

**LEEDS ECONOMY  
BRIEFING PAPER**

**ISSUE 70 | OCTOBER 2019**

**INDEX OF DEPRIVATION 2019**



# LEEDS ECONOMY BRIEFING PAPER

ISSUE 70 | OCTOBER 2019

## INDEX OF DEPRIVATION 2019

Work commissioned from the University of Oxford by Housing, Communities and Local Government on updating the Index of Deprivation 2010 using more up-to-date data, has now been published.

The domains and methodology are the same in the ID2019 as in the ID2015, ID2010 and ID2007. Comparisons can be made on the relative rankings of districts between 2007, 2010, 2015 and 2019.

Oxford has produced six measures of deprivation, which it stresses should be treated equally. They are based on seven domains of deprivation: income; employment; health; education, barriers to housing & services; living environment; and crime. Each domain contains a number of indicators, totaling 37 overall. (See Details for details).

## THE SIX DISTRICT RANKINGS

(See Details for definitions)

Leeds City Council has long argued that "overbounding", where the relatively deprived inner area is surrounded by a more affluent outer area, significantly affects the ranking of Leeds in the district ranking given above. Because of this, the recommended ranking is the Local Concentration measure.

With a rank of 1 equating to the most deprived area, out of 317 local authority districts Leeds is ranked:

- 28<sup>th</sup> in 2019 (24<sup>th</sup> in 2015, 44<sup>th</sup> in 2010 and 48<sup>th</sup> in 2007) most deprived local authority on the Local Concentration measure.
- 50<sup>th</sup> in 2019 (58<sup>th</sup> in 2015, 59<sup>th</sup> in 2010 and 67<sup>th</sup> in 2007) on the extent measure
- 55<sup>th</sup> in 2019 (70<sup>th</sup> in 2015, 68<sup>th</sup> in 2010 and 84<sup>th</sup> in 2007) on the rank of average of SOA scores
- 92<sup>nd</sup> in 2019 (100<sup>th</sup> in 2015, 97<sup>th</sup> in 2010 and 114<sup>th</sup> in 2007) on average of SOA ranks
- 4<sup>th</sup> most deprived on both the Income Scale and 3<sup>rd</sup> on the Work Scale measures (3<sup>rd</sup> in 2015, 4<sup>th</sup> in 2010 and 2007), reflecting the fact that Leeds is the second largest local authority after Birmingham.

## DEPRIVED SOA'S AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL

The whole of England has been divided into 32,844 SOAs, with 482 in Leeds.

- In Leeds, 24% of SOAs are in the 10% most deprived SOAs nationally, and 34% in the 20% most deprived. This is substantially lower than most of the Core Cities reflecting the "overbounding".

## WARD RANKINGS

- 12 of the 33 wards in Leeds do not have any SOAs in the worst 10% nationally
- 5 wards in Leeds have more than half their SOAs in the 10% most deprived SOAs nationally:
  - Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, Gipton and Harehills, Killingbeck & Seacroft, Hunslet & Riverside and Middleton Park.

## DETAILS

### INTRODUCTION

- 1 In the 1990s, the former DETR produced two Index of Deprivation rankings based on the studies undertaken by the University of Manchester. The first study used data solely from the 1991 Census of Population and the results were used to determine national wards eligible for Objective 2 status. This index was updated in 1998, using revised methodology and some new data.
- 2 In 1998 the University of Oxford was commissioned to review and update the 1998 index. Oxford undertook a series of consultation exercises during 1999 and Leeds City Council responded in depth to the final consultation. The ID2000 index, which was published in 2000, was used to determine which wards were eligible for funding from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund.
- 3 In 2003 the ODPM commissioned Oxford to update the ID2000. Following two consultation exercises, to which Leeds City Council responded, the results of the ID2004 were published in May 2004, with revised data published in June. Previous analyses had used wards as the basic geography, even though it was acknowledged that they masked pockets of high deprivation. These were replaced in 2004 with Super Output Area (SOA), which are of approximately equal size (1,500 people) and nest within ward boundaries.
- 4 In 2007 Communities and Local Government commissioned the Social Disadvantage Research Centre at the University of Oxford to update the ID2004 index. The ID2007 is based on the approach, structure and methodology that were used to create the ID2004. The ID2007 updates the ID2004 using more up-to-date data.
- 5 In 2010, 2015 and 2019 Housing, Communities and Local Government again commissioned the University of Oxford to update the index. The ID2019 is broadly based on the approach, structure and methodology that were used to create the ID2007, ID2010 and ID2015.
- 6 The Index of Deprivation district and imputed ward rankings are discussed briefly below.

