

The Geography of Inequalities

Submission No. 2 to the Croydon Opportunity and Fairness Commission

Contents

Page

| | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Introduction |
| 3 | Appendix 1. Social Deprivation in Croydon 2001-3 |
| 11 | Appendix 2. Annual Public Health Report 2015 |
| 13 | - Appendix 1 - Understanding deprivation in Croydon |
| 18 | - Appendix 2 - A View of Croydon |
| 19 | - Appendix 3. What do we know about the people and their lives in Norbury? |

Introduction

1. The Commission will need to root its work in a detailed analysis of inequalities across the Borough, both at ward level, and within wards. The extent to which what is termed ‘multiple deprivation’ has either increased or decreased since 2000 and what the trends are likely to be for the next four to five years will enable the Commission to ensure that its questions to various official agencies, community and voluntary groups, and businesses will be anchored in the realities of deprivation.

2. In February 2004 I finalised a report for the Committee that was setting up the South London Law Centres including in Croydon analysing deprivation with a view to advising on potential locations for law centre premises. I have edited the information relating to Croydon and attach it as Appendix 1.

3. On 27 January the Health, Social Care & Housing and Scrutiny Sub-committee considered possible themes for the Council’s Public Health Report 2015 (<https://secure.croydon.gov.uk/akscroydon/users/public/admin/kab14.pl?operation=SUBMIT&meet=26&cmte=HAS&grpId=public&arc=1>). The Director of Public Health argues the case for concentrating on geographic inequalities with a particular view to being an aid to the Commission. This was subject to a report to the Committee on January. I submitted the commentary in Appendix 2 to Councillors, copied to the Public Health Director, with a short summary as well.

4. I hope these two Appendixes will assist Commission members in their understanding on deprivation and inequalities.

Sean Creighton
Norbury resident
January 2015
sean.creighton1947@btinternet.com

The author has spent his working, community and politically active life on issues relating to poverty, anti-poverty, poor housing and homelessness, housing provision, regeneration, environment, community development and organisation, planning and community/police consultative issues, community engagement and participation, as well as being a historian of aspects of these including Black British History. He has been a Councillor, a member of regeneration boards, an administrator (inc. Committee Secretary) and organiser (e.g. events), a policy researcher and information sharer. He co-ordinates the Croydon Radical and Samuel Coleridge-Taylor networks, reports on developments and events on his two blog sites and in Croydon Citizen. He monitors and shares information in advance on what is under discussion in Council committees on one of his blog sites. He is currently organising several history and cultural events in Croydon.

SOCIAL DEPRIVATION IN CROYDON 2001-3

Introduction

1. This assessment examines the incidence of deprivation in each Croydon. It summarises material relating to where social deprivation appears to be most concentrated.

Measuring Deprivation

2. Measuring deprivation is not an exact science, and is always out of date. The Census 2001 provides an enormous amount of data, but this is still being analysed and local authorities publish detailed results as more data is released by the Government's Office of National Statistics.

Local Authority Deprivation

3. Although Croydon is not in the worst tranche of those marked by social deprivation, there are a number of wards which result in it being included in the 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy Boroughs allocated special funding (the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, Community Empowerment Fund, and the Community and Community Learning Chests).

4. The Government published an analysis of deprivation in 354 English local authorities (Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2000). The Indices are measures of deprivation for every ward and local authority area in England. It combines a number of indicators relating to income, employment, health deprivation and disability, education skills and training, housing and geographical access to services into a single deprivation score for each area. They have been a major tool for planning policy and delivery. (Croydon's) ranking was follows:

| Rank of Av. Ward Ranks | Local Concentration Rank | Borough |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| 174 | 159 | <u>Croydon</u> |

Source: DETR Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2000 (IMD)

5. It should be noted that South London Learning and Skills Council IMD statistics on its website: Table 77. Deprivation ranking of London South LSC boroughs, differ in relation to Rank of Average Ward Ranks from the DETR with no explanation.

6. It should be noted from the rankings of Croydon that the 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Boroughs are not the top 88 by social deprivation ranking. Although this was not explicitly stated when the 88 areas were announced, it is clear that the choice of which to include in the 88 was determined by the wish to include rural areas, small towns as well as inner city areas, and a mix of party political controls.

7. There is currently a Government consultation on the methodology used to construct the 2000 Indices. It is possible that individual Borough rankings will change.

