

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

## REPORT TO POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No 18

meeting date: 26<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2016  
 title: ANALYSIS OF THE 2015 INDICES OF DEPRIVATION  
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES  
 principal author: MICHELLE HAWORTH – PRINCIPAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide information for committee about the Indices of Deprivation 2015.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives –
  - Corporate Priorities –
  - Other Considerations -
- The Indices of Deprivation provide invaluable data on the different levels of deprivation within the borough. This data can help the Council with service delivery, by identifying the areas of greatest need.

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Since the 1970s local measures of deprivation have been calculated in England. This release of data contains the latest version of these statistics and form the English Indices of Deprivation 2015.

2.2 It is important to note that these statistics are a measure of deprivation, not affluence, and to recognise that not every person in a highly deprived area will themselves be deprived. Equally, there will be some deprived people living in the least deprived areas.

2.3 Deprivation covers a broad range of issues and refers to unmet needs caused by a lack of resources of all kinds, not just financial. The English Indices of Deprivation attempt to measure a broader concept of multiple deprivation, made up of seven domains of deprivation which are outlined below. They are combined to produce the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). Each domain contains a number of components (see Appendix A).

- **Income** - measures the proportion of the population in an area experiencing deprivation related to low income.
- **Employment** - measures employment deprivation in an area conceptualised as involuntary exclusion of the working age population from the labour market.
- **Health and Disability** - measures premature death and the impairment of quality of life by poor health. It considers both physical and mental health. The domain measures morbidity, disability and premature mortality but not aspects of behaviour or environment that may be predictive of future health deprivation.
- **Education Skills and Training** - measures the extent of deprivation in terms of education, skills and training in an area. The indicators are structured into two sub-domains: one relating to children and young people and one relating to adult skills.
  - ◆ Sub-domain: Children/young people
  - ◆ Sub-domain: Skills
- **Barriers to Housing and Other Services** - measures the physical and financial accessibility of housing and key local services. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: 'geographical barriers', which relate to the physical proximity of local services, and 'wider barriers' which includes issues relating to access to housing such as affordability.
  - ◆ Sub-domain: Wider barriers
  - ◆ Sub-domain: Geographical barriers

- **Crime** - measures the rate of recorded crime in an area for four major crime types representing the risk of personal and material victimisation at a small area level.
- **Living Environment** - measures the quality of individuals' immediate surroundings both within and outside the home. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: the 'indoors' living environment, which measures the quality of housing, and the 'outdoors' living environment which contains two measures relating to air quality and road traffic accidents.
  - ◆ Sub-domain: The indoors living environment
  - ◆ Sub-domain: The outdoors living environment
- In addition to the Index of Multiple Deprivation and the seven domain indices, there are two supplementary indices: the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) and the Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI).

### 3 NATIONAL RESULTS

- 3.1 The IMD 2015 updates the IMD 2010, where possible using the same indicators and sources of data.
- 3.2 An overview of the findings of the English Indices of Deprivation 2015 focuses on the national and sub-national patterns of multiple deprivation.
- 3.3 The overall measure of multiple deprivation experienced by people living in an area is calculated for every Lower layer Super Output Area (LSOA) in England. The IMD 2015 can be used to rank every LSOA in England according to their relative level of deprivation. (Lower super output areas are a statistical geography that are smaller in size than wards. They contain on average 1,500 people).
- 3.4 According to the IMD 2015 the most deprived LSOA in England is to the east of the Jaywick area of Clacton on Sea (Tendring 18a) and the least deprived is part of Wokingham (Wokingham 020E) both are in the East of England region.
- 3.5 The English Indices of Deprivation 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. In most cases, users concentrate on defining deprived areas by using a cut-off value beyond which areas are deemed to be the most deprived. For instance, a number of uses of the IMD have focussed on the most deprived 10 per cent (most deprived decile) of LSOAs in England. Deprived areas have been defined as those LSOAs that are amongst the 10 per cent most deprived in England according to the overall IMD.
- 3.6 Almost all of the most deprived LSOAs in England are in urban areas.

