

Agenda Item 5

CITY OF SHEFFIELD

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL – 2ND DECEMBER, 2015

COPIES OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS THERETO

Questions

Answers

Questions of Councillor Colin Ross to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Has any public consultation taken place on the Sheffield City Region Devolution deal? | The formal Sheffield City Region (SCR) consultation has been launched today. |
| 2. Are there any plans in place for future consultation with the public on this important issue? | See above |
| 3. If so, could you outline those plans? | See above |
| 4. When will the Devolution Deal issue come to full Council and what format will it take? | The proposal will be brought to Full Council for decision after the people of Sheffield have had the opportunity to give their views through the formal consultation. The date it is brought to Council is still to be finalised. |
| 5. The Council has applied for an award for its communications strategy, citing 'balancing community expectations' around trees as one of its successes. Given the massive public opposition to the Council cutting down many of Sheffield's roadside trees and an over 10,000 strong petition, as Leader, do you think you are justified in doing this? | I wasn't aware of this, the bid was submitted at an officer level. |

Questions of Councillor Brian Webster to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. When, and how long, will the consultation period for the Sheffield City Region devolution deal be? | The formal SCR consultation has been launched today.
. |
|---|---|

2. Will the consultation documents/questions include an option for respondents to indicate that they do not wish to see an elected mayor imposed on the City Region as part of the devolution deal?

The formal SCR consultation has been launched today.

Questions of Councillor Aodan Marken to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore)

1. What actions have been taken to improve how full Council meetings operate, following public comments in July that this is being looked into?

As we have outlined in our amendment to your Motion, as part of this year's Cabinet in the Community meetings we are asking people for their views on how they would like to engage with the Council, considering the full range of opportunities to engage with the Council including Full Council Meetings. This is part of a wider piece of work looking at engagement, and we want to explore ways to improve all forms of engagement and would be happy to involve all groups in this process on a non-political basis. However, I am sure you will agree that the most important views are those of the public.

2. Are there plans to reinvigorate the Corporate Member Board as a way to improve the way different groups work together?

The Corporate Members Group meets when there is an appropriate issue to discuss, we are always happy to have these meetings when they are needed.

Questions of Councillor Joe Otten to Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport)

1. What are the current timescales for Parking Services to process an informal challenge to the issue of a Penalty Charge Notice? 33 Days (there is no legislative timescale for responding to informal challenges).
2. What are the current timescales for Parking Services to process a formal challenge to the issue of a Penalty Charge Notice? 33 Days (we take "formal challenge" as meaning a representation, for which there is a 56 day statutory response timescale on parking contraventions, but there is no statutory timescale for representations on bus lane penalties).
3. In the last 12 months how many formal challenges have been lost by default as a result of the Council not defending the challenge within time? It is not possible to answer this query within the timescale requested. We do not hold the information.
4. In the last 12 months how many formal challenges have been "lost" as a consequence of the Council deciding not to contest a formal challenge? 10 (we have taken "formal challenge" as meaning an appeal to Traffic Penalty Tribunal).
5. Three grit bins have been removed in Trolley Bents due to a lack of use.
 - (a) How many grit bins have been removed in Sheffield since last year? No grit bins have been removed since last year. 158 grit bins have been relocated to different locations in accordance with recent discussions at Scrutiny and Highways Cabinet.

Sheffield continues to provide the largest number of grit bins per KM of any Local Authority in the country (five times the total of all of Manchester and Nottingham combined) as well as maintaining the largest percentage gritted network of any Authority in the UK.
 - (b) How many grit bins have been removed in Sheffield since last year due to a lack of use? No grit bins have been removed from the highway network since last year.

158 have been relocated. The vast

majority of these are grit bins placed out to mitigate the loss of priority 2 gritting services to routes. A very small proportion were grit bins which were not utilised throughout the season despite three significant snow events.

