

## **IMD and a strategic response**

### **Summary**

1. This report arises out of the Executive at its meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> December to instigate a pilot project aimed at reducing deprivation in the worst performing IMD area of the city. It compares the latest Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) figures for York with the previous published figures.
2. From this research it is proposed that the pilot scheme be developed by the City of York Council, with partners, to tackle deprivation in one geographically targeted area of the city. The development of, and the results from, the pilot partnership scheme will be reported back to the Council and the Local Strategic Partnership, so that the lessons learned can be used to inform a city-wide approach to reducing deprivation.

### **Background**

3. The latest Index of Multiple Deprivation (2007) Statistics for England were published by the Department for Communities and Local Government in December 2007.

Whilst published at the end of 2007 the figures were collected in 2005, and therefore may not accurately describe the situation as it is today. However, these figures do allow for a comparison with the previous published figures, which were collected in 2001.

In simple terms the overall IMD is made up of seven sets of statistics called “domains”. Not all domains are given equal value in determining the overall IMD and the table below describes each domain and its weighting.

**Table 1: Domain Weights for the IMD 2007**

	<b>Domain Weight</b>
Income Deprivation Domain	22.5 %
Employment Deprivation Domain	22.5%
Health Deprivation and Disability Domain	13.5%
Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain	13.5%
Barriers to Housing and Services Domain	9.3%
Crime Domain	9.3%
Living Environment Deprivation Domain	9.3%

The IMD provides a score for each Super Output area (SOA) within the York Unitary Authority (as a rule of thumb an SOA has approximately 200 dwellings within it).

#### Headline figures for York

4. When considering response mechanisms to the IMD it is important to look at each area in the city individually to try to ascertain the reasons behind each score. However, some overall figures will help set a context for a response.

- **Overall York's levels of deprivation are decreasing** - The 2004 IMD ranked York UA as 219 out of 354 local authorities (where 1 is the most deprived and 354 is the least deprived). In 2007 York is ranked at 242.
- **The numbers of deprived areas in York are reducing** - In 2004 York had 11 SOA's that were within the 20% most deprived in England, and one of them was within the 10% most deprived. In 2007 York had a reduced figure of 8 SOA's within the 20% most deprived and again one was within the 10% most deprived.
- **One SOA remains particularly disadvantaged** - It is the same SOA within the 10% most deprived for 2004 and 2007.

Care should be taken when considering ranking, as the change in position might be due to other local authorities performing better or worse rather than changes in York. However overall York's IMD scores are improving.

Bearing in mind the descriptions above, the following figures relate to each domain.

Indices Of Deprivation	Within the 20% Most Deprived		of which this number is within the 10% Most Deprived		Improvements Since 2004 IMD?
	2004 IMD	2007 IMD	2004 IMD	2007 IMD	
Overall IMD	11	8	1	1	▲
Income	10	9	3	1	▲
Employment	10	7	3	1	▲
Health Deprivation & Disability	3	2	0	0	▲
Education Skills & Training	14	13	7	7	▲
Barriers to Housing & Services	5	12	1	1	▼
Crime	35	26	18	14	▲
Living Environment	15	12	1	3	?
IDACI	11	8	6	4	▲
IDAOP1	4	6	2	1	?

In order to rank the current IMD for Wards within the city, average scores have been calculated from the total SOA scores within Wards.

Ward	Average Score
Westfield	30.08
Guildhall	23.51
Clifton	21.69
Heworth	20.48
Hull Road	17.55
Micklegate	15.43
Holgate	15.41
Acomb	14.21
Huntington and New Earswick	13.58
Fishergate	11.18
Dringhouses and Woodthorpe	10.08
Wheldrake	8.93
Osbaldwick	8.78
Strensall	8.57
Skelton	8.00
Bishophorpe	7.10
Heslington	7.04
Fulford	6.10
Rural West York	5.70
Heworth Without	5.28
Haxby and Wigginton	4.89
Derwent	4.20

#### Details of SOA scores

5. The detailed results of each SOA, by domain, has been entered (by the Council's Economic Development Unit) onto a spreadsheet which compares their ranking, score, and percentage change between 2004 and 2007.

A detailed analysis is now required of the above results to help determine what policy changes and actions may be required to address these issues.

This spreadsheet is a large file and is difficult to print in an accessible format, therefore it is not attached to this report. Should any partner wish to look at this information in its current form please contact the authors of the report.

#### Initial thoughts prior to analysis

6. The IMD indicates that overall York is not as deprived as many other local authorities and that it has improved in terms of its ranking between 2004 and 2007. However, the city does still have 8 SOA's within the worst 20% in England.