### 4 LOCAL RESULTS

- 4.1 The IMD 2015 provides measures of deprivation at local authority (as well as lower super output area level (LSOA)), ranking the deprivation of 354 local authority districts in England, where 1 is the most deprived and 354 is the least deprived.
- 4.2 The 2015 IMD replicates the 2010 IMD as far as possible, so changes in rankings are likely to reflect change between the two time periods.
- 4.3 This section examines the summary data at local authority level, and it examines changes in deprivation rankings in more depth and the LSOA level data.
- 4.4 Comparing the 2015 to the 2010 Index of Deprivation, for all of the six summary measures of deprivation, Ribble Valley ranks as being relatively less deprived. (This is a change from 2010 when comparing to the 2007 Index of Deprivation, where Ribble Valley ranked as being relatively more deprived.)

IMD summary ranks<sup>1</sup> for Ribble Valley, comparing 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2015.

| IMD                                | Rank of Average Rank | Rank of Average Score | Proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10% nationally | Rank of proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10% nationally | Rank of Extent | Rank of Local Concentration |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|---|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 2004                               | 283                  | 288                   |   |   | 298            | 318                         |
| 2007                               | 296                  | 302                   |   |   | 309            | 332                         |
| 2010                               | 285                  | 290                   |   |   | 294            | 312                         |
| 2015                               | 290                  | 292                   | 0   | 200   | 302            | 309                         |
| Difference*<br>2004 – 2007         | -13                  | -14                   |   |   | -11            | -14                         |
| Difference*<br>2007 - 2010         | 11                   | 12                    |   |   | 15             | 20                          |
| <b>Difference*<br/>2010 - 2015</b> | <b>-5</b>            | <b>-2</b>             |   |   | <b>-8</b>      | <b>3</b>                    |

\* A positive number highlights an increase in relative deprivation; a negative number highlights a relative decrease in deprivation.

4.5 Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015, borough level summary ranks for local authorities in Lancashire can be found in the table below.

4.6 Looking at the Rank of Average Score - four of Lancashire's local authorities fall into the 10% most deprived in the country. Blackpool is the most deprived local authority in the county. Its deprivation ranking has fallen from 6th out of 326 local authorities in 2010 to 1<sup>st</sup>. Burnley is the second most deprived with its ranking falling from 11<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup>. The percentage of Lancashire LSOAs falling into the most deprived 10% in the country has increased from 4.74% to 4.93% (2010 to 2015). The percentage of Lancashire LSOAs falling into the most affluent 10% has decreased, from 1.72% to 1.7%.

| LA NAME                       | Rank of Average Rank | Rank of Average Score | Rank of Extent | Rank of Local Concentration | Rank of proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10% nationally |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Blackburn with Darwen         | 24                   | 15                    | 13             | 20                          | 12  |
| Blackpool                     | 4                    | 1                     | 12             | 1                           | 7   |
| Burnley District              | 17                   | 9                     | 16             | 8                           | 9   |
| Chorley District              | 186                  | 175                   | 146            | 137                         | 125   |
| Fylde District                | 218                  | 217                   | 196            | 191                         | 174   |
| Hyndburn District             | 28                   | 26                    | 24             | 41                          | 22  |
| Lancaster District            | 125                  | 105                   | 100            | 36                          | 80  |
| Pendle District               | 42                   | 38                    | 31             | 62                          | 18  |
| Preston District              | 72                   | 61                    | 46             | 60                          | 53  |
| <b>Ribble Valley District</b> | <b>290</b>           | <b>292</b>            | <b>302</b>     | <b>309</b>                  | <b>200</b>  |
| Rosendale District            | 98                   | 108                   | 109            | 117                         | 119   |
| South Ribble District         | 234                  | 229                   | 208            | 201                         | 156   |
| West Lancashire District      | 164                  | 139                   | 121            | 75                          | 99  |
| Wyre District                 | 167                  | 145                   | 141            | 61                          | 67  |

4.7 Further examining the 'rank of average score', the local authority that appears to have seen the biggest relative increase in its deprivation rank is Fylde, which ranked 236<sup>th</sup> most deprived in 2010 and is now the 217<sup>th</sup> most deprived local authority.

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for full description of the summaries

**Changes in rank on the 'rank of average score' summary for local authorities in Lancashire.**

|                       | 2015 Rank of Average Score | 2010 Rank of Average Score | Difference |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Chorley               | 175                        | 156                        | -19        |
| South Ribble          | 229                        | 206                        | -23        |
| Fylde                 | 217                        | 236                        | 19         |
| <b>Ribble Valley</b>  | <b>292</b>                 | <b>290</b>                 | <b>-2</b>  |
| Pendle                | 38                         | 33                         | -5         |
| Burnley               | 9                          | 11                         | 2          |
| Wyre                  | 145                        | 163                        | 18         |
| Blackpool             | 1                          | 6                          | 5          |
| Hyndburn              | 26                         | 34                         | 8          |
| West Lancashire       | 139                        | 136                        | -3         |
| Preston               | 61                         | 45                         | -16        |
| Lancaster             | 105                        | 116                        | 11         |
| Blackburn with Darwen | 15                         | 17                         | 2          |
| Rossendale            | 108                        | 98                         | -10        |

(A positive number highlights an increase in relative deprivation; a negative number highlights a relative decrease in deprivation).

