Background Paper on Employment targets for North Northamptonshire 2011-31

Introduction

1. This paper sets out the approach to developing minimum job targets by district in North Northamptonshire and the evidence base for this. It translates these requirements into potential sectoral split. This Paper should be read alongside the Strategic Sites background paper which considers land requirements and potential strategic sites to deliver the job targets.

Evidence base for minimum targets

2. Population modelling by Edge Analytics (EA December 2011) gives forecasts of changes in the labour-force arising from the emerging approach to housing growth. These forecasts are shown in Table 1. They are based on a continuation of average economic activity rates seen in different age groups in the period 2004-2009 and reflect not only proposed levels of house-building, but also the age structure of the existing population and differences in the average size of households. These factors weight the forecasts towards Corby.

3. The Employment Targets Study (RTP 2011) endorsed the use of labour-force projections as a starting point for minimum job targets. The report assessed the 4 Spatial Options for distributing housing growth within North Northamptonshire and also set out the number of jobs required as a result of a preferred option for the distribution of housing and population growth. The implications of the preferred option are set out in the table below.

Sector	Additional Dwellings	Labour Force Change
Corby	15,500	15,694
Four Towns	4,100	27
RNOT	2,800	238
Kettering	8,200	4,537
Rothwell & Desborough	2,500	761
Wellingborough	8,200	3,626
North Northants	41,300	24,883
Northern Area	29,000	21,230
Southern Area	12,300	3,653

4. RTP proposed a redistribution of these targets within North Northamptonshire based on past performance and future prospects for delivering jobs. This was effectively a redistribution of 6,000 jobs from the target arising from forecast labour-force growth in Corby, with 50% going to Kettering, 25% to Wellingborough and the rest shared across the other sectors. It is considered that even with this redistribution the minimum jobs targets reflect the need to ensure a broad balance between jobs and housing growth to limit long-distance commuting and increase sustainability. The minimum jobs targets proposed by RTP are set out below:

Sector	Job Change
Corby	9,662
Four Towns	525
RNOT	736
Kettering	7,512
Rothwell & Desborough	1,257
Wellingborough	5,109
North Northants	24,800
Northern Area	19,166
Southern Area	5,634

5. The distribution of the minimum jobs targets will allow a sustainable balance between jobs and housing growth. It is important to recognise that minimum job targets will not hold back the creation of additional jobs if acceptable developments come forward. The JCS will provide a positive framework for considering such proposals. The evidence base for the JCS approach will be the Employment Targets Study by Roger Tym and Partners (RTP, November 2011) which can be viewed on the JPU web site: http://www.nnjpu.org.uk/publications/docdetail.asp?docid=1234. This used labour-force projections as a starting point for minimum job targets but proposed some redistribution within North Northamptonshire based on past performance and future prospects for delivering jobs.

6. The report to the Joint Planning Committee on the 12th January 2012 recommended that the JCS should set out a single set of aspirational, but realistic, minimum targets for the purpose of infrastructure planning and the identification of sites. One of the key tests of soundness on which the JCS will be assessed is whether the plan is effective and can be delivered over its period. At present, North Northamptonshire is significantly under-performing against the job targets of the adopted Core Strategy. It will be important that the JCS sets out minimum job targets that can be delivered by suitable sites in appropriate locations.

7. It is evident from previous feedback from Members of the Joint Planning Committee that the preferred approach recommended by RTP does not do enough to redress the current imbalance of jobs and labour-force in the Four Towns and Wellingborough Sectors, which results in out-commuting. It also does not recognise that a significant number of jobs at Corby could be at the Rockingham Motor Racing Circuit, partly in the Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston (RNOT) area. In response to these issues, the JPC report proposed that the approach to minimum jobs targets should be based on a hybrid of the RTP work and the approach in the Twin Poles spatial option.

8. The Twin Poles spatial option suggested that the southern area should provide twice as many jobs as the increase in labour-force. This would increase the ratio of total jobs: workers in the southern area from around 0.66 (Table 1 in Background Paper on Housing and Jobs requirements, JPU June 2011) to around 0.78, helping to claw-back some out-commuting. The RTP study saw this as very challenging, requiring 1.2% growth in jobs per annum which is some 20% above the rate achieved in North Northamptonshire in the past 10 years. However, it also noted that job creation in Wellingborough has been constrained by a lack of suitable sites (a factor that can be addressed) and that, based on past performance, East Northamptonshire will significantly exceed the job target associated with this option.

