

Agreed findings of the Infrastructure Needs Group (ING) Review into the impact of the population error correction¹ on the 2013 ING Report

Following a meeting held on 6th March 2015, see report and notes attached hereto in Appendix 1, the Infrastructure Needs Group passed the following resolutions in respect of its findings into the impact of the population error review:

- **Resolution 1: The impact of the population correction is both significant and material to the content of the Alresford Chapter of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, in respect of the proposed increase of 500 new homes, and to call on New Alresford Town Council to advise Winchester City Council of our findings.** (*Proposed by John Weston and Seconded by Ralph Pointer.*)
- **Resolution 2: It was resolved for this Needs Group to agree to reconvene and to set a structure and timetable for the completion of a new Infrastructure Needs Group Report.** (*Proposed Brian Durham and Seconded by Keith Barrett.*)

Reasons for our findings:

1. The impact of the population error is demonstrated by the significant impact of the corrected figures on those previously predicted in the ING 2013 report (**see charts 1&2**). This shows a reduction to almost half (56%) in the estimated population increase to 2031 (from 1464 to 827 new residents).
2. The original Infrastructure Needs Group Report identified a number of key infrastructure areas, ranging from Education to Transport, and set out a chapter on Factors detailing what are now known to be incorrect population estimates for the future population for Alresford. The Factors clearly influence the key infrastructure areas as evidenced in the 3rd paragraph of the original report's introduction where it is claimed "*...predicted age profiles shown in Factors suggest there could be a near doubling of the population over 74*".
3. The Alresford chapter of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, for which the original Infrastructure Needs Group Report was supplied as evidence, includes Policy MTRA2 which, alongside setting out housing and other targets for New Alresford (and other settlements), also "*supports economic growth and improvements to facilities and services*".
4. The Local Plan wording clearly references concerns about the adequacy of existing infrastructure and speaks of specific Infrastructure items such as School places, Transport and Car Parking and Burial space. The Local Plan also references various unspecified Infrastructure improvements.
5. Given the above and the agreed impact of the corrected population figures on those previously predicted – and it should be noted that the Infrastructure Needs Group originally used higher numbers than those used by other Needs Groups – then we can have no other conclusion than to say the impact of the population correction is both significant and material to the content of the Alresford Chapter of the Winchester District Local Plan.

¹ The [Alresford Population Projection Correction Report](#), Winchester City Council, December 2014

Note: The predicted numbers shown in this review document are a general guide and should be treated with caution.

Chart 1. Predicted 2031 Age Profile of the Alresford Population

We used an Age Profile chart in our original report to help us visualise the increase in new residents in each age group up to 2031.

However the projections we used were incorrect and this revised chart demonstrates the impact of the corrected projections on the numbers we originally published. For example, we originally said the 75+ age group may double by 2031, now however we are able to say that the increase will likely be nearer 55%.

In 2011 the over 75+ group represented 12.2% of our population in 2031 it will represent 16% a rise of 4%. The 16% is in line with the national average.

	Age 0-4	5-15	16- 44	45- 65	65- 74	75+	Total no. of Residents	
2011	276	631	1657	1594	591	661	5410	<i>Source: 2011 Census</i>
Previously used 2031 projections By Infrastructure Needs Group	315	820	1912	1814	807	1207	6874	<i>Source: WCC Projections*</i> <i>These numbers are incorrect and are no longer being used</i>
Corrected 2031 projections	292	741	1772	1686	721	1025	6237	<i>Source: WCC Projections*</i> <i>These are the correct numbers</i>
Fewer People Difference between old and new	- 23	-79	-140	-128	-86	-182	-637	<i>Reduction of 637 people is 9% of 6,874 which is the previously used total population.</i>
Expected population growth	16 or 6%	110 or 17.5%	115 or 7%	92 or 6%	130 or 22%	364 or 55%	827 or 15%	<i>This is now approximately how many extra people we expect to see in each age group by 2031</i>
<i>*These projections are the sum of predicted growth rates and a multiplier applied to illustrate population change arising from an increase of 500 dwellings from 2011 to 2031</i>								

Chart 2. % of population by age range (Approximate)

Age range	0-4	5-15	16-44	45-64	65-74	75+
2011	5	12	31	29	11	12
Old 2031	5	12	28	26	12	18
Corrected 2031	5	12	28	27	11.5	16

Appendix 1 to Agreed Findings Report 09 03 15

Notes and report of Infrastructure Needs Group meeting 6th March 2015 Held at the ARC

Background:

A meeting of the Infrastructure Needs Group (ING) was called, notification of such was by email to identified group members on 3/3/15, to address a number of issues arising out of the single meeting the group has held, and subsequent email exchanges, since the population error review commenced.

Apologies for non-attendance were received from Howard Boardman.

The meeting followed directly from that held by the Employment Needs Group. As the meeting commenced the ING Chairman and a small number of other ING members and residents left the meeting without comment. The residents who remained numbered approximately 42.

Sam Kerr-Smiley addressed the meeting on the subject of the Infrastructure Needs report review, progress to date and the impact of the population error on the data used in the original report.