4.8 Local authority measures can provide useful summaries of deprivation in local areas. One measure that is used widely is the proportion of LSOAs in a local authority amongst the 10 per cent most deprived in England. Ribble Valley has 0.125 amongst the most deprived 10% nationally in the Barriers to Housing and Services and Living Environment components.

| Ribble Valley BC                          | Average rank | Rank of average rank | Average score | Rank of average score | Proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10% nationally | Rank of Proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10% nationally | Scale   | Rank of scale |
|---|--------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---|---|---------|---------------|
| Income                                    | 7189.41      | 315                  | 0.062         | 316                   | 0   | 211   | 3521    | 323           |
| Employment                                | 9550.24      | 268                  | 0.07          | 268                   | 0   | 200   | 2195.25 | 315           |
| Education Skills and Training             | 7181.44      | 316                  | 7.012         | 318                   | 0   | 257   |         |               |
| Health Deprivation                        | 10652.89     | 218                  | -0.463        | 212                   | 0   | 173   |         |               |
| Crime                                     | 7870.25      | 292                  | -0.701        | 296                   | 0   | 220   |         |               |
| Barriers to Housing and Services          | 13909.55     | 230                  | 19.576        | 208                   | 0.125   | 88  |         |               |
| Living Environment                        | 17732.44     | 113                  | 22.871        | 111                   | 0.125   | 84  |         |               |
| Income deprivation affecting children     | 5358.03      | 325                  | 0.057         | 325                   | 0   | 233   |         |               |
| Income deprivation affecting older people | 7712.81      | 300                  | 0.087         | 302                   | 0   | 183   |         |               |

- All of the domains have been examined to see if any of Ribble Valley's 40 LSOA fall into the 10 per cent most deprived. The following notable results were found (please see Appendix B for full results):
  - Employment –
    - ◆ 2 LSOAs fall in the bottom 30 per cent (1 in Whalley ward and 1 in Littlemoor ward)
  - Health –
    - ◆ 2 LSOAs fall in the bottom 30 per cent (1 in Edisford and Low Moor ward and 1 in Littlemoor ward)
  - Crime –
    - ◆ 1 LSOA falls in the bottom 30 per cent (1 in Littlemoor ward)
  - Education, skills and training (subdomain Children and Young People) –
    - ◆ 3 LSOAs fall in the bottom 30 per cent (1 in Edisford and Low Moor ward, 1 in Primrose ward and 1 in Littlemoor ward)
  - Barriers to Housing and Services –
    - ◆ 5 LSOAs fall in the bottom 10 per cent (Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley, 1 in Billington and Old Langho ward, Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn, Gisburn and Rimington, 1 in Waddington and West Bradford ward)
    - ◆ 3 LSOAs fall in the bottom 20 per cent (1 in Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave ward, 1 in Wilpshire, Wiswell and Pendleton)
    - ◆ 3 LSOAs fall in the bottom 30 per cent (Chipping, 1 in Mellor ward, 1 in Whalley ward)
  - Barriers to Housing and Services (sub domain geographical barriers) –
    - ◆ 11 LSOAs fall in the bottom 10 per cent (Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley, 1 in Billington and Old Langho ward, Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn, Chipping, 1 in Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave ward, Gisburn and Rimington, 1 in Mellor ward, 1 in Waddington and West Bradford ward, 1 in Whalley ward, 1 in Wilpshire ward, Wiswell and Pendleton)
    - ◆ 5 LSOAs fall in the bottom 20 per cent (1 in Alston and Hothersall ward, 1 in Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave ward, Ribchester, 1 in Waddington and West Bradford ward, and 1 in Wilpshire ward)
    - ◆ 4 LSOAs fall in the bottom 30 per cent (1 in Billington and Old Langho ward, 1 in Derby and Thornley ward, 1 in Langho ward, 1 in Primrose ward)
  - Living Environment –
    - ◆ 5 LSOA falls in the bottom 10 per cent (Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley, Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn, Chipping, Gisburn Rimington, 1 in Primrose ward)
    - ◆ 5 LSOAs fall in the bottom 30 per cent (1 in Derby and Thornley ward, 1 in Littlemoor ward, Ribchester, and both in Waddington and West Bradford ward)
  - Living Environment – (sub domain Indoors)
    - ◆ 5 LSOA falls in the bottom 10 per cent (Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley, Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn, Chipping, Gisburn Rimington, and 1 in Primrose ward)
    - ◆ 5 LSOAs fall in the bottom 20 per cent (1 in Derby and Thornley ward, 1 in Read and Simonstone ward, Ribchester, and both in Waddington and West Bradford ward)
    - ◆ 8 LSOAs fall in the bottom 30 per cent (1 in Alston and Hothersall ward, Chatburn, 1 in Clayton-le-Dale ward, 1 in Derby and Thornley ward, 1 in Edisford and Low Moor ward, both in Littlemoor ward, and Wiswell and Pendleton)
  - Rank of Index of Multiple Deprivation –
    - ◆ 1 LSOA falls in the bottom 40 per cent (1 of the LSOAs in Littlemoor ward)

