



BIP with Purvis and CND

Prime Minister

LARGE SCALE HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

1. We discussed my proposals for a large scale survey in 1986 to provide data for RSG, inner city and housing policies, and I said that I would examine urgently whether there are any existing sources that could supply what we want without the need for a fresh survey.

2. I have now looked into this. I attach a note to show (eg in Appendix A) that we already make very extensive use of administrative data in our assessments of local authorities' needs (their GREs). For example we use DES annual counts of pupils, DEm and DHSS counts of persons in receipt of unemployment benefit and supplementary benefit, and OPCS mid-year estimates of population (which in turn take account for example of changes to the electoral register). By using such sources we update annually the indicators for over 80 per cent of the total value of GRE's. So to that extent, we are already doing what you seek.

3. But as the local authorities are quick to point out - and I have a statutory obligation to consult them - these sources do not reflect at all accurately the numbers in some groups which create major demands on them, eg the elderly living alone, children in poor housing and ethnic minorities. Statistics on these and other groups - which are available only from a census or large survey - are used to distribute around £900m of education GRE, most of the £2300m personal social services GRE and the £200m of passenger transport revenue support GRE. To illustrate the importance of such variables, details are given in Appendix B to the note of the differences which would occur in 1985/86 if these sums were allocated entirely according to the numbers in the total or school population of relevant ages. Roughly £450m would be transferred, mainly away from inner cities, with a very marked impact on





some individual authorities. Greater reliance on social security and unemployment benefit statistics would reduce the impact to some extent but it is clear eg from para 9 and Appendix C to the Note that these could not substitute for the much more appropriate Census or survey results. The alternative, without a survey to up-date the Census figures, is to continue to base our assessment of needs on 1981 figures in each RSG settlement up to and including the 1992/93 Settlement. Appendix D to the Note gives an illustration of how GRE's can be affected by the use of out-dated information.

4. As suggested at the Chequers presentation, any reform of local government finance will still require distribution of grant on the basis of needs. This could only be based on the indicators we use at present (paragraph 13 of the attached paper). If anything, the kind of package we discussed at Chequers would make it even more important than now that we adequately reflect differences in the individual circumstances of local authorities. We shall want to do this in a radically simpler way; but it will still remain crucial to use factors which reflect economic and social deprivation. In the absence of the survey, we would have to run for the first few years of any new system using many 1981 indicators of relative need. This would discredit the reform in the eyes of local government.

5. For our inner city policies Census statistics are major indicators of relative social and environmental problems. They are used to inform our decisions on which authorities should be designated under the Inner Urban Areas Act, and on the allocation of resources between them. As for our work on RSG, administrative sources do provide some useful statistics for inner cities policy work, but no sources exist to update or replace the Census indicators.





6. The Survey would also provide information needed for our housing policies. At the national level there are sources that we can and do use to monitor changes. But national figures can conceal as much as they reveal. For example the national balance of households and dwellings conceals areas of acute stress offset by areas of relative plenty.

7. The Government was criticized by the Environment Committee in 1981 for having in the field of housing "as a matter of policy, deprived itself of information which is necessary for sound decisions to be taken". Similar criticisms may be made if housing policy decisions towards the end of the decade have to be based extensively on data from the 1981 Census.

8. I have satisfied myself that my officials are making full use of statistics available from administrative and other sources; there remains a core of key indicators of needs that can only be updated by a new survey. There will be a major weakness in our policies if we decide not to hold a survey. Such a decision will undoubtedly be exploited by the critics of the local government finance reforms on which we are now working in exploiting it very effectively. The cost of the survey - around £15m - is, I am convinced, fully justified.

9. Copies of this minute go to the the Secretary of State for Employment, the Chief Secretary, Sir Robert Armstrong and Sir John Boreham.