### DISTRICT RANKINGS

- 1 Oxford has produced six indicators of deprivation (details given at the end of this note), which it stresses should be treated equally.
- 2 Leeds City Council has long argued the case that using a district-wide indicator is invalid for Leeds because of the over-bounding problem. Indeed, the original study by Manchester University accepted that this was a problem and that a district index would mask the high concentrations of multiple deprivation within its boundary. This is highlighted in the ward-based analysis

Leeds is ranked 4th most deprived for the Income Scale and 3<sup>rd</sup> on the Work Scale measures, reflecting the fact that Leeds is the second largest local authority after Birmingham. It is also ranked 28<sup>th</sup> most deprived local authority on the Local Concentration measure.

The table below gives the rankings for the:

- Core cities: Birmingham, Leeds and Sheffield have similar rankings on the Local Concentration measure
- Leeds City Region: significant difference between metropolitan districts and the rest

INDEX OF DEPRIVATION 2019 - CORE CITIES & LEEDS CITY REGION							
Local Authority	Local Concentration Rank	Extent Rank	Rank of Average of SOA Scores	Rank of Average of SOA Ranks	Rank of Income Scale	Rank of Work Scale	% of SOA's in worst 10% nationally
<b>CORE CITIES</b>							
Birmingham	30	4	7	6	1	1	41%
Bristol	44	68	65	82	12	9	16%
<b>Leeds</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24%</b>
Liverpool	5	1	3	4	3	2	49%
Manchester	13	2	6	2	2	4	43%
Nottingham	43	11	11	10	11	10	31%
Newcastle	12	38	41	74	25	19	26%
Sheffield	36	47	57	93	6	7	24%
<b>LEEDS CITY REGION</b>							
Barnsley	51	35	38	38	48	36	22%
Bradford	17	13	13	21	5	6	34%
Calderdale	54	63	66	76	76	74	16%
Craven	260	236	245	239	310	308	-
Harrogate	280	260	278	278	219	207	-
Kirklees	81	62	83	87	13	11	12%
<b>Leeds</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24%</b>
Selby	222	223	246	252	277	264	2%
Wakefield	57	51	54	64	32	17	16%
York	193	192	267	275	147	136	1
The <b>six district indicators</b> are explained at the end of this Note.							

The table below shows the rankings for the 39 Local Enterprise Partnerships.

- Leeds City Region was ranked 7<sup>th</sup> on the Local Concentration measure, while Greater Manchester was 5<sup>th</sup> and Greater Birmingham 6<sup>th</sup>.
- 18% of SOAs in Leeds City Region were in the worst 10% nationally, compared with 2% in London, 25% in Gtr Birmingham and 23% in Gtr Manchester.

INDEX OF DEPRIVATION 2019 - LEPs							
	Local Concentration Rank	Extent Rank	Rank of Average of SOA Scores	Rank of Average of SOA Ranks	Rank of Income Scale	Rank of Work Scale	% of SOA's in worst 10% nationally
Liverpool City Region	1	1	1	1	7	6	34%
Tees Valley	2	3	2	5	21	20	29%
Humber	3	10	9	11	17	17	22%
Lancashire	4	8	9	9	11	10	20%
Greater Manchester	5	4	4	3	2	2	23%
Greater Birmingham and Solihull	6	5	5	4	5	7	25%
<b>Leeds City Region</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18%</b>
North Eastern	8	6	6	6	6	5	17%
Sheffield City Region	9	7	8	7	9	9	19%
Black Country	10	2	3	2	10	11	19%
Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire	12	11	13	14	8	8	10%
South East	20	21	22	22	3	3	5%
London	27	14	14	12	1	1	2%

## CONCENTRATION OF DEPRIVATION

The table below shows the high concentration of deprivation, particularly in the Core Cities.