## 5 USE OF THE DATA

5.1 A series of ward profiles have been produced that summarise a variety of information which is available at ward level. This information covers:

- Population, age and ethnicity;
- Deprivation – this has been updated to now reflect the 2015 Indices of Multiple Deprivation;
- Mosaic data;
- Education;
- Employment/Unemployment;
- Health;
- Housing and Tenure and;
- Crime.

5.2 The ward profiles can be found on the Council's website -

[https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/info/200396/performance\\_and\\_statistics/1641/ward\\_profiles](https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/info/200396/performance_and_statistics/1641/ward_profiles)

## 6 RISK ASSESSMENT

6.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – None identified.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None identified.
- Political – None identified.
- Reputation – None identified.
- Equality & Diversity – None identified.

**Michelle Haworth**  
PRINCIPAL POLICY AND  
PERFORMANCE OFFICER

**Jane Pearson**  
DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

PF3-16/MH/AC  
14 January 2016

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

For further information please ask for Michelle Haworth, extension 4421

## Components

Each domain contains a number of components as listed below.

- **Income** - measures the proportion of the population in an area experiencing deprivation related to low income. Calculated by summing the following 5 indicators:
  - Adults and children in Income Support families
  - Adults and children in Income-Based Jobseeker's Allowance families
  - Adults and children in Pension Credit (Guarantee) families
  - Adults and children in Child Tax Credit families (who are not in receipt of Income Support, Income-Based Jobseeker's Allowance or Pension Credit) whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60 per cent of the median before housing costs
  - Asylum seekers in England in receipt of subsistence support, accommodation support, or both.
- **Employment** - measures employment deprivation in an area conceptualised as involuntary exclusion of the working age population from the labour market. Calculated by summing the following 7 indicators:
  - Claimants of Jobseeker's Allowance (both Contributory and Income-Based) women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64, averaged over 4 quarters
  - Claimants of Incapacity Benefit women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64, averaged over 4 quarters
  - Claimants of Severe Disablement Allowance women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64, averaged over 4 quarters
  - Claimants of Employment Support Allowance women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64
  - Participants in New Deal for the 18-24s who are not in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance, averaged over 4 quarters
  - Participants in New Deal for 25+ who are not in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance, averaged over 4 quarters
  - Participants in New Deal for Lone Parents (after initial interview) aged over 18, averaged over 4 quarters.
- **Health and Disability** - measures premature death and the impairment of quality of life by poor health. It considers both physical and mental health. The domain measures morbidity, disability and premature mortality but not aspects of behaviour or environment that may be predictive of future health deprivation. 4 indicators are used to calculate this domain:
  - Years of Potential Life Lost – an age and sex standardised measure of premature death
  - Comparative Illness and Disability Ratio – an age and sex standardised measure of morbidity and disability
  - Measures of acute morbidity – an age and sex standardised rate of emergency admissions to hospital
  - Proportion of adults under 60 suffering from mood or anxiety disorders – a modelled indicator for the proportion of adults suffering from mood and anxiety disorders.
- **Education Skills and Training** - measures the extent of deprivation in terms of education, skills and training in an area. The indicators are structured into two sub-domains: one relating to children and young people and one relating to adult skills. 7 indicators are used to calculate this domain:
  - Sub-domain: Children/young people