PJ

PATRICK JENKIN

22 April 1985

3F



Indicators used in Grant Related Assessment Calculations

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Update</u>
<u>A. Persons</u>		
Persons by age groups	OPCS	annual
Pupils/students	DES	annual
Commuters	Census	decennial
Overnight visitors	English Tourist Board	annual
<u>B. Physical features</u>		
Area	Ordnance Survey	annual
Sparsity	derived	annual
Density	derived	annual
Roadlengths	DTP	annual
Vehicle Kilometres	DTP	annual
Days of snow/frost	Met, office	annual
Numbers of properties	IR	annual
Floorspace	IR/DOE	annual
Building regulation applications	CIPFA	annual
Planning applications	DOE	annual
Protected coastline	DOE	ad hoc
<u>C. Social and environmental problems</u>		
Birthplace	Census	decennial
Lacking amenities	Census	decennial
Overcrowding	Census	decennial
Lone parent families	Census	decennial
Large families	Census	decennial
Socio-economic group	Census	decennial
Economic activity	Census	decennial
Shared accommodation	Census	decennial
Privately renting	Census	decennial
Living alone	Census	decennial
Car ownership	Census	decennial
Population change	OPCS	annual
Unemployment	DE	annual
Supplementary Benefit	DHSS	annual
Low income	IR	annual
Income from residential care	DHSS	annual
<u>D. Special requirements of particular services</u>		
Crime	HO	annual
Numbers of fires	HO	annual
Area of high fire risk	CIPFA	annual
Student awards, education pools	DES	annual
Housing benefits	DHSS	annual
Land Drainage expenditure	DOE	annual



<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Update</u>
Education debt charges	DES	annual
Passenger transport debt charges	DOE	annual
Housing Revenue Account deficit	DOE	annual
Number of deaths	OPCS	annual
Capital	DOE	annual
Passenger train miles	British Rail	annual

E. Costs of providing services

Higher costs in the London area	DE	annual
Special costs in the Isles of Scilly	DOE	annual



Appendix B

EFFECTS OF USING POPULATION COUNTS IN PLACE OF SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

1. The table attached shows the effects on 1985/86 GRE allocations.
2. Column 1 shows the difference between notional GRE's based solely on client numbers (eg the numbers of primary school pupils in the case of primary education, the population aged 65 and over for social services for the elderly, etc) and the actual 1985/86 GRE's.
3. The amounts redistributed total £435m (ie the sum of the gains to authorities or the sum of the losses in column 1). Column 2 shows the actual 1985/86 GRE's and column 3 the effect of dropping Census data in percentage terms. Only figures for the major authorities are shown.



Effects of excluding Census variables in GRE assessments

PAGE: 1

TOTALS TOTALS

	Net effect of dropping census data	1985/86 Settlement GRE	Effect as percentage
	£m	£m	%
<b>SHIRE COUNTIES</b>			
District Councils	5.222	1,462.368	.4%
County Councils	344.860	10,442.375	3.3%
TOTAL	350.082	11,904.743	2.9%
<b>METROPOLITAN COUNTIES</b>			
District Councils	-105.105	4,186.852	-2.5%
County Councils	-45.619	1,185.457	-3.8%
TOTAL	-150.724	5,372.309	-2.8%
<b>GREATER LONDON</b>			
City of London	.077	16.596	.5%
Inner Boroughs	-131.621	729.472	-18.0%
Outer Boroughs	-31.270	1,708.042	-1.8%
I L E A	-36.345	554.805	-6.6%
G L C (exc ILEA)	-	548.517	-
Metropolitan Police	-	384.948	-
Inner London Total	-167.889	1,300.873	-12.9%
London Boroughs&City	-162.814	2,454.110	-6.6%
ILEA+GLC+Met.Pol.+LRT	-36.345	1,488.270	-2.4%
TOTAL	-199.159	3,942.379	-5.1%
<b>METROPOLITAN &amp; LONDON</b>			
TOTAL	-349.883	9,314.689	-3.8%
ISLES OF SCILLY	-.199	1.352	-14.7%
England Total	.000	21,220.784	.0%