Meeting Overview:

1. The group acknowledges that the ING Report of 2013 was poorly compiled, contained both errors and omissions and is out of date. During the review process so far Group members have identified a number of other necessary changes to the report, such as the inclusion of up-to-date and relevant evidence that has become available in the two years since the original report was written.
2. A number of members of the original ING expressed concern that they were not given the opportunity to agree the final 2013 report.
3. The review so far, which had taken place under the Chairmanship of Councillor Margot Power, only addressed the effects of population change and attempted to bring in some other changes at her discretion. This review has not addressed the wider concerns of group members regarding the content of the original report.
4. A revised population table, a table has been compiled and agreed with Irene Spencer under the instructions of the ING, was passed around to demonstrate the impact of the corrected population estimates.
5. Sam Kerr-Smiley highlighted the errors made in the original report and challenged the assumption that the error was not significant. The agreed impact of the corrected population figures on those previously predicted in the ING 2013 report shows a reduction to almost half (56%) in the estimated population increase to 2031 (from 1464 to 827 new residents). Please see appendix 1.
6. Sam Kerr-Smiley said that we have become aware, through the work of other needs groups, that a tight deadline exists to get results of the review back to WCC so they can act on our findings. In the light of this deadline we urgently needed to reconvene, hence the meeting tonight.
7. The original Infrastructure Needs Group Report identified a number of key infrastructure areas, ranging from Education to Transport, and set out a chapter on Factors detailing what are now known to be incorrect population estimates for the future population for Alresford. The Factors clearly influence the key infrastructure areas as evidenced in the 3rd paragraph of the original report's introduction where it is claimed *"...predicted age profiles shown in Factors suggest there could be a near doubling of the population over 74"*.
8. The Alresford chapter of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, for which the original Infrastructure Needs Group Report was supplied as evidence, includes Policy MTRA2 which, alongside setting out housing and other targets for New Alresford (and other settlements), also *"supports economic growth and improvements to facilities and services"*.

9. The Local Plan wording clearly references concerns about the adequacy of existing infrastructure and speaks of specific Infrastructure items such as School places, Transport and Car Parking and Burial space. The Local Plan also references various unspecified Infrastructure improvements.
10. Given the above and the agreed impact of the corrected population figures on those previously predicted – and it should be noted that the Infrastructure Needs Group originally used higher numbers than those used by other Needs Groups – then we can have no other conclusion than to say the impact of the population correction is both significant and material to the content of the Alresford Chapter of the Winchester District Local Plan.
11. The meeting voted on three resolutions:
 - The impact of the population correction is both significant and material to the content of the Alresford Chapter of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, in respect of the proposed increase of 500 new homes, and to call on New Alresford Town Council to advise Winchester City Council of our findings. (Proposed by John Weston and Seconded by Ralph Pointer.)
 - It was resolved for this Needs Group to agree to reconvene and to set a structure and timetable for the completion of a new Infrastructure Needs Group Report. (Proposed Brian Durham and Seconded by Keith Barrett.)
 - In view of the actions of the existing Chairman of the Needs Group, this assembled group of Alresford residents resolved that it has no confidence in Councillor Power as Chairman of the NATC Infrastructure needs Group. (Proposed by Ken Veitch and Seconded by Rowena Price.)

All motions were passed with no dissentions or abstentions from those present. (Separately however, prior to the meeting, ING members Irene Spencer and Lisa Griffiths emailed to voice their opposition to the motion regarding the significance of the impact of the population error.)

12. The meeting was also addressed by Ernie Jeffs, Winchester City Councillor on the subject of Roads and Infrastructure. He informed the meeting that Steve Opacic had written to him recently stating in essence that the Inspector would expect to receive a detailed traffic assessment only at the detailed planning stage.
13. Steve Wallis, (practising Highways Engineer), advised that this was not the case and that a detailed assessment was required as part of the draft Plan process. Specifically this process & requirement is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance document 'Transport Evidence Bases in Plan Making' which was published in October 2014."
14. Professor Brian Tippet suggested that formal notes be kept of the meeting and circulated to members. This was agreed and email addresses of those present were collected to enable this.

The meeting was closed

The meeting was recorded and separate notes were taken by Councillor Barbara Jeffs and Bob Fowler. An image of members voting is attached to this document as Appendix 2.

Appendix 1

Note: The predicted numbers shown in this review document are a general guide and should be treated with caution.

Chart 1. Predicted 2031 Age Profile of the Alresford Population

We used an Age Profile chart in our original report to help us visualise the increase in new residents in each age group up to 2031.

However the projections we used were incorrect and this revised chart demonstrates the impact of the corrected projections on the numbers we originally published. For example, we originally said the 75+ age group may double by 2031, now however we are able to say that the increase will likely be nearer 55%.

In 2011 the over 75+ group represented 12.2% of our population in 2031 it will represent 16% a rise of 4%. The 16% is in line with the national average.

	Age 0-4	5-15	16- 44	45- 65	65- 74	75+	Total no. of Residents	
2011	276	631	1657	1594	591	661	5410	<i>Source: 2011 Census</i>
Previously used 2031 projections By Infrastructure Needs Group	315	820	1912	1814	807	1207	6874	<i>Source: WCC Projections* These numbers are incorrect and are no longer being used</i>
Corrected 2031 projections	292	741	1772	1686	721	1025	6237	<i>Source: WCC Projections* These are the correct numbers</i>
Fewer People Difference between old and new	- 23	-79	-140	-128	-86	-182	-637	<i>Reduction of 637 people is 9% of 6,874 which is the previously used total population.</i>
Expected population growth	16 or	110 or	115 or	92 or	130 or	364 or	827 or	<i>This is now approximately how many extra people we expect to see in</i>

	6%	17.5%	7%	6%	22%	55%	15%	<i>each age group by 2031</i>
<i>*These projections are the sum of predicted growth rates and a multiplier applied to illustrate population change arising from an increase of 500 dwellings from 2011 to 2031</i>								

Chart 2. % of population by age range (Approximate)

Age range	0-4	5-15	16-44	45-64	65-74	75+
2011	5	12	31	29	11	12
Old 2031	5	12	28	26	12	18
Corrected 2031	5	12	28	27	11.5	16

Appendix 2



Photo copyright Sam Kerr-Smiley