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Disadvantaged Communities

• An urban pattern: almost all (98%) of the most deprived 10% of LSOAs in England are in urban areas (IMD 2010)
• ‘Intrinsic features’ (location, economic history, housing history and stock) underpin concentrated disadvantage, ‘acquired features’ (e.g. population composition, services) modify it
Inner Urban – industrial workers housing

- Inner neighbourhoods of major cities
- Always housing the urban poor
- ‘first foothold’ for migrants
- Several waves of redevelopment
- High density of housing and population
- Close to city centres
- Often cut through by arterial routes
- Usually low car ownership
Inner Urban – formerly more affluent

- Inner neighbourhoods or inner suburbs of major cities
- In 1800s artisan or managerial and professional housing – later ‘run-down’ as these people moved to suburbs
- Not worst housing so less likely to have been redeveloped
- Low income owner-occupation/private renting
- High density of housing and population
- Close to city centres
- Often cut through by arterial routes
- Usually low car ownership
Inner Urban – formerly more affluent

- Inner neighbourhoods or inner suburbs of major cities
- In 1800s artisan or managerial and professional housing – later ‘run-down’ as these people moved to suburbs
- Not worst housing so less likely to have been redeveloped
- Low income owner-occupation/private renting
- High density of housing and population
- Close to city centres
- Often cut through by arterial routes
- Usually low car ownership
Outer urban overspill/expansion/growth

- Built from 1920s – 1980s to house people from slum clearance or for new industrial expansion
- Always poor
- High proportion of social housing
- Often lacking local shops and amenities
- City-edge locations
- Low density housing
- Higher car ownership for those who can afford
- Bus routes go into and round estates (not passing by)
Small industrial town

• Typically peripheral locations – small communities based on single industry
• Outside major conurbations (and PTEs)
• Considerable distance from major employment centres
• Higher car ownership for those who can afford
• Mixed housing (estates and street properties)
• Have suffered severe population decline
Rapid Decline

• “It all went very quickly once the jobs went”
• “The place got torn to shreds. Everything’s gone, the houses, the shops, everything”
Difficult to generalise

• Disadvantaged communities vary enormously in location, housing type, density, connectivity, services, ethnic composition, social capital etc.
• Long recognised in policy that solutions have to be based on close local knowledge (and locally owned), yet transformatory interventions almost always decided at higher spatial levels: issues of governance, power, voice [transport a key example]
Regional Breakdown (%, selected regions) of Most Deprived LSOAs (depending on cut-off)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and The Humber</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCLG English Indices of Deprivation 2010
Some generalisations!

Issues for Low Income Neighbourhoods
Lower incomes- but not for everyone

• Median income in the most deprived tenth of areas is £281, compared with £396 for England as a whole, and £533 in the least deprived tenth of areas.

• Median hourly wages are 40% less in the poorest 10\textsuperscript{th} than richest 10\textsuperscript{th} of areas. Issues for some with low quality employment.

• But only 38% of the people living in the poorest 10\% of areas are ‘income deprived’

Sources: National Equality Panel, CLG Indices of Deprivation
Low employment levels, more people sick or caring

Source: LFS 2006-2008
## Environmental and Social Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical environment</th>
<th>Private sector services</th>
<th>Public sector services</th>
<th>Sense of power, control and inclusion</th>
<th>Social organisation</th>
<th>Social order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empty housing and shops</td>
<td>No bank</td>
<td>Failing schools</td>
<td>Sense of area decline</td>
<td>Reduced social networks</td>
<td>High crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to empty buildings</td>
<td>Few shops</td>
<td>Poor standard of housing and repairs</td>
<td>Mistrust of public service providers</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>High shop prices</td>
<td>Feeling of inferiority vis-à-vis professionals</td>
<td>Divided community</td>
<td>Neighbour intimidation and aggression</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumped household rubbish and goods</td>
<td>‘No-go’ area for taxis and newspaper delivery</td>
<td>Low take-up rates</td>
<td>Mistrust of neighbours</td>
<td>Drug dealing</td>
<td>cars/bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used needles</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>Sense of being ‘no good’ because of bad reputation of area</td>
<td>High levels of mental ill-health</td>
<td>High levels of truancy and exclusion</td>
<td>Neighbourhood intimidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalised bus shelters and lights</td>
<td>Overgrown hedges and verges</td>
<td>High levels of mental health</td>
<td>Unsupervised children and youth</td>
<td>Unsupervised children and youth</td>
<td>Nuisance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken fences</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lupton, 2003, based on observations and interviews in 12 of the most disadvantaged areas in England and Wales
The core problem

• People with the fewest resources are concentrated in neighbourhoods with the fewest resources
• More to cope with, personally and in the area
• More challenges to taking up services and opportunities
• “Those who report experiencing a higher level of street level incivilities or suffering from the absence of goods also report higher levels of anxiety, depression, poor health and smoking. 23% of those who report a high incidence of street level incivilities say they feel sad or depressed very or fairly often, compared with 13% of those with a low incidence.”