AUTHOR: [REDACTED]

Net effect of dropping census data	1985/86 Settlement GRE	Effect as percentage
--	------------------------------	----------------------------

## SHIRE COUNTIES

Avon	11.025	323.856	3.4%
Bedfordshire	2.579	195.517	1.3%
Berkshire	9.887	254.795	3.9%
Buckinghamshire	11.482	223.084	5.1%
Cambridgeshire	6.781	221.137	3.1%
Cheshire	14.749	350.430	4.2%
Cleveland	-6.259	242.922	-2.6%
Cornwall	5.687	161.040	3.5%
Cumbria	7.823	176.960	4.4%
Derbyshire	7.411	332.985	2.2%
Devon	11.599	347.778	3.3%
Dorset	11.079	204.115	5.4%
Durham	2.520	218.270	1.2%
East Sussex	.330	224.258	.1%
Essex	30.292	524.005	5.8%
Gloucestershire	7.865	178.140	4.4%
Hampshire	23.965	528.974	4.5%
Hereford and Worcester	10.499	235.125	4.5%
Hertfordshire	22.540	340.241	6.6%
Humberside	-2.518	339.732	-.7%
Isle of Wight	1.453	44.046	3.3%
Kent	19.409	538.693	3.6%
Lancashire	-5.402	532.058	-1.0%
Leicestershire	2.143	329.488	.7%
Lincolnshire	5.751	208.529	2.8%
Norfolk	8.945	251.735	3.6%
Northamptonshire	2.818	210.270	1.3%
Northumberland	6.122	110.527	5.5%
North Yorkshire	12.367	242.420	5.1%
Nottinghamshire	.174	379.755	.0%
Oxfordshire	9.147	179.022	5.1%
Shropshire	4.794	146.908	3.3%
Somerset	7.811	156.906	5.0%
Staffordshire	13.457	375.254	3.6%
Suffolk	9.107	209.919	4.3%
Surrey	28.576	319.717	8.9%
Warwickshire	7.001	169.345	4.1%
West Sussex	14.058	222.837	6.3%
Wiltshire	7.794	191.584	4.1%



AUTHORIT

	Net effect of dropping census data	1985/86 Settlement GRE	Effect as percentage
GREATER LONDON			
City of London	.077	16.596	.5%
Camden	-10.249	66.934	-15.3%
Greenwich	-4.091	43.104	-9.5%
Hackney	-15.950	66.864	-23.9%
Hammersmith and Fulham	-11.251	52.579	-21.4%
Islington	-10.550	64.357	-16.4%
Kensington and Chelsea	-6.548	39.410	-16.6%
Lambeth	-19.560	80.583	-24.3%
Lewisham	-8.057	59.120	-13.6%
Southwark	-12.580	80.300	-15.7%
Tower Hamlets	-9.935	43.426	-22.9%
Wandsworth	-13.059	68.742	-19.0%
Westminster	-9.790	64.052	-15.3%
Barking and Dagenham	.499	55.437	.9%
Barnet	.523	99.996	.5%
Bexley	5.346	78.714	6.8%
Brent	-13.114	125.653	-10.4%
Bromley	4.766	97.233	4.9%
Croydon	-1.371	117.634	-1.2%
Ealing	-9.376	116.723	-8.0%
Enfield	.758	95.457	.8%
Haringey	-13.565	101.270	-13.4%
Harrow	3.018	70.931	4.3%
Havering	5.709	83.551	6.8%
Hillingdon	3.929	83.293	4.7%
Hounslow	-2.229	79.690	-2.8%
Kingston-upon-Thames	1.407	45.746	3.1%
Merton	-.567	61.773	-.9%
Newham	-14.390	114.490	-12.6%
Redbridge	1.937	79.230	2.4%
Richmond-upon-Thames	.152	50.261	.3%
Sutton	2.733	57.606	4.7%
Waltham Forest	-7.435	93.356	-8.0%
GLC	-	548.517	-
ILEA	-36.345	554.805	-6.6%
Met.Police	-	384.948	-