- (c) Is a lack of use a new criterion for removing grit bins?
- We have always said that the Streets Ahead team would monitor the use of all grit bins each winter season (see Highways Cabinet notes from August 2014, Scrutiny and Highways Cabinet in 2015). Those grit bins that are under used may be relocated to another part of the highway network. This means we can make best use of our valuable resources. This information has been and remains on our website as information for the public and Members.
6. Early in November, three Speed Indicator Devices, known as 'Smiley SIDs', were stolen from roadsides in Sheffield. These had been purchased by former community assemblies and, as they were not classed as a 'network item', they were not covered by Amey's insurance. How many other roadside non 'network items' are there in Sheffield?
- You have been misinformed and the SIDs are included in Streets Ahead. Amey are also looking at purchasing a spare SID.
7. What is the estimated cost of these items?
- No cost to the Council, Amey are replacing the SIDs.
8. Are there now plans for the Council to insure these items in light of recent events?
- The Council has passed the risk onto Amey.

Questions of Councillor Ian Auckland to Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport)

1. Does the Administration have any active plans under consideration to move to a franchised model of bus service delivery?
- No. Even if we did, these would need to be approved by the Quality Contracts Board and I would refer you to the recent decision taken by the Board regarding bus operations in the North East.

2. Is it true that Sheffield City Council is a signatory of the Sheffield Bus Agreement? Does the Cabinet Member accept he is equally accountable and fully accountable for the changes made to bus services and the process by which these changes were made?

Yes, Sheffield City Council (SCC) is accountable as a signatory to the Partnership. However, we are not accountable for day to day operational decisions taken by bus companies – such as a decision to replace double-deckers with single deck buses (resulting in overcrowding and people left at stops - since reversed by the company). It should be noted that we, as a Council, do not have expertise in bus networking nor timetabling – that rests with South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) in the public sector.

What we as a Council have signed up to are broad principles – such as removing over-bussing on certain routes; improving operating conditions for buses by improving infrastructure, introducing synchronised timetables and a single network map; reducing costs to passengers and re-allocating that resource within the overall service (this helped reduce the cost of multi-operator tickets).

So, for instance, it can be said that the Cabinet Member is partly responsible for a 30% reduction in ticket prices over the last two years!

It could also be suggested that members of the SCR Transport Committee (of which Councillor Auckland is one) have also approved the principles and issues arising from Sheffield and other bus partnership work across South Yorkshire.

3. What was the cost (actual and estimated for in kind officer contribution) to public funds of the consultant's report recommending the changes implemented from 1st November?

Zero – the cost was met by operators. Officer time (SCC and SYPTTE) spent working on public transport matters is a core service provided by both organisations, in the same way as officer time spent working on road safety or cycling matters.

4. And similarly for the consultation

We can't comment on behalf of

exercise concerning the proposals?

SYPT. As a partner to the Sheffield Bus Agreement, the Council contributes a quarter of the cost of the consultation exercise and related marketing work – consultation on the new network is only one strand of the jointly produced campaigning work the Bus Partnership has endorsed to date. I understand this to be in the region of £20,000 per partner over the full year to date.

5. Will the Administration veto further cuts to the overall bus network in Sheffield?

We support promoting a number of improvements to the overall bus “offer”. This includes making more effective use of existing bus resources - hence removing over-bussing as a consequence of competition between operators, where this results in a better service for passengers. We do not support cuts that have a negative impact on bus services in Sheffield. It should be remembered that the core objective of the Bus Partnership is still to grow the number of bus passengers by 2% each year.

Questions of Councillor Roger Davison to Councillor Mary Lea (Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living) to be answered by Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport)

Does the Council have a breakdown in the main causes of pollution in Sheffield? - I am particularly interested in the diesel and petrol contribution.

At the last source apportionment investigation, results were as follows:

Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and Fine Particulate Matter (PM10)

	NOx	PM₁₀
Road Transport	50%	40%
Industry	35%	45%
Area	15%	15%

Questions of Councillor Martin Smith to Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport)

I understand that work on the School Keep Clear Review has been suspended for phases 6 onwards due to budget restrictions.