9. Following consideration of the RTP report, the emerging approach for the Joint Core Strategy is to set minimum targets for net additional jobs in the period 2011-31, as follows:

Northern area

10. For the northern area the emerging approach aims for a balance between growth in the labour-force and new jobs. The forecast increase in the labour-force in this sub-area is 18,700 over the period 2011-31, weighted heavily towards Corby due to its high housing target and the nature of its population/household composition.

11. The starting point in considering an appropriate distribution of targets is the RTP view that a "realistic but still testing target" for Corby is 9,662 net new jobs. The report notes that this would still leave Corby needing to increase employment at a rate of 1.4% pa over the plan period, a rate well above the national average and which would require Corby to be one of the fastest growing economies in the country. This minimum target is reflected in the table below. Compared to the forecast increase in labour-force, it leaves around 4,683 jobs to be provided elsewhere in the northern area.

12. RTP recommended that the minimum target for Kettering/ Burton Latimer should be increased by 3,000 above the forecast growth in the labour-force, reflecting strong past performance and close functional relationship with Corby. This would give a minimum target of just under 8,000 jobs.

13. RTP recommended that the minimum targets for the Rothwell/ Desborough sub-area should be increased by 500 above the forecast growth in the labour-force, reflecting local growth opportunities. This gives a minimum target of 884 jobs, which would help to address the current imbalance between jobs and workers in this sub-area.

14. The RNOT sub-area is forecast to experience a decline in the labour-force of around 1,000 workers because of the ageing population, reducing household size, and limited number of new homes that are proposed (excluding any new village). Allocating the remaining target for the northern area to RNOT would result in a minimum target of around just 200 jobs (option a. in the attached table). This could be increased to around 1,000 jobs if the Corby target is adjusted to reflect the Twin Poles Option and RTP assumptions (option b). This is the recommended approach, justified on the basis that some of the jobs expected at the Rockingham MRC area will fall within the RNOT area.

15. The risk in incorporating more of the potential jobs at Rockingham MRC into a minimum job target for RNOT is that, if this development does not proceed, there could be pressure for significant employment development in less-sustainable locations elsewhere in the RNOT area. It is considered preferable to have a limited strategic (minimum) job target but a positive policy framework to encourage economic development, particularly SMEs which are unlikely to require the allocation of significant new areas of development land. The proposed policy relating to a new village at Deenethorpe Airfield will ensure that any village proposal includes a balance of uses, including employment. The RNOT plan already identifies sites to be protected for employment uses and ENC may wish to identify further sites based on local aspirations and opportunities. It is considered that this is best dealt with at the local level.

<u>Southern area</u>

16. For the southern area, it is proposed to set minimum job targets that are double the forecast increase in the labour-force (as per the Twin Poles option), requiring <u>at least</u> 5,556 jobs in Wellingborough and 4,234 jobs in the 4 Towns. This will pose a challenge for Wellingborough, which lost an estimated 2,400 jobs in the period 2001-10 but less so for the Four Towns area, which has performed strongly.

17. Achieving these minimum targets would improve the estimated ratio of jobs to workers (labour force) in the southern area from 0.64 to 0.73 in 2031. The current figure for North Northamptonshire as a whole is around 0.72 jobs per worker.

18. It is tempting to set still higher minimum job targets for the southern area. However, it will be necessary to show a reasonable prospect of delivering targets on appropriate sites during the lifetime of the plan, otherwise the JCS may not be found sound and the Councils' could be subject to speculative development pressures on less sustainable sites. Wellingborough has expressed an aspiration to achieve a balance of 1 job per dwelling across the Borough. This would require around 11,100 net additional jobs (i.e. the current difference between homes and jobs of 3,488 plus the 7,660 housing target figure in the emerging JCS approach). This is fine as a long term policy objective, which can be referenced in the JCS, but is not considered deliverable over the 20 years to 2031, given past economic performance.

19. As with the RNOT area (paragraph 14 above), it is considered preferable to set a realistic minimum job requirement,, based on the evidence set out above, which can be exceeded if acceptable proposals come forward in line with the positive policy framework provided by the JCS.