AUTHORI

	Net effect of dropping census data	1985/86 Settlement GRE	Effect as percentage
<b>GREATER MANCHESTER</b>			
Bolton	-3.186	98.646	-3.2%
Bury	1.855	58.060	3.2%
Manchester	-23.116	213.935	-10.8%
Oldham	-4.332	88.780	-4.9%
Rochdale	-3.614	80.389	-4.5%
Salford	-4.087	95.390	-4.3%
Stockport	4.278	94.225	4.5%
Tameside	-1.026	77.866	-1.3%
Trafford	.959	75.203	1.3%
Wigan	4.293	106.340	4.0%
<b>MERSEYSIDE</b>			
Knowsley	-4.199	68.496	-6.1%
Liverpool	-13.853	217.111	-6.4%
St Helens	1.630	68.175	2.4%
Sefton	3.146	97.925	3.2%
Wirral	1.428	119.363	1.2%
<b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE</b>			
Barnsley	2.821	74.374	3.8%
Doncaster	-.217	101.291	-.2%
Rotherham	2.373	88.062	2.7%
Sheffield	-1.249	187.091	-.7%
<b>TYNE AND WEAR</b>			
Gateshead	.532	71.554	.7%
Newcastle upon Tyne	-2.018	102.672	-2.0%
North Tyneside	1.044	66.538	1.6%
South Tyneside	-.634	57.925	-1.1%
Sunderland	1.547	105.497	1.5%
<b>WEST MIDLANDS</b>			
Birmingham	-39.694	420.497	-9.4%
Coventry	-5.228	117.884	-4.4%
Dudley	5.814	98.348	5.9%
Sandwell	-6.049	119.446	-5.1%
Solihull	3.190	68.476	4.7%
Walsall	-.685	100.182	-.7%
Wolverhampton	-7.482	105.490	-7.1%
<b>WEST YORKSHIRE</b>			
Bradford	-13.694	185.494	-7.4%
Calderdale	-1.786	69.161	-2.6%
Kirklees	-5.096	139.321	-3.7%
Leeds	-1.850	244.449	-.8%
Wakefield	3.081	103.195	3.0%



AUTHORIT

	Net effect of dropping census data	1985/86 Settlement GRE	Effect as percentage
--	--	------------------------------	----------------------------

## METROPOLITAN COUNTIES

Greater Manchester	-8.918	276.644	-3.2%
Merseyside	-9.990	175.141	-5.7%
South Yorkshire	-2.222	121.749	-1.8%
Tyne and Wear	-8.263	140.876	-5.9%
West Midlands	-14.222	270.467	-5.3%
West Yorkshire	-2.003	200.581	-1.0%

## ALL-PURPOSE AUTHORITIES

Isles of Scilly	-.199	1.352	-14.7%
-----------------	-------	-------	--------



Effects of distributing Additional Education Needs on  
Supplementary Benefit data alone

1. For 1985/86, £900m is distributed on Additional Education Needs. The table attached shows the 1985/86 allocations (using the 1981 Census indicators and Supplementary Benefit data) and what authorities would have received had it been distributed solely on the basis of Supplementary Benefit data.
2. Overall £93m would have been over-allocated to some authorities in 1985/86 if Supplementary Benefit data alone had been used and the same amount under allocated to other authorities.
3. Decreases in GRE allocations by using Supplementary Benefit data alone would be particularly large for most London boroughs whereas the majority of metropolitan districts would gain. The pattern in the shire counties would be variable - e.g. Surrey would lose half of its allocation whereas Cleveland would gain substantially.
4. Further, the information on Supplementary Benefit is very volatile from year to year. As such, an allocation of Additional Education Needs using Supplementary Benefit data alone would result in wide fluctuations in many authorities' GRE allocations from year to year.