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| (1) | How many schools are affected? | 71 |
| (2) | When is work likely to recommence? | Some of this work has already been designed and the work can take place at the beginning of the new financial year – subject to the increased pressures placed on the Council by the continued significant reductions in Government funding for local safety initiatives such as this. It remains to be seen what difficult decisions the Council have to take on next year’s local transport programme in the light of the settlement. |
| (3) | Has an assessment been carried out to ensure that the delay will not lead to any safety issues on the remaining sites, and that the current parking restrictions are enforceable? | The delay is mostly due to reduced Central Government funding. The Council has an overall programme for completing an overhaul of “school keep clear” marking, this programme has always been influenced by the parallel Streets Ahead investment programme because our strategy is to install new school keep clear road markings once the new roads in an area have been resurfaced by our Streets Ahead contractor.

No site in Sheffield is entirely without its safety issues, but we are not aware of any increased safety problems arising as yet from the delay in the “school keep clear” programme. |

Questions of Councillor Brian Webster to Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport)

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Have Council officers and/or Members engaged in negotiations with Amey, either as part of the recent refinancing of the Streets Ahead contract or at any other time, with the explicit intention of altering the terms of the contract to revise the current policy of felling and replacing healthy street trees? | No. There is no policy of replacing healthy trees but rather one that deals with problem trees that are dead, dying, dangerous, discriminatory (blocking the pavement), diseased or damaging the road, pavement or someone’s property to such an extent we cannot make a reasonable repair that complies with the Council’s legal duties. |
|----|--|---|

2. If there have been any such negotiations, have they resulted in any alteration being made to the Streets Ahead contract as it relates to pavement standards and/or street trees?
- Not applicable, see above answer. The pavement standards we assume you are referring to are not in the contract but rather national standards such as ramping limits where we adhere to the Inclusive Mobility standards and to deviate from them would discriminate against the disabled and we assume all Members would agree that is not acceptable.

Questions of Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley to Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport)

1. Can you confirm who is the Administration's Councillor Cycle Champion?
- Councillor Steve Wilson.
2. When will the Council start carrying out proper cycle audits on a Red, Amber, Green scale?
- A cycle audit is a systematic process applied to planned changes to highway and other infrastructure or developments, designed to ensure that opportunities to encourage cycling are considered within the scope of the project and equally important, that cycling conditions are not made worse by proposed changes.
- Cycle Audits, as with Road Safety Audits, are an iterative process. Issues and questions are raised by the auditor and responded to by the scheme designer and scheme client. The process recognises that we do not work in a perfect world with unlimited spaces or resources, it focusses on identifying issues and assessing risk.
- RAG-ratings are one mechanism that might be employed within the Cycle audit, but they are not central to "proper" cycle audits. The Council already undertakes "proper" cycle audits as described above. It is however a relatively new process and we don't claim it's perfect as yet. The process will be refined and improved

in partnership with stakeholders such as Sustrans and Cycle Sheffield.

3. How many schemes have been designated as dangerous for cyclists in 2013/14, 2014/15, and this year?

No schemes audited have been classified as “dangerous”, any more than road safety audits do. No schemes have been considered to make conditions more dangerous than the situation they would supersede. Under both audit processes, issues are identified, a discussion takes place and a decision on the way forward is recorded

4. When schemes have been designated as dangerous for cyclists e.g. Spital Hill Bus Scheme, what actions are then taken? Please could you give examples?

The Spital Hill scheme has not been designated as dangerous. In general, it is felt to be marginally better for on-road cyclists and certainly no more hazardous for them than the current situation. There was however a potential concern raised by the cycle audit that may or may not come to pass and a potential solution identified should this concern become valid when the scheme becomes operational (bear in mind that cycle audits, like safety audits, have several phases - at least one of which takes place after a scheme opens)

As I’ve already said, issues are routinely raised within audit processes and then addressed appropriately.