20. The recommended minimum job targets for the emerging JCS approach are set out in Table 1 below (option b. in relation to Corby and the RNOT areas). It is considered that this represents a robust set of minimum jobs targets that are consistent with the Duty to Cooperate, and will allow a sustainable balance between jobs and houses to be achieved. At a district level this would give the following minimum targets:

Corby	8,898
East Northamptonshire	5,184
Kettering	8,858
Wellingborough	<u>5,556</u>
Total	28,496

21. RTP note that the use of minimum jobs targets should not be used to constrain the supply of land where other evidence, balanced with other planning considerations, suggests a higher rate of delivery is warranted. However, RTP note that in doing so, councils' must not lose sight of the need to demonstrate delivery or the duty to cooperate. Any single district which promotes significantly more jobs than it can justify by its own housing growth (i.e. re-calling outward commuters) will need to consider the impact of that strategy on its neighbour's plans and strategies.

Table 1: Emerging JCS approach to minimum job targets 2011-31

	Emerging Approach		
	Additional dwellings	**Forecast Growth in labour force (Edge Analytics December 2011)**	**Minimum job targets based on RTP preferred scenario and modified Twin Poles approach**
Corby	14,200	14,345	a) 9,662 As per RTP recommended approach – some of these jobs may be at Rockingham MRC (partly RNOT) OR b) 8,898 As per Twin Poles option and the same ratio of jobs: workers as the RTP preferred option.
RNOT	1,800	-993	a) 190 (excluding Rockingham MRC) OR b) 954 Including some of RMRC if Corby target is reduced to 8,898
Kettering/ Burton Latimer	8,200	4,974	7,974 (growth in labour-force plus 3,000 as per RTP)
Rothwell/ Desborough	2,500	384	884 (increase in labour-force plus 500 as in the RTP preferred option)
Northern area Total	**26,700**	**18,710**	**18,710** (growth in labour-force)
Four Towns	6,100	2,117	4,234 (2 X growth in labour-force)
Wellingborough	7,660	2,778	5,556 (2 X growth in labour-force)
Southern area Total	**13,760**	**4,895**	**9,790** (2 X growth in labour-force)
NN Total	**40,460**	**24,332**	**28,500**

<u>Deliverability and Sectoral Split</u>

21. To take forward the minimum jobs targets it is important to understand recent economic performance and to fully understand sectoral delivery prospects. The adopted CSS seeks to diversify the economy into higher value activities. This set out an ambitious job creation target of 47,400 jobs for North Northamptonshire between 2001-2021 with emphasis on increasing the delivery of jobs within the office sector. A significant proportion of jobs (52%) were forecast to be generated in service sectors, for example in retailing, leisure, professional and public services, driven partly by increased population.

TABLE 6: JOB GROWTH BY DISTRICT AND SECTOR

LOCATION	NET JOB GROWTH (IN ALL SECTORS)	OF WHICH B USE CLASSES
CORBY	13580	
General Industrial		1900
Distribution		3640
Offices		2450
EAST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE	5220	
General Industrial		-420
Distribution		840
Offices		2330
KETTERING	16200	
General Industrial		1120
Distribution		1870
Offices		3260
WELLINGBOROUGH	12400	
General Industrial		360
Distribution		3090
Offices		3150
NORTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE	47400	
General Industrial		2960
Distribution		9440
Offices		11190

22. The RTP study considered sectoral economic performance within North Northamptonshire between 1998 and 2008. Health and education were two of the largest growth sectors, together delivering over 8,000 new jobs over 10 years. The study indicated that these sectors should be treated with caution as these jobs will not be spread evenly across the area, i.e. the growth in health and education jobs will be disproportionately located in districts with hospitals and large education institutions (colleges, etc) respectively. This may, for example, partly explain high level of new jobs in health service provision in Kettering.

23. Over the 10 years, all districts lost manufacturing employment. This was particularly the case in the early and middle of this time period. Towards the end of the 10 year period the decline lessened, although RTP expect the recession to contribute to a further sharp fall. The largest losses were in Corby and Wellingborough which both lost around 5,000 manufacturing jobs over the 10 years with most losses occuring in the early and middle of the period. The size of the sectors in each authority roughly halved over the 10 year period. Kettering also lost a sizeable number of manufacturing jobs; 3,000 or 1/3rd of the total over

the period. East Northamptonshire is the noticeable exception in North Northamptonshire which lost t 1,000 jobs or roughly 1/5th of its manufacturing base.