RESULT OF CAT PAGE 1 Supplementary Benefit data alone

ACCT	SHORTNAME	AENSCALE £m	SBSCALE £m	DIFF £m	PCDIFF %
404	Avon	13.132	14.473	1.341	10.2
405	Beds	11.855	8.883	-2.972	-25.1
406	Berks	12.739	8.104	-4.635	-36.4
407	Bucks	9.755	7.183	-2.572	-26.4
408	Cambs	10.025	8.357	-1.668	-16.6
409	Cheshire	15.012	17.014	2.002	13.3
410	Cleveland	14.232	22.607	8.375	58.8
411	Cornwall	5.951	6.480	0.529	8.9
412	Cumbria	6.575	6.390	-0.185	-2.8
413	Derbys	15.882	15.025	-0.857	-5.4
414	Devon	12.281	14.341	2.060	16.8
415	Dorset	7.176	6.526	-0.650	-9.1
416	Durham	10.698	15.702	5.004	46.8
417	E Sussex	8.213	8.084	-0.129	-1.6
418	Essex	20.748	23.073	2.325	11.2
419	Gloucs	7.445	6.658	-0.787	-10.6
420	Hants	21.707	19.194	-2.513	-11.6
421	Hereford&Wrcs	9.834	12.249	2.415	24.6
422	Herts	13.391	9.909	-3.482	-26.0
423	Humberside	16.923	21.725	4.802	28.4
424	I of Wight	1.494	1.878	0.384	25.7
425	Kent	23.127	22.475	-0.652	-2.8
426	Lancs	29.517	29.345	-0.172	-0.6
427	Leics	19.576	15.212	-4.364	-22.3
428	Lincolns	8.717	8.711	-0.006	-0.1
429	Norfolk	9.763	10.473	0.710	7.3
430	Northants	10.075	10.031	-0.044	-0.4
431	Northumberl	3.818	4.007	0.189	5.0
432	N Yorkshire	8.222	7.021	-1.201	-14.6
433	Notts	19.535	21.045	1.510	7.7
434	Oxfords	7.459	5.583	-1.876	-25.2
435	Shropshire	6.917	9.061	2.144	31.0
436	Somerset	5.571	4.942	-0.629	-11.3
437	Staffs	16.247	17.730	1.483	9.1
438	Suffolk	8.278	7.180	-1.098	-13.3
439	Surrey	10.813	5.684	-5.129	-47.4
440	Warwicks	8.054	7.378	-0.676	-8.4
441	W Sussex	7.849	6.091	-1.758	-22.4
442	Wilts	8.539	6.194	-2.345	-27.5
403	I of Scilly	0.038	0.038	0.	0.
334	Bolton	7.000	6.843	-0.157	-2.2
335	Bury	2.963	3.335	0.372	12.6
336	Manchester	14.936	19.279	4.343	29.1
337	Oldham	6.179	6.977	0.798	12.9
338	Rochdale	5.771	6.327	0.556	9.6
339	Salford	5.483	6.594	1.111	20.3
340	Stockport	4.039	4.980	0.941	23.3
341	Tameside	4.596	5.110	0.514	11.2
342	Trafford	3.947	4.383	0.436	11.0
343	Wigan	5.471	7.111	1.640	30.0
344	Knowsley	5.601	10.708	5.107	91.2
345	Liverpool	13.476	22.652	9.176	68.1
346	St Helens	3.575	5.493	1.918	53.7
347	Sefton	4.939	7.396	2.457	49.7
348	Wirral	6.512	10.474	3.962	60.8
349	Barnsley	3.834	3.990	0.156	4.1
350	Doncaster	5.746	6.981	1.235	21.5
351	Rotherham	5.091	6.318	1.227	24.1