5. Could the Cabinet Member please give an updated timeline for the Cycle Inquiry recommendations, which are now 14 months behind schedule? What is the new timeline, and can the Cabinet Member assure Members that this will now progress on time?

Many of the 19 recommendations within the inquiry are fluid. Having said that, most deadlines have been met and work continues on those that need to be updated regularly.

One or two are beyond our control but we continue to press the relevant parties for progress. The outstanding items that could be deemed not to have progressed evolve around developing a cycle network, cycle action plan and integration with public transport. As a result of a best practice study tour to the

Netherlands, we have realised that there are better ways of doing things and it is more important to take our time and get it right. We have discussed this lengthened timescale with CycleSheffield colleagues, they understand the reasoning and are supportive.

This demonstrates one of the most important aspects of the Cycling Inquiry - that of stakeholder communications and engagement – we are currently planning that exercise in partnership with colleagues including Sustrans.

(We continue to develop and progress the green route network – but as an integral element of a joined-up network both on and off-street)

6. What changes have been made as a result of the Cycle Inquiry?

There have been a number of changes. The pertinent recommendation which links into this question and the answer above is R4, learning from and building upon best practice. The Dutch model is a significant departure from what we have delivered previously, and will require time and resource at all levels (officer, senior management, and member) in order for it to progress.

The number of officers delivering existing cycle infrastructure schemes has increased. The majority of the SCC Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) programme is earmarked for cycle schemes.

We are revising our standards, and applying them to all schemes and developments (e.g. in the City Centre) whose development started pre the best practice learning.

We are, where possible, not building anything that does not meet these standards. However one or two

schemes may end up being built that would be previously accepted as a reasonable scheme. These will be upgraded to the new standard in future years.

7. When will the Sheffield trees strategy go out for public consultation? When is it expected to be in place?

The Parks and Countryside team are working to develop the draft Trees and Woodland strategy and as stated in the first Highway Tree Advisory Forum meeting in July, this will be shared with the public in Spring 2016. Early consultation about the scope of the strategy is expected soon.

8. How will the management of street trees be incorporated into the wider implementation of green corridors and urban tree management as part of the trees strategy?

This is currently been looked at by the officers in Parks and Countryside.

9. What, if any, impact does the Cabinet Member believe the tree strategy will have on the policy of felling and replacing healthy street trees, once it is in place?

The Council does not have a policy of replacing healthy trees but rather one to deal with problem trees that meet our 6 D criteria and each tree that is removed is replaced with a species of tree that will thrive in a highway location.

Questions of Councillor Roger Davison to Councillor Mary Lea (Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living)

1. With the continuing trend in the ageing population and the budget forecasts taking this into account, could you please supply the age structure of the Sheffield population and the forecast medium term increase in the 65, 75, and 85 plus age groups?
Please see the information requested attached.

2. Does the Council have a breakdown in the main causes of pollution in Sheffield? - I am particularly interested in the diesel and petrol contribution.
Question to be answered by Councillor Terry Fox.

Questions of Councillor Ian Auckland to Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 With reference to 'The Sheffield Plan: Citywide Options for Growth to 2034' page 45, 5.2 Green Belt Review – please could you provide the revised timetable for the Green Belt Review? | A technical report setting out the Green Belt review process will be published alongside the draft Sheffield Plan. We intend to publish the draft plan for consultation next summer. |
| 2 The document states that the City Region Authorities have agreed a common approach to the Green Belt Review. Are you able to provide a written copy of this agreement? | Yes, we can provide a copy of the common approach to Green Belt Review and will place this on the Council's web site. |
| 3 For clarity, 'Our provisional view is that the majority of the Sheffield Green Belt is too environmentally sensitive to be suitable for development' – do these words reflect the view of all the City Region Authorities? | This is Sheffield's view, we can only express our view but the Citywide Options document says:

<i>The City Council is committed to working with the other SCR local authorities to reach agreement on the most sustainable way of accommodation future growth.</i> |
| 4 Are you able to provide a more exact definition of the land referred to as "East of Norton"? | Not at this stage. |
| 5 What action have you taken to attempt to influence the actions of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire County Councils with reference to 'City Deals'? | Nottingham and Derbyshire County Council are not part of the City Deal. |
| 6 Do you share my concern that the word 'Sheffield' is mentioned all too infrequently in sentences containing the words 'Leeds' and 'Manchester' and sentences linking 'Liverpool', 'Newcastle' and 'Hull' with Leeds and Manchester? | As with HS2 the Government needs to invest in the 'Nottingham Powerhouse', fully and in a way that delivers maximum jobs and investment. We believe that Sheffield is a crucial part of this and we are working to ensure Sheffield and the City Region gets the investment it needs. |

Questions of Councillor Aodan Marken to Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. In what ways have the Council | The Council has met the targets as |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|

successfully implemented the stated targets that are part of achieving 'fair trade city' status?

part of our Fairtrade City Status in a number of ways:

- **Catering contract** – Fairtrade options are available, e.g. tea and coffees used for meeting.
- **School Meals contract** - We encourage Fairtrade products in our School Meals contract [used by 128 schools across the city]. This includes produce like Fairtrade bananas and sugar, and where refreshment facilities are available in Secondary schools, Fairtrade coffee and hot chocolate
- **Promotion** – We support the promotion of Fairtrade annual events including Fairtrade Fortnight and the Food Festival (which includes Fairtrade stalls and products), allowing these events to use city centre spaces without charge
- **Awareness raising** – We also use wider opportunities like the 'Broader Perspective for School Assemblies' to promote Fairtrade. This is part of the collective worship guidelines in Sheffield; used at school discretion; and includes theme weeks one of which is Fairtrade Fortnight.

2. What efforts have been made to sustain and improve on these successes?

One of the four aims within Sheffield's Food Strategy 2014-17 is to ensure our local food system is sustainable and ethical, seeking to minimise the environmental impact. As such we are committed to promote the use of locally sourced food, however where this isn't possible we will continue to encourage sustainable choices including the use of Fairtrade products.

Question of Councillor Andrew Sangar to Councillor Ben Curran (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources)

How many funded parking permits for staff have been approved by the Council and at what cost?

The Council does not procure any external parking for staff. Therefore, there is no cost to the Council for staff parking permits.

Questions of Councillor Colin Ross to Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families)

1. The Chief Executive recently received a letter from the Ofsted Regional Director regarding the provisional outcomes in Primary Schools in 2015. What steps are being taken to address the issues raised?

Sheffield's performance is going up:

- a. In 2010 only 60% of Sheffield pupils achieved expectations at the end of the primary school. In 2015 it is predicted to be 78%. Sheffield's rate of improvement is greater than the national average. That is an additional 2,500 pupils leaving primary with good test scores over the last five years.
- b. Ofsted referred to provisional figures that do not discount children new to English schools. When these children are removed from the final results it is predicted that the gap between Sheffield and national will be 2%. In 2010 it was 4%. Over time Sheffield is closing the gap.
- c. In 2008 there were 33 primary schools deemed under-performing. In 2015 it is expected to reduce to 11 under more demanding measures.
- d. Schools where the LA has intervened to strengthen performance and partnership working have seen improvements far outstripping national averages.
- e. The number of good or outstanding schools in Sheffield continues to rise. All special schools are now judged good or outstanding and the percentage of secondary schools judged good or outstanding is only 1 percentage point below the national average – an improvement of 16 % points since September 2014. Judgements for primary schools are improving, admittedly not

quickly enough; however, there has been an 11 percentage point increase in the percentage of primary schools judged good or outstanding in the last 5 years.

- f. Children in Sheffield are getting a better start in life – over the last two years the percentage of children achieving a good level of development at the end of the Foundation Stage has increased by 14 percentage points.
- g. Sheffield's secondary schools have improved more rapidly than the national average of the last 5 years in terms of both attainment and progress measures. The % of pupils making expected progress in maths has improved by 8 percentage points against a national improvement of 2 percentage points. Sheffield's performance is above the average for core cities across the headline attainment and progress measures.