24. Manufacturing losses have a large impact on the headline total employment numbers. East Northamptonshire, with its more robust manufacturing sector, has had to replace relatively fewer manufacturing jobs with employment in new or growing sectors whereas Corby, with its formerly much larger manufacturing base and heavy rate of loss, has had to replace 5,000 jobs before the district is able to show net jobs growth. RTP state that it is important to recognise this because in the future the economic potential of North Northamptonshire will be less dominated by the need to replace manufacturing jobs and more about growing new jobs in the wider economy. Excluding manufacturing losses, the stock of jobs in North Northamptonshire grew by 25,000 between 1998 and 2008, although the recession has further impacted on economic performance.

25. It is evident that North Northamptonshire has under-performed against the job targets in the adopted CSS. Using longer term data since 1998, North Northamptonshire has created 7,622 jobs with significant (4390) jobs lost during the economic recession between 2008 and 2010. East Northamptonshire has exceeded its CSS requirement, creating 6519 jobs. Of the authorities where significant growth is focused, Kettering has created 5320 jobs whereas Corby (-1804) and Wellingborough (-2413) have lost jobs since 1998 over the CSS period and are significantly under-performing against the CSS. As referred to above, this emphasises that the identified minimum job targets will be challenging.

26. Warehousing related jobs growth was the largest growth sector in North Northamptonshire which added nearly 7,000 new jobs in ‘wholesale, retail and repair’ sectors and a further 2,500 in ‘transport, storage and communications’ between 1998 and 2008. These are the two broad sectors which are most closely related to warehousing, although they also include some other sectors e.g. shops. Corby added the most jobs in these sectors (3,500) followed by East Northamptonshire (3,300) and Kettering (2,600), with Wellingborough losing a small number of jobs.

27. To illustrate how these levels of jobs growth set out in Table 1 might be achieved for each district, RTP prepared three sectoral growth scenarios at district level:

- Scenario **a** illustrates the growth pattern if sectoral proportions are held constant at 2008 levels (i.e. the jobs will be created to match the structure of the economy in 2008)
- Scenario **b** apportions growth according to sectoral growth over the past period 1998-2008 (i.e. jobs will be created in the same way that they have been created 1998-2008)
- Scenario **c** applies forecast regional growth rates by sector from the Regional Working Futures Report (i.e. jobs will grow at the same rate that they have been created in the East Midlands).

28. Using the sectoral ratios used by RTP it is possible to generate updated sectoral scenarios based on the amended minimum job targets which are set out in Appendix 1. These wider sector forecasts have been translated into B space employment figures using the methodology used in the North Northamptonshire Employment Land Futures Report (NNELF). This study highlighted the sectors most relevant to employment land, comprising:

- Financial and Business Services (FBS), which generates most of the demand for offices (B1);
- Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transport and Communications, which generates the demand for industrial (B2) and warehousing space (B8).

29. Since the publication of the NNELF Report, the SIC codes have changed, and the following amended codes are used, but these are consistent with the methodology set out above:

- Financial Intermediation, Business Services, which generates most of the demand for offices (B1)
- Manufacturing, Wholesale, Retail Trade & Repair, Transport, Storage and Communications which generates the demand for industrial (B2) and warehousing space (B8).

30. As referred to in this report, the changes to the SIC codes mean that some shops will be included in the sectoral figures. RTP, however, concluded that ‘wholesale, retail and repair’ and ‘transport, storage and communications’ are the two broad sectors which are most closely related to warehousing.

31. The commentary provided by RTP in relation to their preferred economic scenario is also referenced. This commentary is relevant when identifying the sectoral strategy for each district and North Northamptonshire as a whole. Applying the sectoral ratios used by RTP to the amended minimum targets identifies the following sectoral split for each district:

Corby

Corby	Scenario a	Scenario b	Scenario c
B1	1045	0	3357
B2	2695	0	-1636
B8	3117	5792	3967
Total B jobs	6857	5792	5688
Total non B jobs	2041	3106	3210
Total	8898	8898	8898

32. Corby needs to achieve substantially higher jobs growth than in the past. Its current sectoral structure is not favourable and regional growth rates would only deliver 1,700 additional jobs.

