Region

Total Household Growth

2.28 Figure 13 below highlights the level of total average annual household growth in Merseyside projected by the revised run of the model. The original run of the model projected that indigenous household growth in Merseyside would equal 2,689 households per annum, whereas the revised run forecasts that indigenous household growth in the sub-region will be approximately 3,166 per annum. This represents an increase of 477 indigenous households per annum.

2.29 The table shows that the revised run of the model projects a lower level of total household growth per annum than the original run for 7 of the 9 scenarios. This is because the projected reductions in job-led household growth shown in Figure 14 below are greater than the increases in indigenous growth for these 7 scenarios.

2.30 It can also be seen from the table that the average annual household growth projected by the revised run ranges from -2,064 for the High Long Term scenario to 7,239 for the Low Recent scenario.

Figure 13: Total Household Growth (Merseyside)

| Total Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|----------|---------|---------------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 4,323 | 3,872 | -451 | 8,276 | 7,239 | -1,037 | 6,512 | 5,737 | -775 |
| Medium | -78 | 124 | 202 | 7,832 | 6,861 | -971 | 6,263 | 5,525 | -738 |
| High | -2,646 | -2,064 | 582 | 7,573 | 6,640 | -933 | 6,118 | 5,401 | -717 |

Job-Led Household Growth

2.31 The revised run projects a lower average annual level of job-led household growth for 8 of the 9 scenarios, as illustrated by Figure 14 below. It can also be seen that the average annual job-led growth projected by the revised run ranges from -5,230 for the High Long Term scenario to 4,073 for the Low Recent scenario.

Figure 14: Job-Led Household Growth (Merseyside)

| Job-Led Household Growth (Per Annum) | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|----------|---------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------|
| | Long Term | | | Recent | | | Improvement | | |
| | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 1,634 | 706 | -928 | 5,587 | 4,073 | -1,514 | 3,823 | 2,571 | -1,252 |
| Medium | -2,767 | -3,043 | -276 | 5,143 | 3,695 | -1,448 | 3,574 | 2,358 | -1,216 |
| High | -5,335 | -5,230 | 105 | 4,884 | 3,474 | -1,410 | 3,429 | 2,235 | -1,194 |

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

3.1 The key findings of this report are summarised below:

- As a result of recently identified data issues, the Lancashire Recent, Merseyside Recent and Merseyside Improvement scenarios have been amended to take account of amended employment growth figures. The re-run of the model is based upon the resultant household figures
- The original run of the model forecast that the North West would have 3,255,000 indigenous households in 2021, whereas the DCLG figures projects 3,290,000 households in 2021. As a result, the revised run of the model is based on a level of indigenous household growth that is 1,945 per annum greater
- The revised run of the model is projected to result in a higher level of total household growth at the regional level for 4 of the 9 scenarios, whilst job-led growth is forecast to decline for all 9 scenarios
- At the sub-regional level, job led household growth is projected to increase in Cumbria in comparison with the original run. All other sub-regions are forecast to experience a decline in job-led growth vis-à-vis the original model for most if not all scenarios
- The revised indigenous population for Merseyside and Cumbria forecast by the DCLG figures is greater than the figures assumed within the original model. However, for the remaining sub-regions, the number of households in 2021 forecast by the DCLG projections is lower than the number of indigenous households projected by the original run of the model
- The revised run forecasts lower levels of total household growth for the majority of scenarios for all sub-regions besides Cumbria.

APPENDIX 1 – Total Household Estimates by Economic Performance Level

Total Household Estimates (Per Annum) for Long Term Scenario

| | Cheshire | | |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 5,360 | 3,494 | -1,866 |
| Medium | 4,415 | 2,715 | -1,700 |
| High | 3,477 | 1,940 | -1,537 |

| | Cumbria | | |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 920 | 1,263 | 343 |
| Medium | 468 | 881 | 413 |
| High | -435 | 119 | 554 |

| | Greater Manchester | | |
|--------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 10,537 | 9,459 | -1,078 |
| Medium | 8,053 | 7,338 | -715 |
| High | 3,094 | 3,105 | 11 |

| | Lancashire | | |
|--------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 6,431 | 4,450 | -1,981 |
| Medium | 4,866 | 3,093 | -1,773 |
| High | 2,053 | 759 | -1,294 |

| | Merseyside | | |
|--------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 4,323 | 3,872 | -451 |
| Medium | -78 | 124 | 202 |
| High | -2,646 | -2,064 | 582 |

| | Regional | | |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 26,245 | 25,138 | -1,107 |
| Medium | 18,209 | 18,242 | 33 |
| High | 5,226 | 7,149 | 1,923 |

Total Household Estimates (Per Annum) for Recent Scenario

| Cheshire | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 6,657 | 4,562 | -2,095 |
| Medium | 5,665 | 3,744 | -1,921 |
| High | 4,680 | 2,931 | -1,749 |

| Cumbria | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 1,740 | 1,955 | 215 |
| Medium | 1,259 | 1,549 | 290 |
| High | 299 | 738 | 439 |

| Greater Manchester | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 14,022 | 12,433 | -1,589 |
| Medium | 11,416 | 10,209 | -1,207 |
| High | 6,213 | 5,768 | -445 |

| Lancashire | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 8,181 | 5,904 | -2,277 |
| Medium | 8,021 | 5,773 | -2,248 |
| High | 7,752 | 5,547 | -2,205 |

| Merseyside | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 8,276 | 7,239 | -1,037 |
| Medium | 7,832 | 6,861 | -971 |
| High | 7,573 | 6,640 | -933 |

| Regional | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 37,161 | 34,467 | -2,694 |
| Medium | 28,655 | 27,169 | -1,486 |
| High | 14,915 | 15,429 | 514 |

Total Household Estimates (Per Annum) for Improvement Scenario

| Cheshire | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 7,139 | 4,960 | -2,179 |
| Medium | 6,130 | 4,128 | -2,002 |
| High | 5,127 | 3,300 | -1,827 |

| Cumbria | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 1,429 | 1,692 | 263 |
| Medium | 959 | 1,296 | 337 |
| High | 21 | 504 | 483 |

| Greater Manchester | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 15,035 | 13,298 | -1,737 |
| Medium | 12,393 | 11,043 | -1,350 |
| High | 7,120 | 6,541 | -579 |

| Lancashire | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 8,595 | 6,250 | -2,345 |
| Medium | 6,875 | 4,820 | -2,055 |
| High | 3,917 | 2,360 | -1,557 |

| Merseyside | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 6,512 | 5,737 | -775 |
| Medium | 6,263 | 5,525 | -738 |
| High | 6,118 | 5,401 | -717 |

| Regional | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Revised | Difference |
| Low | 37,219 | 34,516 | -2,703 |
| Medium | 28,709 | 27,216 | -1,493 |
| High | 14,965 | 15,472 | 507 |