This is at a time when:

- 1. The numbers of children arriving new to English has grown rapidly – in 2010 White British accounted for 74% of the pupil population, now it is 67%. Nearly 25% of children starting primary school have English as an additional language.
- 2. City-wide the number of children eligible for Free School Meals has increased by 900 over the last 5 years.

Changes we have made:

- Transformed the City Wide Learning Body into Learn Sheffield because we know that school to school collaboration is

the best way to raise standards.

- Invested in our Best Start Strategy so that all children are ready for school.
- Focused on Free School Meal pupils – cross-city work on Pupil Premium.
- Taken tough decisions around poor performing schools – hence the numbers above.
- Invested heavily in literacy and numeracy.
- Developed strong networks of EAL support to improve outcomes for pupils new to English.

2. How many schools are currently signed up to Learn Sheffield and what proportion is this of the total number of schools?

Please see attached sheet.

3. Can you break down these by type (e.g. Primary, Secondary, Special, Academy, Faith)?

Please see response to Question 2.

Appendix to Councillor Jackie Drayton's responses

Learn Sheffield Membership

Total School (174 - Includes UTC & PRU)	
No.	%
55	32

Primary (135)		Secondary (26 - Includes UTC)		Special (11 - includes PRU)		Nursery (2)		Academies (59)	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
43	32	7	27	4	36	0	0	12	20

Academies			
Prim (38)		Sec (21)	
No.	%	No.	%
5	13	7	33

Faith Schools 25 - 2 Secondary)	
No.	%
3	12

Other (College)	
No.	%
1	100

Questions of Councillor Steve Ayriss to Councillor Jayne Dunn (Cabinet Member for Housing)

There is currently planning permission in Sheffield for 7,840 new dwellings that are currently not being developed or are incomplete

(a) Why are these houses not being built?

This is considerably lower than under your Administration which had 10,595 dwellings in March 2011 with planning permission that were not developed or incomplete.

Unfortunately there is no compulsion for developers to proceed with developments after full planning approval has been granted. In the last Parliament we supported proposals put forward by Labour to give Councils powers to force developers with planning permission to build, known as 'use it or lose it'. Unfortunately this was not implemented as it was blocked by the Coalition Government of which the Liberal Democrats were a member, who refused to implement this policy.

(b) What are you doing to encourage developers to build these houses?

Efforts over the last few years of New Homes Bonus projects moving sites forward and getting sites and developments in the pipeline for development, getting design work done, new applications for planning applications in, under negotiation and approved, on site and completed. This is evidenced by the fact that completions in 2014/15 were nearly double the level in 13/14 and were well above the current Core Strategy target.

Over the last year a considerable amount of work has taken place to review land available in the city (public and private ownership) so we understand the potential number of units that can be built for Sheffield. As part of the work to

explore how we can support house building in the City, a number of initiatives have been implemented.

Focus on enabling activity such as supporting Small Medium Enterprise developers to expand their business and develop their workforce. We have launched our custom build register, 223 people have signed up to it and have made 11 sites available for sale with the capacity to deliver 102 new homes. These sites have been promoted to those on our custom build register.

Evidence shows us that viability can be a considerable barrier to building on brownfield land particularly in marginal housing markets. In response to this, there are now areas of the city that are nil-rated in both regards of Community Infrastructure Levy and Affordable Housing requirements.