8. It is important to note that each Borough has its own socio-economic characteristics resulting from its historical social, economic and political development. Some contextual social and economic statistics are set out for each Borough in Appendix 1. These show the wide variations between the Boroughs. Further it should be noted that the highest levels of Black and ethnic minorities are located in Wandsworth, Merton and Croydon. 70% of all BME residents in England are in the 88 Neighbourhood Renewal areas. Black and ethnic minorities face greater socio-economic disadvantage.

Ward Deprivation

9. The local authority rankings are based on the concentration of social deprivation indicators at ward level. The more wards showing social deprivation the higher the local authority ranking. It is likely that individual ward rankings within Boroughs will change following the outcome of the Government consultation of the methodology used to construct the indices. As part of its response to the Government, the Greater London Authority has been working on a new approach to London's deprivation indices. If adopted in the form as consulted then it would result in higher deprivation ratings for some of the wards. In 2000 there were 8,414 wards in England. Since then there have been ward adjustments including mergers. The following table sets out the ward rankings of those wards identified (see below) as having high social deprivation levels. Croydon has 8 wards each in the most deprived deciles,

Ranking of Croydon Wards in first three deciles of degree of Deprivation

| Ranking | Ward |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| In Worst 10% Decile: | |
| 578 | Fieldway |
| In 20% Decline: | |
| 1180 | New Addington |
| 1372 | Broad Green |
| In 30% Decile: | |
| 1695 | Whitehorse Manor |
| 1877 | West Thornton |
| 2213 | Thornton Heath |
| 2289 | Upper Norwood |
| 2435 | Bensham Manor |

Source: DETR Indices of Multiple Deprivation. 2000

Problems of Comparability

10. Published descriptions of deprivation are limited. There is a lack of constituency in presentation between each Borough's analyses. Different analyses are produced for different purposes. Even different parts of the same organisation do not keep up-to-date at the same time. e.g. London Central Learning & Skills Council is still using mainly 2001 data, while London South uses mainly 2002 data.

Government Office for London Borough Profile Information on Deprivation

| Borough | LA Authority Deprivation | Deprived wards in Borough | Comments |
|---------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| | Ranking out of 354 | context | |
| Croydon | Not given | Not listed | 'there is significant deprivation in some wards.' |

Source: Borough Profiles. Government Office for London website: www.go-london.co.uk

Borough Level Deprivation

11. The relative deprivation position of each local authority is less relevant than:

- the potential number of users for services
- the geographic areas from which service users are more likely to come
- the geographical areas where it would be sensible to locate services
- the transport access location to services.

in relation to where the ward and smaller area concentrations of deprivation area. The picture presented is therefore a snap shot in time.

| Ward | Advice Need | Deprivation and Additional Information |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Addiscombe | Mental Health, Health & Community Care | |
| Beulah | | 0.5%+ higher unemployment rate than Borough In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Bensham Manor | | In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Broad Green | Welfare Benefits, Employment | 1.5%+ higher unemployment rate than Borough In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Fairfield | Welfare Benefits, Employment, Housing, Health & Community Care | 0.5%+ higher unemployment rate than Borough |
| Fieldway | Debt | 0.5%+ higher unemployment rate than Borough In lowest 10% wards in country for deprivation |
| New Addington | | In lowest 15% wards in country for deprivation |
| Norbury | Health & Community Care | 0.5%+ higher unemployment rate than Borough |
| South Norwood | | 1%+ higher unemployment rate than Borough In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Thornton Heath | Debt | 1.5% higher unemployment rate than Borough |

| | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Upper Norwood | | 0.5%+ higher unemployment rate than Borough In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Waddon | Welfare Benefits, Employment, Health & Community Care | In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| West Thornton | Debt | 1.5% higher unemployment rate than Borough In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Wallington | | 1% higher unemployment rate than Borough |
| Whitehorse Manor | Welfare Benefits, Debt, Mental Health | In lowest 30% of wards in country for deprivation |
| Small areas | Welfare Benefits | Shrublands Estate, Shirley Ward Croftleigh Ave Estate, Kenley |

Sources: Cabinet 3 November 2003. Allocation of the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund for 2004/5 and 2005/6); Croydon's Strategic Partnership: Action Plan 2003-04 (January 2003)

12. It is clear that there is a high concentration of deprivation in Croydon. The Northern Wards with the highest deprivation concentration: Bensham Manor, West Thornton, Thornton Heath, Upper Norwood, plus those in the 4th decile: Waddon, S. Norwood, Norbury, Woodside, Addiscombe, will provide the bulk of the demand for services.