33. Stemming the losses in manufacturing employment is a critical first step in achieving additional jobs growth. At present, the business services sector does not seem to be a good growth prospect for Corby, although it should seek to gain some presence in this sector. Somewhere between scenario **a** and **b** would probably give Corby the best prospect of reaching its target with modest growth in service sectors, losses in manufacturing reversed and principal growth in the warehousing and distribution sector.

Kettering

Kettering	Scenario a	Scenario b	Scenario c
B1	1197	1606	3018
B2	1412	0	-1174
B8	2229.4	2475.9	2228
Total B jobs	4838	4082	4072
Total non B jobs	4020	4776	4786
Total	8858	8858	8858

34. Whilst Kettering's target does not appear to be too testing when compared to past performance, it does imply a strong growth rate of over 1% pa. Regional growth rates applied to Kettering's sectoral structure would only deliver an additional 4,000 jobs. Kettering's growth can come from a range of sectors with possibly additional growth required in the distribution sector in order to offset lower than forecast growth in the health sector.

Wellingborough

Wellingborough	Scenario a	Scenario b	Scenario c
B1	1020	2040	2698
B2	992	0	-1229
B8	1685	172	1786
Total B jobs	3697	2212	3255
Total non B jobs	1859	3344	2301
Total	5556	5556	5556

35. RTP note that, whilst the Wellingborough growth target is high compared to past performance, the Borough has under-performed with losses in manufacturing not offset by growth in other sectors. At regional growth rates, Wellingborough should be able to create 3,600 jobs. If losses in manufacturing can be stemmed then growth targets in other sectors are relatively modest and both business services and distribution sectors can make a contribution.

East Northamptonshire

East Northamptonshire	Scenario a	Scenario b	Scenario c
B1	711	1196	3305
B2	983	0	-4210
B8	1501	2039	2758
Total B jobs	3195	3235	1853
Total non B jobs	1989	1949	3331
Total	5184	5184	5184

36. For East Northamptonshire the scenarios imply setting a minimum job target below its past performance. As with all North Northamptonshire, there is a rationale for allowing a higher, above minimum, target for new jobs. This could be supported by emerging national planning policy, which does not seek to constrain economic growth. When considering the

merits of such a strategy, RTP consider that planners must not lose site of the link between jobs and new homes and a high job target could, therefore, be used to justify a higher housing target. It will therefore be important to consider the relationship between jobs and new homes, alongside the existing jobs/worker ratio within the existing jobs/worker ratio within the specific sectors and a wider North Northamptonshire Housing Market Area (HMA) context.

37. Translating the employment scenarios to a North Northamptonshire level

Scenario A

	Corby	Kettering	Wellingborough	East Northamptonshire	Total
B1	1045	1197	1020	711	3973
B2	2695	1412	992	983	6082
B8	3117	2229.4	1685	1501	8532
Total B	6857	4838	3697	3195	18587
Non B	2041	4020	1859	1989	9909

Scenario B

	Corby	Kettering	Wellingborough	East Northamptonshire	Total
B1	0	1606	2040	1196	4842
B2	0	0	0	0	0
B8	5792	2475.9	172	2039	10,478
Total B	5792	4082	2212	3235	15,321
Non B	3106	4476	3344	1949	13,175

Scenario C

	Corby	Kettering	Wellingborough	East Northamptonshire	Total
B1	3357	3018	2698	3305	12,378
B2	-1636	-1174	-1229	-4210	-8,249
B8	3967	2228	1786	2758	10,739
Total B	5688	4072	3255	1853	14,868
Non B	3210	4786	2301	3331	13,628

38. RTP consider that manufacturing jobs will not decline at the same rate as in the past and therefore other sectors will not have to grow so strongly to make up the deficit. For North Northamptonshire as a whole, a sectoral growth pattern lying somewhere between scenario **b** and scenario **c** looks quite plausible. As a minimum number, scenario **b** is likely to be the easiest to deliver because it focuses growth into sectors with a track record of delivery and a high level of market interest in promoting additional sites (and so jobs).

39. Moving towards scenario **c** better meets local aspirations to diversify the local economy and reduces the dependency on new warehouses. This is more challenging sectorally because it suggests constraining the delivery of warehousing jobs below past trends while

increasing the delivery of office type jobs above the level the Districts have so far been able to deliver. Furthermore, the study concluded that if the growth of warehouses is to be constrained in this way then the Councils' will need strong justification; bearing in mind that strategic warehousing in Northamptonshire is of national economic importance

40. When considering choice and flexibility within the labour market, the RTP study briefly considers land supply implications, the strength of employment sectors and how the Plan should allow for choice and flexibility in the land market.