Response to question 1 to Councillor Mary Lea

Mid 2012 based ONS Sheffield Population Projections (Persons)

5 Year Age Groups

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
65-69 persons	26163	27107.2	27016.01	26915.41	26707.8	25352.96	24667.61	24446.79	24393.05	24670.32	25204.52
70-74 persons	20340	20321.52	20930.15	21410.36	22170.49	23785.65	24712.01	24682.76	24623.89	24465.48	23264.65
75-79 persons	17194	17637.35	17838.9	17916.01	17693.64	17651.85	17724	18325.04	18821.28	19541.12	21039.65
80-84 persons	12600	12653.38	12910.67	13097.91	13373.87	13695.26	14154.26	14398.35	14524.86	14399.47	14430.88
85-89 persons	7608	7652.711	7767.885	8013.576	8188.814	8357.696	8532.026	8823.048	9075.842	9363.962	9674.773

Source: ONS

Response to question 1 to Councillor Mary Lea

Mid 2012 based ONS Sheffield Population Projections (Persons)

5 Year Age Groups

5 YEAR (Euro 2013)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	
00-00	persons	7022	6813.601	6898.127	6916.262	6960.798	7031.886	7054.952	7076.808	7090.437	7101.35	7108.882
01-04	persons	27281	27419.5	27298.2	27236.28	27400.03	27345.36	27558.85	27698.09	27838.92	27952.42	28012.82
05-09	persons	31468	32342.83	32881.85	33400.7	33515.18	33762.58	33722.98	33707.49	33678.95	33849.63	33849.25
10-14	persons	29621	29161.26	29238.2	29462.87	30105.91	30904.38	31767.6	32297.73	32808.86	32923.68	33173.88
15-19	persons	39448	39057.49	38543.56	38262.67	37895.23	37137.47	36607.67	36449.59	36483.66	36967.86	37863.07
20-24	persons	60431	61311.47	61640.43	61186.26	60795.31	60297.65	59744.37	59070.77	58346.36	57361.21	56190.36
25-29	persons	39243	40233.88	41166.81	42034.44	42758.49	43864.42	44319.28	44593.1	44346.28	44054.01	43645.35
30-34	persons	36386	36965.17	37063.6	37157.04	37709.14	38131.77	38947.81	39700.4	40401.06	41036.69	41943.78
35-39	persons	33514	32903.89	33280.62	34170.52	34913.79	35544.82	36159.34	36290.93	36383.96	36831.14	37192.02
40-44	persons	38904	37965.62	36617.31	35257.87	33740.68	32622.3	32015.39	32349.05	33191.83	33913.51	34556.67
45-49	persons	36957	37397.35	37949.23	38191.57	38228.68	37896.18	37011.59	35720.62	34416.58	32940.71	31841.13
50-54	persons	33410	34139.89	34671.88	35115.43	35682.47	36015.83	36430.45	36939.83	37153.86	37187.86	36864.53
55-59	persons	28189	28740.68	29442.38	30427.64	31292.15	32197.99	32924.83	33462.3	33914.78	34469.66	34800.8
60-64	persons	27088	26303.99	26041.13	25967.06	26249.17	26806.34	27353.21	28032.78	28981.97	29820.24	30699.57
65-69	persons	26163	27107.2	27016.01	26915.41	26707.8	25352.96	24667.61	24446.79	24393.05	24670.32	25204.52
70-74	persons	20340	20321.52	20930.15	21410.36	22170.49	23785.65	24712.01	24682.76	24623.89	24465.48	23264.65
75-79	persons	17194	17637.35	17838.9	17916.01	17693.64	17651.85	17724	18325.04	18821.28	19541.12	21039.65
80-84	persons	12600	12653.38	12910.67	13097.91	13373.87	13695.26	14154.26	14398.35	14524.86	14399.47	14430.88
85-89	persons	7608	7652.711	7767.885	8013.576	8188.814	8357.696	8532.026	8823.048	9075.842	9363.962	9674.773
90 and over	persons	4515	4514.982	4620.195	4730.824	4846.138	5010.729	5139.126	5315.347	5579.931	5803.942	6052.014
All ages	persons	557382	560643.8	563817.1	566870.7	570227.8	573413.1	576547.3	579380.8	582056.4	584654.3	587408.6

Source: ONS

This page is intentionally left blank