As noted earlier the IMD is compiled from a number of domains. A range of partners and partnerships have a significant, and in some instances, a lead role to

play in tackling deprivation, e.g. the PCT, Police, Learning and Skills Council, Jobcentre Plus etc.

A detailed analysis is required to understand what is behind the figures within an SOA in order to suggest potential responses to improve the deprivation score. For example, a high scoring SOA may have above average numbers of elderly people on pensions (low incomes) in poor health and living in social housing (maybe even in an elderly persons sheltered housing scheme). In this instance it would not be helpful to consider actions relating to training and employability skills. It would be more appropriate to implement health education such as ways to avoid falls in the home. Therefore it is essential to cross reference local knowledge (from a range of partners) and demographic data to the IMD.

## **Consultation**

7. The appropriate Ward Planning Committee has been briefed on the details behind the “most deprived” area report and their support for initiatives to address the issues has been agreed. A report has also been presented to the Local Strategic Partnership (WOW) Board which describes the proposal detailed below. The LSP will consider this proposal at its meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2008.

## **Options**

8. The option for Members is to consider the action set out below in response to the issue raised.

## **Analysis**

9. It is acknowledged that more analysis is required with the involvement of key agencies in the city.

However, it is proposed that rather than delay action with further detailed analysis, the City Council lead and manage a pilot multi-agency programme – involving where appropriate the Ward (Planning) Committee - which will tackle deprivation initially in one geographical area of the city. The lessons learned and the results of this action will be reported back, at regular intervals, to the Council and the WOW Board to inform the partnership on how best to develop a city-wide approach to tackling deprivation.

The pilot team will be tasked to:

- Examine the likely causes of deprivation and consider appropriate responses.
- Assemble a working budget.
- Aim to reduce deprivation in one area of the city.
- Identify effective leadership roles to deliver actions and outcomes.
- Develop and deliver proposals, which provide outcomes supporting existing strategies of partnership agencies.
- Establish a template for a city-wide approach to tackling deprivation.
- Suggest how partners’ resources might be better used through a joint approach.
- Develop interim success measures prior to the next IMD in 4 years time.
- Develop a reporting mechanism for actions and results.

## Corporate Priorities

9. The Council's corporate strategy identifies a number of priorities relevant to the issues considered within this report:
- Improve the actual and perceived condition and appearance of the city's streets, housing estates and publicly accessible spaces.
  - Reduce the actual and perceived impact of violent, aggressive and nuisance behaviour on people in York.
  - Increase people's skills and knowledge to improve future employment prospects.
  - Improve the economic prosperity of the people of York with a focus on minimising income differentials.
  - Improve the health and lifestyles of the people who live in York, in particular among groups whose levels of health are the poorest.
  - Improve the life chances of the most disadvantaged and disaffected children, young people and families in the city.
  - Improve the quality and availability of decent, affordable homes in the city.

## Implications

10. Financial : There are potential financial implications for all partners involved in the proposed pilot. As yet the extent of the costs are unknown and the development of an adequate working budget will be one of the first tasks of the group.

11. Human resources: From past experience of similar work in Bell Farm and Clifton, a pilot project managed and lead through the council will have a call on staff time across directorates and particularly within the Economic Development and Partnerships team. This will have to be managed corporately along with other emerging priorities, e.g. responses to the Future York Report.

12. Equalities: The project will support the council meet part of its vision to promote cohesive and inclusive communities.

13. Legal: None

14. Crime and Disorder: Any action tackling deprivation will have a positive impact on crime and disorder.

15. Information Technology: None

16. Property: None

## Risk Management

17. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy. There are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

## Recommendation

18. The Executive is requested to agree the actions set out in paragraph 8 above as a response to the new published information on the Index of Multiple Deprivation.

Reason: To reduce deprivation in the city, and to inform the Council and the Local Strategic Partnership on the development of an effective city-wide response to deprivation.

## Contact Details

### Author:

Terry Atkinson, Skills and Labour  
Market Manager.  
Jonathan Walker, Economic  
Development Assistant.  
Economic Development Unit  
Phone No: 01904 554421

### Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Bill Woolley  
Director of City Strategy

Report Approved

Date 31/1/08

Specialist Implications Officers: None

Wards Affected: All

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

**Background Papers:** The spreadsheet containing detailed comparative figures for all York SOA's is a large file and is difficult to print in an accessible format. Should any partner wish to look at this information in its current form it is held at the Economic Development Unit and published on the Council's intranet site (look under – Site content-Directorate-City Strategy-Economic Development Unit).

Annexes: None