• “Further, those who report a higher level of street level incivilities or the absence of goods are also less trustful of others, more resigned about the difficulties of their area, and report more fear of crime. Whereas 80% of those who report a low level of street level incivilities say they feel safe walking in their neighbourhood during the day, only 46% of those who report a high level of incivilities say they feel safe.”

Source: Environment Group Research Findings No.25/2005 Public Attitudes and Environmental Justice in Scotland
Trends

• Because ‘intrinsic’ features underpin concentrated deprivation:
  – Highly stable patterns e.g. (88%) of the most deprived areas in the same decile in both 2010 and 2007
  – Spatial concentration tends to increase when overall inequality rises (Dorling et al. 2007)
  – Gaps widen and narrow with the economic cycle

• But policy interventions do help:
  – Power (2009 and others) points to combined impacts of multiple local level interventions on improved living environments and prospects
Some observations on transport issues and their interaction with these economic and social problems
The urban nature of disadvantaged neighbourhoods means they are often ostensibly well connected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMD</th>
<th>% of working age people accessible to employment centres (without car)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived 10th</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^{nd}</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3^{rd}</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4^{th}</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5^{th}</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6^{th}</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7^{th}</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8^{th}</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9^{th}</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived 10th</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from DfT Core Accessibility Indicators – weighted for ease of travel.
% people who think transport is bad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If in 10% most deprived wards (IMD)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In worst 10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in worst 10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACORN category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affluent suburban and rural areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent family areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent urban area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature home-owning areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New home owning area</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council estates and low income areas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether ACORN 'deprived area'</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not deprived</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: English Housing Survey
But it is hard to generalise

• Friends of the Earth did a detailed mapping of transport and social exclusion in Bradford in 2001. They showed:
  – All disadvantaged areas had bus routes, but some very circuitous
  – Most areas of low car ownership had bus routes, but some didn’t

• Ongoing LSE/Warwick research on employment in low income areas shows different levels of labour market connectivity for poor neighbourhoods within cities
Map I
Bus routes and Areas of Stress

This map shows that Bradford's Areas of Stress - defined as deprived by Bradford Council - all have at least some level of bus services. Some places have less frequent services, or services which take long or circuitous routes.

Legend:
- At least five buses per hour
- Between two and four buses per hour
- No more than one bus per hour

- Area of stress
- Bradford urban area

0 1 2 3 Kilometers
Example: Cardiff

- Three neighbourhoods under study
- Employers and agencies show strong pre-disposition to employ people who are local to low paid jobs and those involving shift work/anti-social hours
- For potential employees, obvious interactions between wages and cost of travel.
- Analysis using journey planning websites (postcode to postcode) shows that the neighbourhood that appears most isolated (edge of city large social housing area, Area 1) is actually more accessible to more other areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of other postcodes reachable in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 mins by bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- City Centre jobs (ie certain sectors and types of firm) will be more accessible by bus/one bus
- Further analysis underway looking at actual vacancies per postcode
Accessibility goes beyond cost and availability

• Housing density– low density estates can involve long walks to and from the bus stop (or multiple circuitous stops)
• Safety
• Limited travel horizons
• Health
• Children
• Cultural restrictions

• ... so increasing connectivity requires knowledge of local issues
Too many journeys?

• Poor quality services may increase need to travel:
  – Single-handed GP surgeries, no specialist clinics
  – Poor quality schools (and school choice regimes)
  – Expensive and poorly stocked local shops

• Poorer people more likely to draw on specialist services e.g. hospitals

• So we need to think about impact of poverty on the journeys that people need to make as well as the means of making those journeys
Traffic is a concern in low income areas

- Children are more likely to play out
  - Higher child density
  - Fewer cars so more pedestrian journeys
  - Fewer gardens and a ‘playing out’ culture

- Some areas have problems with joy riding/speeding motorbikes

- Children in the ten per cent most deprived wards in England are more than three times as likely to be pedestrian casualties as those in the ten per cent least deprived wards (Grayling et al. 2002)
Concluding Remarks

- Low income neighbourhoods are typically urban: transport/accessibility issues may be greater for low income individuals outside these areas or for small rural pockets of deprivation.
- But the issues are localised: is there a lack of close local analysis (neighbourhood transport audits?)
- The tensions between accessibility, safety and environment are almost certainly more acute than in more affluent neighbourhoods.
- Accessibility is a complex issue that goes beyond existence of provision.
- We need to understand how poverty makes people travel as well as how it stops them, and how we can make neighbourhoods simultaneously more accessible and safer.