- ◆ Average points score of pupils taking English, Maths and Science Key Stage 2 exams
- ◆ Average points score of pupils taking English, Maths and Science Key Stage 3 exams
- ◆ Average capped points score of pupils taking Key Stage 4 (GCSE or equivalent) exams
- ◆ Proportion of young people *not* staying on in school or non-advanced education above age 16
- ◆ Secondary school absence rate – the proportion of authorised and unauthorised absences from secondary school
- ◆ Proportion of those aged under 21 *not* entering Higher Education.
- Sub-domain: Skills
  - ◆ Proportion of adults aged 25-54 with no or low qualifications.
- **Barriers to Housing and Other Services** - measures the physical and financial accessibility of housing and key local services. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: 'geographical barriers', which relate to the physical proximity of local services, and 'wider barriers' which includes issues relating to access to housing such as affordability. Seven indicators are combined to calculate this domain:
  - Sub-domain: Wider barriers
    - ◆ Household overcrowding – the proportion of households within an LSOA which are judged to have insufficient space to meet the household's needs
    - ◆ Homelessness – the rate of acceptances for housing assistance under the homelessness provisions of the 1996 Housing Act (at local authority district level)
    - ◆ Difficulty of access to owner-occupation (local authority district level) – proportion of households aged under 35 whose income means they are unable to afford to enter owner occupation.
  - Sub-domain: Geographical barriers
    - ◆ Road distance to a GP surgery
    - ◆ Road distance to a supermarket or convenience store
    - ◆ Road distance to a primary school
    - ◆ Road distance to a Post Office.
- **Crime** - measures the rate of recorded crime in an area for four major crime types representing the risk of personal and material victimisation at a small area level.
  - Violence – number of reported violent crimes (19 reported crime types) per 1000 at risk population
  - Burglary – number of reported burglaries (4 reported crime types) per 1000 at risk population
  - Theft – number of reported thefts (5 reported crime types) per 1000 at risk population
  - Criminal damage – number of reported crimes (11 reported crime types) per 1000 at risk population.
- **Living Environment** - measures the quality of individuals' immediate surroundings both within and outside the home. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: the 'indoors' living environment, which measures the quality of housing, and the 'outdoors' living environment which contains two measures relating to air quality and road traffic accidents. 4 indicators are combined to calculate this domain:
  - Sub-domain: The indoors living environment
    - ◆ Social and private housing in poor condition
    - ◆ Houses without central heating
  - Sub-domain: The outdoors living environment



- ◆ Air quality
- ◆ Road traffic accidents

### **Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2015**

The Indices of Deprivation 2015 provide a set of relative measures of deprivation for small areas (Lower-layer Super Output Areas) across England, based on seven domains of deprivation. The domains were combined using the following weights to produce the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD):

- Income Deprivation (22.5%)
- Employment Deprivation (22.5%)
- Education, Skills and Training Deprivation (13.5%)
- Health Deprivation and Disability (13.5%)
- Crime (9.3%)
- Barriers to Housing and Services (9.3%)
- Living Environment Deprivation (9.3%)

### **Description of the summary measures**

Summaries of the 2015 IMD lower super output area level data are provided at local authority level, these are:

- **Average score** - Population weighted average of the combined scores for the LSOAs in a larger area. The average score summary measure is calculated by averaging the LSOA scores in each larger area after they have been population weighted. The resultant scores for the larger areas are then ranked, where the rank of 1 (most deprived) is given to the area with the highest score. This gives a measure of the whole area covering both deprived and non-deprived areas. The main difference from the average rank measure described below is that more deprived LSOAs tend to have more 'extreme' scores than ranks. So highly deprived areas will not tend to average out to the same extent as when using ranks; highly polarised areas will therefore tend to score higher on the average score measure than on the average rank.
- **Average rank** - Population weighted average of the combined ranks for the LSOAs in a larger area. This measure is calculated by averaging all of the LSOA ranks in each larger area after they have been population weighted. The 'average rank' scores for the larger areas are then ranked, where the rank of 1 (most deprived) is given to the area with the highest score. (For the purpose of calculating the score for the larger area, LSOAs are ranked such that the most deprived LSOA is given the rank of 32,844.) The nature of this measure – using all areas, and using ranks rather than scores – means that a highly polarised larger area would not tend to score highly, because extremely deprived and less deprived LSOAs will 'average out'. Conversely, a larger area that is more uniformly deprived will tend to score highly on the measure.
- **Proportion of Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in most deprived 10% nationally** - Proportion of a larger area's LSOAs that fall in the most deprived 10% of LSOAs nationally. The score is the proportion of the larger area's LSOAs that fall in the most deprived 10% of LSOAs nationally. The scores for the larger areas are then ranked, where the rank of 1 (most deprived) is given to the area with the highest score. (Larger areas which have no LSOAs in the most deprived 10 per cent of all such areas in England have a score of zero for this summary measure). By contrast to the average rank and average score measures, this measure focuses only on the most deprived LSOAs.
- **Extent** - Proportion of a larger area's population living in the most deprived LSOAs in the country. This is a weighted measure of the population in the most deprived 30 per cent of all areas:

- ◆ The population living in the most deprived 10 per cent of LSOAs in England receive a 'weight' of 1.0;
  - ◆ The population living in the most deprived 11 to 30 per cent of LSOAs receive a sliding weight, ranging from 0.95 for those in the eleventh percentile, to 0.05 for those in the thirtieth percentile.
  - ◆ The 'extent' scores for the larger areas are then ranked, where the rank of 1 (most deprived) is given to the area with the highest score. (Higher-level areas which have no LSOAs in the most deprived 30 per cent of all areas in England have a score of zero for this summary measure.) The extent measure is a more sophisticated version of the proportion of LSOAs in the most deprived 10 per cent nationally measure, and is designed to avoid the sharp cut-off seen in that measure, whereby areas ranked only a single place outside the most deprived 10 per cent are not counted at all.
- **Scale** - Income Scale is the number of people who are income deprived; Employment Scale is the number of people who are employment deprived. These measures are designed to give an indication of the number of people experiencing income deprivation and employment deprivation in the local area. For example, if two districts have the same percentage of income deprived people, the larger district will be ranked as more deprived on the income scale measure because more people are experiencing the deprivation.
  - **Local concentration** - Population weighted average of the ranks of a larger area's most deprived LSOAs that contain exactly 10% of the larger area's population. The 'local concentration' score for the larger area is ranked, where the rank of 1 (most deprived) is given to the area with the highest score. (For the purpose of calculating the score for the larger area, LSOAs are first ranked such that the most deprived LSOA is given the rank of 32,844.) Similar to the proportion of LSOAs in the most deprived 10 per cent nationally and extent measures, the local concentration measure is based on only the most deprived LSOAs in the larger area, rather than on all areas. By contrast to these measures however, the local concentration measure gives additional weight to very highly deprived areas.

### Further Information on the Indices of Deprivation

- Since their original publication, the Indices of Deprivation have been used widely for a range of purposes. The Indices of Deprivation can be used for identifying areas with high levels of deprivation or areas with specific issues, such as health, that may not be considered deprived on the overall index. Local authorities or other larger geographies can also be compared by, for instance, looking at the proportion of the 10% most deprived LSOAs contained within each of the areas. Cut-offs other than the 10% most deprived may also be appropriate depending on the use being made of the summary.
- The Indices are central to the evidence base for regeneration policy in England and help target limited resources appropriately. As a composite index, the Index of Multiple Deprivation fits well with moves from Government to take a holistic approach to developing local services. The fact that the Indices cover a range of domains means that they will also be useful for driving forward policies to address local priorities.
- Previous versions of the Indices have been used by central Government as a criterion for allocating resources efficiently for programmes such as regeneration, and neighbourhood renewal, identifying disadvantaged pupils for additional support or allocating grants to community groups. Key users of the Indices are local authorities where the Indices are used to identify the local areas with the greatest level of need for support or intervention. Examples include analysing community safety data to evaluate neighbourhood policing and partnerships, using the Indices as local measures of community cohesion, investigating patterns of 'risk of youth offending', identifying the greatest health inequalities between the most and least deprived populations or for context in community safety strategic assessments.