The results for Leeds highlight the problems of overbounding: high levels of multiple deprivation in the inner area being masked by low levels in the more affluent outer areas. This is clearly demonstrated in the ward analysis below.

	Number of SOAs	Percentage of SOAs in worst 5% nationally	Percentage of SOAs in worst 10% nationally	Percentage of SOAs in worst 20% nationally
<b>West Yorkshire</b>				
Bradford	310	18%	34%	47%
Calderdale	128	10%	16%	30%
Kirklees	259	3%	12%	30%
<b>Leeds</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>34%</b>
Wakefield	209	7%	16%	34%
<b>Core Cities</b>				
Birmingham	639	22%	41%	56%
Bristol	263	8%	16%	30%
<b>Leeds</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>34%</b>
Liverpool	298	38%	49%	63%
Manchester	282	23%	43%	59%
Newcastle	175	18%	26%	39%
Nottingham	182	12%	31%	57%
Sheffield	345	13%	24%	34%
<b>Leeds City Region</b>				
Barnsley	147	10%	22%	39%
Bradford	310	18%	34%	47%
Calderdale	128	10%	16%	30%
Craven	32	-	-	6%
Harrogate	104	-	1%	1%
Kirklees	259	3%	12%	30%
<b>Leeds</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>34%</b>
Selby	50	-	2%	2%
Wakefield	209	7%	16%	34%
York	120	-	1%	5%

## WARD RANKINGS

- Pre-2004 studies on the Index of Deprivation produced national ward rankings for the 8,414 wards in England. There was general consensus in the consultation for the ID 2004 indicators should be constructed at the smallest practicable spatial scale and the geography should be relatively even sized populations.
- The Office for National Statistics developed units called 'Super Output Areas', which contain on average 1,500 people. In 2019, England contains 32,844 SOAs, with 482 in Leeds. These are used as the base-geography for the ID2007, ID2010, ID2015 and ID2019.
- Ward rankings are not published because they mask high levels of multiple deprivation within wards. However, it is possible to re-analyse the results to highlight the concentration of deprivation within wards in Leeds. SOA boundaries in Leeds do not map onto ward boundaries; a "best-fit" approach is used.

## CONCENTRATION OF DEPRIVATION IN LEEDS

- The table below highlights the problem of overbounding in Leeds:
  - 12 wards in Leeds do not have any SOAs in the worst 10% nationally
- 5 wards in Leeds have more than half their SOAs in the 10% most deprived SOAs nationally.
- In Leeds as a whole, 24% of SOAs are in the 10% most deprived nationally.

LEEDS WARD RANKINGS ID2019	Total SOAs in ward	% in worst 10% nationally
Gipton & Harehills	17	94
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	15	93
Killingbeck & Seacroft	16	75
Middleton Park	18	72
Hunslet & Riverside	18	56
Armley	15	47
Chapel Allerton	13	38
Bramley & Stanningley	16	38
Farnley & Wortley	16	38
Beeston & Holbeck	15	33
Temple Newsam	14	29
Kirkstall	12	25
Cross Gates & Whimoor	15	20
Little London & Woodhouse	13	15
Alwoodley	15	13
Morley South	13	8
Weetwood	13	8
Adel & Wharfedale	14	7
Moortown	14	7
Pudsey	16	6
Roundhay	16	6
Ardsley & Robin Hood	13	-
Calverley & Farsley	14	-
Garforth & Swillington	13	-
Guiseley & Rawdon	14	-
Harewood	13	-
Headingley & Hyde Park	16	-
Horsforth	14	-
Kippax & Methley	14	-
Morley North	15	-
Otley & Yeadon	15	-
Rothwell	13	-
Wetherby	14	-
<b>Leeds MD</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>24</b>



## DOMAIN INDICATORS

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 is based on seven independent domains of multiple deprivation, each with its own additive impact.

There are 37 separate indicators, organized over seven district domains of deprivation which can be combined, using appropriate weights, to calculate the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019. This is an overall measure of multiple deprivation experienced by people living in an area and is calculated for every Lower Layer Super Output Area (LSOA). The IMD2019 can be used to rank every LSOA according to their relative level of deprivation.