ACCT	SHORTNAME	AENSCALE	SBSSCALE	DIFF	PCDIFF
352	Sheffield	10.559	11.982	1.423	13.5
353	Gateshead	3.867	6.114	2.247	58.1
354	Newcastle	5.284	8.426	3.142	59.5
355	N Tyneside	3.072	4.852	1.780	57.9
356	S Tyneside	3.025	4.822	1.797	59.4
357	Sunderland	6.060	10.062	4.002	66.0
358	Birmingham	41.811	38.919	-2.892	-6.9
359	Coventry	9.677	9.840	0.163	1.7
360	Dudley	5.603	6.764	1.161	20.7
361	Sandwell	11.066	9.749	-1.317	-11.9
362	Solihull	3.403	4.180	0.777	22.8
363	Walsall	7.918	9.901	1.983	25.0
364	Wolverhampt	10.493	9.243	-1.250	-11.9
365	Bradford	17.768	17.765	-0.003	0.
366	Calderdale	4.607	4.637	0.030	0.7
367	Kirklees	11.276	8.783	-2.493	-22.1
368	Leeds	15.000	17.183	2.183	14.6
369	Wakefield	5.501	6.728	1.227	22.3
383	Barking	3.099	3.124	0.025	0.8
384	Barnet	6.149	3.226	-2.923	-47.5
385	Bexley	3.174	2.757	-0.417	-13.1
386	Brent	10.561	4.763	-5.798	-54.9
387	Bromley	3.553	3.057	-0.496	-14.0
388	Croydon	6.745	3.684	-3.061	-45.4
389	Ealing	10.384	5.036	-5.348	-51.5
390	Enfield	6.336	4.382	-1.954	-30.8
391	Haringey	8.058	5.714	-2.344	-29.1
392	Harrow	3.819	1.305	-2.514	-65.8
393	Havering	3.182	3.279	0.097	3.0
394	Hillingdon	3.760	2.558	-1.202	-32.0
395	Hounslow	5.492	2.814	-2.678	-48.8
396	Kingston	1.790	1.166	-0.624	-34.9
397	Merton	3.043	1.658	-1.385	-45.5
398	Newham	10.315	7.065	-3.250	-31.5
399	Redbridge	4.459	2.543	-1.916	-43.0
400	Richmond	1.873	1.077	-0.796	-42.5
401	Sutton	2.164	1.813	-0.351	-16.2
402	WalthamForest	7.239	5.121	-2.118	-29.3
458	ILEA	74.374	68.803	-5.571	-7.5



Redistribution Effects of the Additional Education Needs

Ethnic Indicator

1. For 1985/86, £300m is distributed on the Additional Education Needs ethnic indicator. The table attached shows the GRE each authority would have received using alternatively 1971 and 1981 Census data on persons born in the New Commonwealth or Pakistan.
2. Overall, £18½m would have been over-allocated to some authorities in 1985/86 if the 1971 Census birthplace indicator had been retained and the same amount under-allocated to other authorities. For many individual authorities the differences are proportionately very large. In Harrow, the amount allocated using 1981 Census data is more than double that if 1971 Census information had been retained - a difference of over £2m. (Harrow's total GRE in 1985/86 is £71m).