- The Indices also allows communities to compare their areas with similar, or nearby areas on a range of nationally consistent measures. This helps residents to gauge their relative levels of deprivation, assess whether progress is being made and hold relevant authorities accountable.
- Most of the data used in the Indices of Deprivation 2015 relates to the tax year 2012/13 - see Chapter 4 of the Technical Report for more details.
- All of the data files and supporting documents for the English Indices of Deprivation 2015 are available from: [www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015](http://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015)
- The Indices of Deprivation 2015 have been published using the Open Government License (OGL) version 3.0, see [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/)
- The Indices of Deprivation 2015 have been constructed for the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) by Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion (OCSI).
- For statistical enquiries, please contact: [indices.deprivation@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:indices.deprivation@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

| LSOA      | Ward                            | Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Income Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Supplementary Indices  |   | Employment Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Health Deprivation and Disability Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Crime Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Education, Skills and Training Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Sub-divisions   |  | Barriers to Housing and Services Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Sub-divisions   |  | Living Environment Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Sub-divisions   |  |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
|           |                                 |  |   | Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Income Deprivation Affecting Older People (IDAOPI) Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) |   |  |  |   | Children and Young People Sub-domain Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Adult Skills Sub-domain Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) |   | Geographical Barriers Sub-domain Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Wider Barriers Sub-domain Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) |   | Indoors Sub-domain Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) | Outdoors Sub-domain Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs) |
| E01025315 | Aighton, Bailey and Chaigley    | 6  | 10  | 10   | 9   | 10  | 9  | 10   | 10  | 9   | 9  | 1   | 1   | 9  | 1   | 1   | 8  |
| E01025316 | Alston and Hothersall           | 10   | 10  | 10   | 8   | 10  | 6  | 10   | 9   | 10  | 8  | 6   | 2   | 10   | 7   | 6   | 9  |
| E01025317 | Alston and Hothersall           | 8  | 8   | 7  | 9   | 8   | 6  | 9  | 8   | 9   | 7  | 8   | 4   | 9  | 4   | 3   | 9  |
| E01025318 | Billington and Old Langho       | 9  | 8   | 9  | 7   | 8   | 6  | 10   | 8   | 7   | 8  | 7   | 3   | 10   | 5   | 4   | 6  |
| E01025319 | Billington and Old Langho       | 9  | 9   | 9  | 10  | 10  | 10   | 10   | 10  | 10  | 10   | 1   | 1   | 10   | 7   | 5   | 9  |
| E01025320 | Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn   | 5  | 10  | 10   | 9   | 8   | 8  | 8  | 8   | 8   | 7  | 1   | 1   | 10   | 1   | 1   | 10   |
| E01025321 | Chatburn                        | 8  | 7   | 8  | 7   | 7   | 6  | 10   | 8   | 8   | 7  | 9   | 5   | 9  | 4   | 3   | 6  |
| E01025322 | Chipping                        | 8  | 10  | 10   | 9   | 10  | 9  | 10   | 8   | 8   | 8  | 3   | 1   | 10   | 1   | 1   | 8  |
| E01025323 | Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave | 8  | 9   | 9  | 8   | 9   | 9  | 8  | 9   | 10  | 9  | 2   | 1   | 10   | 4   | 3   | 8  |
| E01025324 | Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave | 9  | 10  | 10   | 9   | 8   | 8  | 7  | 9   | 9   | 9  | 4   | 2   | 10   | 7   | 7   | 5  |