The Identification of Sites

41 The process of identifying sufficient land within each local authority area across North Northamptonshire in order to accommodate the scale of growth outlined in the three scenarios identified in paragraph 37, above, is documented in the Strategic Housing and Employment Sites background paper. That particular paper also outlines the selection criteria and a methodology used to appraise the merits of potential strategic sites that have been put forward for consideration and determine the most sustainable locations for employment provision.

Conclusions

42. The employment strategy in policies 22-27 of the draft Plan seeks to provide a flexible, enabling framework in order to deliver the minimum job targets that are set out in this Background Report. Policy 22 recognises key sectoral priorities in North Northamptonshire and seeks to ensure that these opportunities are utilised. Consistent with the RTP report and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy 22 also seeks to safeguard committed employment land, which is important to the long term delivery and retention of job opportunities. The policy framework and use of minimum job targets seek to provide a policy framework to deliver economic growth within North Northamptonshire. Policy 24 specifically recognises the importance of strategic distribution within North Northamptonshire and seeks to ensure that such development can support the provision of higher value employment.

43. This report has set out 3 different sectoral scenarios to deliver the minimum jobs targets within each district. It is evident that there are issues with the employment split in scenario B in relation to Corby as this particular scenario implies a strong focus on B8 development. Similarly, as scenario B is based on past employment performance between 1998 and2008, it implies no net growth in B2 employment in North Northamptonshire, even though the RTP report identifies a need for additional B2 employment land. It is proposed that, as part of the consultation on the draft policies, the opportunity be taken to obtain further feedback from key stakeholders as to the sectoral split of employment which best meets local aspirations and deliverability.

44. The RTP report and work undertaken by the JPU has identified a significant over supply of committed employment land in relation to B1. The Employment Targets Report states that in whatever development strategy emerges there needs to be a clear separation of those sites which are promoted because they meet a policy aspiration, in terms of the sector mix or location, from those which are in market demand and deliverable. The Strategic Housing and Employment Sites background paper has considered the deliverability of potential employment sites in North Northamptonshire and, based on that site assessment, several strategic sites are identified in Policy 23.

Appendix 1: Sectoral scenarios based on ratios in RTP report:

Corby

Corby		8898.00				
	2011-31a %	**2011-31a new**	2011-31b %	**2011-31b new**	2011-31c %	**2011-31c new**
Agriculture, Hunting & Forestry	0.07	**6.45**	0.00	**0.00**	-0.07	**-6.45**
Fishing	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Mining and Quarrying	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Manufacturing	30.28	**2694.63**	0.00	**0.00**	-18.39	**-1636.49**
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	0.08	**7.37**	0.26	**23.02**	-0.10	**-9.21**
Construction	3.16	**280.88**	1.89	**168.53**	7.74	**688.85**
Wholesale, Retail Trade & Repair	22.71	**2020.51**	19.55	**1739.63**	28.90	**2571.23**
Hotels & Restaurants	3.98	**354.56**	0.00	**0.00**	5.07	**451.25**
Transport, Storage & Communication	12.33	**1096.82**	45.54	**4052.08**	15.69	**1396.13**
Financial Intermediation	0.57	**50.65**	0.00	**0.00**	1.83	**163.00**
Business Services	11.18	**994.60**	0.00	**0.00**	35.89	**3193.78**
Public Admin & Defence	3.04	**270.75**	8.38	**745.95**	4.56	**406.13**
Education	5.55	**493.62**	14.74	**1311.40**	8.32	**740.43**
Health & Social Work	4.25	**378.50**	7.55	**671.36**	6.38	**567.29**
Social & Personal Services	2.78	**247.73**	2.10	**186.95**	4.18	**372.05**
	99.99	**8897.08**	100.01	**8898.92**	100.00	**8898.00**