SHORTNAME	ETH71CEN	ETH01CEN	DIFF	PCDIFF
Beds	5436	5567	131	2.4
Berks	6935	6395	-539	-7.8
Bucks	4120	3867	-252	-6.1
Cambs	2538	2660	122	4.8
Cheshire	1464	1368	-96	-6.6
Cleveland	1466	1427	-40	-2.7
Cornwall	986	795	-190	-19.3
Cumbria	478	437	-41	-8.6
Derbys	3164	3041	-123	-3.9
Devon	2671	2171	-500	-18.7
Dorset	1548	1257	-292	-18.9
Durham	571	626	55	9.6
E Sussex	2102	1868	-234	-11.1
Essex	4627	4378	-249	-5.4
Gloucs	1973	1588	-385	-19.5
Hants	8101	6244	-1858	-22.9
Hereford&Wrcs	1388	1356	-32	-2.3
Herts	4700	4655	-45	-1.0
Humberside	1323	1357	35	2.6
I of Wight	376	217	-60	-21.7
Kent	6910	5888	-1022	-14.8
Lancs	5984	6516	532	8.9
Leics	9494	11816	2322	24.5
Lincolns	1308	1131	-177	-13.5
Norfolk	1326	1281	-44	-3.3
Northants	2273	2622	348	15.3
Northumberl	260	288	29	11.2
N Yorkshire	1462	1147	-315	-21.5
Notts	4590	4009	-581	-12.7
Oxfords	2713	2199	-514	-18.9
Shropshire	1112	979	-133	-12.0
Somerset	989	832	-157	-15.9
Staffs	2224	2260	35	1.6
Suffolk	1816	1429	-388	-21.4
Surrey	4206	3874	-332	-7.9
Warwicks	2615	2171	-445	-17.0
W Sussex	2451	2219	-232	-9.5
Wilts	2697	2040	-657	-24.4
ILEA	42179	40316	-1863	-4.4



Redistribution Effects of the Additional Education  
Needs Ethnic Indicator..

SHORTNAME	ETH71CEN £ 000	ETH81CEN £ 000	DIFF £ 000	PCDIFF %
Bolton	2502	2475	-28	-1.1
Bury	465	525	60	12.9
Manchester	4132	4371	239	5.8
Oldham	1460	1739	280	19.2
Rochdale	1681	1617	-64	-3.8
Salford	477	456	-20	-4.2
Stockport	498	654	157	31.5
Tameside	1062	1074	12	1.1
Trafford	1041	1042	1	0.1
Wigan	213	288	75	35.2
Knowsley	165	156	-9	-5.5
Liverpool	1279	1191	-87	-6.8
St Helens	151	184	34	22.5
Sefton	409	346	-64	-15.6
Wirral	515	472	-44	-8.5
Barnsley	113	173	60	53.1
Doncaster	675	597	-78	-11.6
Rotherham	467	553	87	18.6
Sheffield	2255	2151	-104	-4.6
Gateshead	139	169	30	21.6
Newcastle	741	886	145	19.6
N Tyneside	198	221	23	11.6
S Tyneside	139	152	13	9.4
Sunderland	292	352	61	20.9
Birmingham	20362	20046	-315	-1.5
Coventry	4398	3945	-453	-10.3
Dudley	1567	1372	-195	-12.4
Sandwell	4763	4468	-296	-6.2
Solihull	551	514	-37	-6.7
Walsall	3078	2595	-484	-15.7
Wolverhampt	6293	4898	-1395	-22.2
Bradford	7712	7380	-332	-4.3
Calderdale	927	949	22	2.4
Kirklees	4854	4106	-748	-15.4
Leeds	4224	3771	-454	-10.7
Wakefield	491	542	51	10.4
Barking	733	816	83	11.3
Barnet	3654	4515	860	23.5
Bexley	1154	1308	154	13.3
Brent	9396	10738	1342	14.3
Bromley	1454	1333	-121	-8.3
Croydon	4425	4879	454	10.3
Ealing	8339	9022	683	8.2
Enfield	3093	4538	1445	46.7
Haringey	7588	6943	-645	-8.5
Harrow	2020	4109	2089	103.4
Havering	741	804	63	8.5
Hillingdon	1588	2091	503	31.7
Hounslow	3762	4649	887	23.6
Kingston	796	919	123	15.5
Merton	1853	2078	225	12.1
Newham	5592	8011	2419	43.3
Redbridge	1965	3145	1180	60.1
Richmond	822	780	-42	-5.1
Sutton	752	864	112	14.9
WalthamForest	3840	4675	835	21.7
I of Scilly	0	2	1	-
Avon	3664	3059	-605	-16.5



HOUSING : Policy : Pt 5.

11 12 11  
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

22 APR 1965