The indices are a continuous measure of relative deprivation therefore there is no definitive point on the scale below which areas are considered to be deprived and above which they are not.

### INCOME: MEASURES PROPORTION OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING INCOME DEPRIVATION.

Adults and children in Income Support families  
Adults and children in income-based Job Seeker's Allowance families  
Adults and children in income-based ESA families  
Adults and children in Pension Credit (Guarantee) families  
Adults and children in Working Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit families: below 60% of median income not already counted  
Asylum seekers in receipt of subsistence and/or accommodation support  
Adults & children in UC families where no adult is in 'Working – no requirements' conditionally regime

### EMPLOYMENT: MEASURES INVOLUNTARY EXCLUSION OF WORKING AGE POPULATION FROM WORLD OF WORK

Claimants of Job Seekers Allowance, aged 18-59/64  
Claimants of Employment and Support Allowance, aged 18-59/64  
Claimants of Incapacity Benefit, aged 18-59/64  
Claimants of Severe Disability Allowance, aged 18-59/64  
Claimants of Carer's Allowance, aged 18-59/64  
Claimants of UC in the 'Searching for Work' and 'No work requirements' conditionally groups'

### HEALTH DEPRIVATION AND DISABILITY: IDENTIFIES AREAS WITH RELATIVELY HIGH RATES OF PEOPLE WHO DIE PREMATURELY OR WHOSE QUALITY OF LIFE IS IMPAIRED BY POOR HEALTH OR WHO ARE DISABLED

Years of Potential Life Lost  
Comparative Illness and Disability Ratios  
Measures of acute morbidity  
Mood or anxiety disorders

### EDUCATION, SKILLS AND TRAINING: MEASURES EXTENT OF DEPRIVATION

Children/young people:  
Key Stage 2 attainment  
Key Stage 4 attainment  
Secondary school absence  
Staying on in education post 16

Skills  
Entry to higher education  
Adults with no or low qualification, aged 25-59/64  
Adults who cannot speak English or cannot speak English well

### BARRIERS TO HOUSING AND SERVICES

Wider Barriers  
Household overcrowding  
Homelessness  
Housing affordability

Geographical Barriers  
Road distance to GP surgery  
Road distance to supermarket or convenience store  
Road distance to primary school  
Road distance to a Post Office

## CRIME: MEASURES INCIDENCE OF RECORDED CRIME

Recorded crime rates for:  
Violence  
Burglary  
Theft  
Criminal damage

## LIVING ENVIRONMENT DEPRIVATION: QUALITY OF HOUSING, AIR QUALITY AND ROAD TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Housing in poor condition  
Housing without central heating in  
Air quality  
Road traffic accidents

## DOMAIN INDICES

1. There are seven **domain indices**, which consist on the combined indicators in that domain:
  - Income and Employment are rates
  - Health, Education, Barriers to Housing & Services, Crime & Disorder and Living Environment are factor scores.
2. The overall **Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019** is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score.

## DISTRICT LEVEL

Six summary measures of the overall IMD 2019 have been produced at the district level. No single measure is favoured over another: there is no single best way of describing or comparing England's 317 districts.

### Local Concentration

Population weighted average of the ranks of the district's most deprived SOAs that contain exactly 10% of the district's population

*Way of identifying 'hot spots' of deprivation*

### Extent

Proportion of the district's population living in the most deprived SOAs in the country.

*Overbounding severely affects the score for Leeds.*

### Average of SOA Scores

Population weighted average of the combined scores for the SOAs in the district

*Overbounding severely affects the score for Leeds..*

### Average of SOA Ranks

Population weighted average of the combined ranks for the SOAs in the district

*Overbounding severely affects the score for Leeds.*

### Scale

Income Scale is the number of people who are Income deprived.  
Employment Scale is number of people who are Employment deprived.

*These appears to be included to mop-up the larger local authorities which were not included in the 'most deprived 50' in the four factor score indicators above. The measures are designed to give an indication of the number of people experiencing deprivation.*