East Northamptonshire

		5304.00				
	2011-31a %	**2011-31a new**	2011-31b %	**2011-31b new**	2011-31c %	**2011-31c new**
Agriculture, Hunting & Forestry	2.46	**130.39**	2.06	**109.36**	-19.75	**-1047.34**
Fishing	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Mining and Quarrying	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	-0.24	**-12.62**
Manufacturing	18.95	**1005.28**	0.00	**0.00**	-81.21	**-4307.13**
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Construction	6.11	**323.88**	1.90	**100.95**	21.49	**1139.88**
Wholesale, Retail Trade & Repair	22.05	**1169.32**	33.23	**1762.39**	40.52	**2149.36**
Hotels & Restaurants	5.00	**264.99**	0.00	**0.00**	9.20	**487.92**
Transport, Storage & Communication	6.90	**365.94**	6.11	**323.88**	12.69	**672.99**
Financial Intermediation	1.03	**54.68**	0.79	**42.06**	4.76	**252.37**
Business Services	12.69	**672.99**	22.28	**1181.94**	59.00	**3129.40**
Public Admin & Defence	1.59	**84.12**	2.22	**117.77**	3.49	**185.07**
Education	10.15	**538.39**	19.35	**1026.31**	22.05	**1169.32**
Health & Social Work	7.77	**412.21**	8.01	**424.82**	16.89	**895.92**
Social & Personal Services	5.23	**277.61**	3.89	**206.10**	11.26	**597.28**
	99.92	**5299.79**	99.84	**5295.59**	100.16	**5312.41**

Kettering

		8742.00				
	2011-31a %	**2011-31a new**	2011-31b %	**2011-31b new**	2011-31c %	**2011-31c new**
Agriculture, Hunting & Forestry	0.57	**49.85**	0.05	**3.99**	-0.89	**-77.76**
Fishing	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Mining and Quarrying	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Manufacturing	15.94	**1393.70**	0.00	**0.00**	-13.25	**-1158.42**
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	0.25	**21.93**	0.96	**83.74**	-0.39	**-33.90**
Construction	5.11	**446.62**	5.37	**469.55**	9.83	**859.35**
Wholesale, Retail Trade & Repair	20.25	**1770.53**	24.66	**2155.34**	20.24	**1769.53**
Hotels & Restaurants	5.61	**490.49**	2.99	**261.19**	5.61	**490.49**
Transport, Storage & Communication	4.92	**429.67**	3.30	**288.11**	4.92	**429.67**
Financial Intermediation	1.16	**101.69**	0.00	**0.00**	2.94	**257.21**
Business Services	12.35	**1079.67**	18.13	**1585.10**	31.13	**2721.59**
Public Admin & Defence	2.65	**231.29**	4.74	**414.72**	3.11	**272.16**
Education	7.36	**643.01**	12.83	**1121.54**	8.67	**757.66**
Health & Social Work	19.77	**1728.66**	22.33	**1951.97**	23.29	**2035.71**
Social & Personal Services	4.07	**355.90**	4.64	**405.75**	4.80	**419.70**
	100.01	**8743.00**	99.99	**8741.00**	100.01	**8743.00**

Wellingborough

		5556.00				
	2011-31a %	**2011-31a new**	2011-31b %	**2011-31b new**	2011-31c %	**2011-31c new**
Agriculture, Hunting & Forestry	0.61	**33.71**	0.76	**42.41**	-1.41	**-78.30**
Fishing	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Mining and Quarrying	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**	0.00	**0.00**
Manufacturing	17.85	**991.79**	0.00	**0.00**	-22.12	**-1228.87**
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	0.02	**1.09**	0.10	**5.44**	-0.04	**-2.17**
Construction	4.50	**250.12**	0.00	**0.00**	9.08	**504.60**
Wholesale, Retail Trade & Repair	23.04	**1279.98**	3.09	**171.82**	24.17	**1343.05**
Hotels & Restaurants	4.91	**272.96**	2.62	**145.72**	5.17	**287.10**
Transport, Storage & Communication	7.30	**405.63**	0.00	**0.00**	7.65	**425.21**
Financial Intermediation	2.09	**116.36**	0.86	**47.85**	5.54	**307.76**
Business Services	16.27	**903.71**	35.86	**1992.29**	43.02	**2390.31**
Public Admin & Defence	4.85	**269.70**	15.93	**885.22**	5.99	**332.77**
Education	6.67	**370.83**	19.14	**1063.57**	8.24	**457.83**
Health & Social Work	7.40	**411.07**	21.59	**1199.50**	9.14	**507.86**
Social & Personal Services	4.46	**247.95**	0.00	**0.00**	5.52	**306.67**
	99.98	**5554.91**	99.96	**5553.83**	99.96	**5553.83**