| E01025325 | Derby and Thornley              | 6  | 5   | 6  | 4   | 7   | 4  | 6  | 5   | 4   | 5  | 10  | 10  | 7  | 5   | 3   | 7  |
| E01025326 | Derby and Thornley              | 7  | 8   | 8  | 8   | 8   | 6  | 4  | 8   | 8   | 8  | 6   | 3   | 9  | 3   | 2   | 8  |
| E01025327 | Dilworth                        | 10   | 9   | 10   | 9   | 9   | 7  | 9  | 8   | 8   | 8  | 9   | 5   | 10   | 8   | 6   | 9  |
| E01025328 | Dilworth                        | 10   | 9   | 8  | 8   | 10  | 9  | 8  | 9   | 8   | 8  | 10  | 9   | 10   | 7   | 6   | 7  |
| E01025329 | Edisford and Low Moor           | 5  | 5   | 6  | 6   | 4   | 3  | 8  | 4   | 3   | 5  | 9   | 5   | 9  | 8   | 6   | 9  |
| E01025330 | Edisford and Low Moor           | 6  | 6   | 9  | 5   | 5   | 5  | 6  | 7   | 6   | 8  | 9   | 6   | 8  | 4   | 3   | 7  |
| E01025331 | Gisburn, Rimington              | 5  | 9   | 9  | 9   | 8   | 9  | 7  | 8   | 9   | 7  | 1   | 1   | 10   | 1   | 1   | 9  |
| E01025332 | Langho                          | 10   | 10  | 10   | 10  | 10  | 8  | 10   | 10  | 10  | 10   | 10  | 6   | 10   | 9   | 9   | 8  |
| E01025333 | Langho                          | 8  | 8   | 10   | 8   | 5   | 7  | 8  | 9   | 9   | 9  | 6   | 3   | 10   | 7   | 6   | 7  |
| E01025334 | Littlemoor                      | 6  | 5   | 5  | 6   | 5   | 6  | 5  | 8   | 8   | 8  | 9   | 4   | 10   | 5   | 3   | 9  |
| E01025335 | Littlemoor                      | 4  | 4   | 5  | 4   | 3   | 3  | 3  | 4   | 3   | 4  | 9   | 7   | 6  | 3   | 3   | 4  |
| E01025336 | Mellor                          | 10   | 10  | 9  | 10  | 9   | 9  | 10   | 10  | 10  | 10   | 3   | 1   | 10   | 7   | 5   | 10   |
| E01025337 | Mellor                          | 10   | 9   | 10   | 9   | 9   | 7  | 10   | 10  | 10  | 10   | 8   | 4   | 10   | 6   | 5   | 7  |
| E01025338 | Primrose                        | 6  | 7   | 8  | 5   | 6   | 7  | 5  | 7   | 7   | 6  | 10  | 8   | 9  | 1   | 1   | 5  |
| E01025339 | Primrose                        | 7  | 6   | 7  | 6   | 6   | 6  | 7  | 5   | 3   | 7  | 7   | 3   | 9  | 6   | 5   | 9  |
| E01025340 | Read and Simonstone             | 9  | 8   | 8  | 8   | 9   | 9  | 8  | 9   | 9   | 9  | 9   | 5   | 10   | 4   | 2   | 8  |
| E01025341 | Read and Simonstone             | 10   | 10  | 10   | 10  | 10  | 10   | 7  | 10  | 10  | 10   | 9   | 5   | 10   | 9   | 8   | 8  |
| E01025342 | Ribchester                      | 9  | 9   | 9  | 8   | 10  | 9  | 10   | 9   | 8   | 9  | 6   | 2   | 9  | 3   | 2   | 9  |
| E01025343 | Sabden                          | 9  | 8   | 8  | 7   | 7   | 7  | 9  | 7   | 6   | 8  | 10  | 8   | 9  | 6   | 4   | 9  |
| E01025344 | St Mary's                       | 8  | 7   | 9  | 7   | 7   | 7  | 8  | 9   | 8   | 8  | 10  | 9   | 8  | 6   | 4   | 7  |
| E01025345 | St Mary's                       | 10   | 10  | 10   | 10  | 9   | 8  | 9  | 9   | 9   | 9  | 9   | 5   | 10   | 7   | 6   | 7  |
| E01025346 | Salthill                        | 9  | 8   | 9  | 9   | 7   | 7  | 7  | 9   | 9   | 8  | 10  | 5   | 10   | 5   | 4   | 7  |
| E01025347 | Salthill                        | 7  | 6   | 7  | 6   | 5   | 7  | 7  | 8   | 7   | 8  | 8   | 4   | 9  | 7   | 6   | 7  |
| E01025348 | Waddington and West Bradford    | 8  | 9   | 10   | 9   | 9   | 9  | 10   | 8   | 8   | 8  | 4   | 2   | 10   | 3   | 2   | 8  |
| E01025349 | Waddington and West Bradford    | 8  | 10  | 10   | 9   | 9   | 9  | 9  | 10  | 10  | 9  | 1   | 1   | 10   | 3   | 2   | 9  |
| E01025350 | Whalley                         | 10   | 9   | 10   | 7   | 8   | 8  | 8  | 10  | 9   | 10   | 9   | 5   | 10   | 7   | 7   | 6  |
| E01025351 | Whalley                         | 6  | 8   | 10   | 9   | 3   | 6  | 8  | 9   | 10  | 7  | 3   | 1   | 10   | 6   | 4   | 8  |
| E01025352 | Wilpshire                       | 10   | 10  | 10   | 10  | 10  | 10   | 9  | 10  | 10  | 9  | 2   | 1   | 10   | 10  | 10  | 9  |
| E01025353 | Wilpshire                       | 10   | 10  | 10   | 10  | 9   | 9  | 9  | 10  | 10  | 10   | 4   | 2   | 10   | 8   | 7   | 8  |
| E01025354 | Wiswell and Pendleton           | 8  | 10  | 10   | 10  | 8   | 9  | 8  | 10  | 10  | 10   | 2   | 1   | 10   | 4   | 3   | 8  |