13. **Fieldway and New Addington (Croydon).** The high deprivation rating of these two areas would justify locating services here, especially given their distance from Croydon Town Centre (even though public transport has been improved with Tramlink).

14. **London/Thornton and Brigstock Rds (Croydon).** In terms of the way the public transport system operates, there is no one single suitable location for services in the North Croydon area if Croydon Town Centre proves too expensive. An office at this road junction does at least have the merits of having bus routes from Norbury, Thornton Health, Croydon Town Centre, and Pollards Hill over the border in Merton and parts of Beddington over in Sutton.

Sean Creighton

February 2004

Edited for Croydon Opportunity and Fairness Commission February 2015

A. Population, Employment, Unemployment

| | |
|------------|----------------|
| | Croydon |
| Population | 330,688 |
| Non-white | 29.8 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| Households (rounded) | 138,000 |
| Public Housing Tenure (rounded) | 17.2% |
| Unemployment | 3.8% |
| Professionals | 6% |
| Intermediate occupations | 34% |
| Skilled non-manual | 29% |
| Skilled manual | 17% |
| Partly skilled | 11% |
| Unskilled | 2% |

B Unemployment and Income Support

| Croydon | No. | % |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------|
| Unemployed Claimants | 6,649 | |
| Unemployment Rate | | 3.8% |
| Male unemployment rate | | 4.8% |
| Female rate | | 2.4% |
| Notified Job Centre vacancies | 4,121 | |
| Average weekly earnings of full-time employees in Boroughs as % of GB average | | 105% |
| Income Support claimants and as % of pop. 16+ | 21,000 | 8% |
| Lone parents on IS | 7,000 | 3% |
| Disabled on IS | 5,000 | 2% |
| 60+ on IS | 8,000 | 3% |
| 18-24 on IS | 2,000 | 1% |

The Average weekly earnings in Great Britain (4/02) were £464.80, London, £624.30, London South LSC area £484.10

C Ethnicity and Other Special Needs

| | Croydon No | Croydon % | Relevant London %s |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| White Pupils of compulsory school age in primary schools | 16,400 | 65% | 58% |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| BME Pupils of compulsory school age in primary schools | | 35% | 42% |
| White Pupils of compulsory school age in secondary schools | 10,371 | 64% | |
| BME Pupils of compulsory school age in primary schools | | 36% | |
| Pupils of compulsory school age with ESL in primary schools | | 14.3% | |
| Pupils of compulsory school age with ESL in secondary schools | | 14.7% | 28.2% |
| Eligibility for Free School Meals | 10,195 | 21.5% | 25.5% |
| Homeless Households accepted Q1-3/02 | 844 | | |
| Asylum Seekers (av 12/02) | 821 | | |

Sources:

(A) Data on London South LSC website:

Table 5. Population by age group and gender 2001. Census of Population.

Table 13. Social class occupation based residents 16+. 1998 and 1999 annualised Labour Force Survey Data.

Table 36. Unemployed claimants with unemployment rate estimates September 2002

Table 39. Unemployment by London South LSC wards and boroughs. September 2002

Table 44. Job Centre Vacancies Notified in London South LSC Boroughs by 30 occupations, quarter ending September 2002.

Table 51. Ethnic Breakdown of pupils of compulsory school age in maintained schools London South LSC boroughs, January 1999

Table 52. Proportion of pupils in maintained schools for whom English is an additional language London South LSC boroughs January 1999

Table 53. Participation in full and part-time education by 16 and 17 year olds 1994/95 to 1999/00

Table 76. Average earnings of full-time employees in London South LSC boroughs, with preliminary results for 2002

Table 77. Deprivation ranking of London South LSC boroughs

Table 78. Income support claimants in London South LSC boroughs by statistical group, February 2002

Table 79. Eligibility for free school meals in London South LSC boroughs January 2002

Table 80. Homeless households accepted each quarter by local authorities as being in priority need under the provisions the 1985 and 1986 Housing Acts

Table 81. Asylum seekers figures, average for December 2002

(B) Data on London Central LSC website:

Population by age group and gender 2001. Census of Population.

Table 12. Social class occupation based residents 16 and over in London Central LSC boroughs 1998 and 1999 annualised Labour Force Survey Data.

Table 34. Unemployed claimants with unemployment rate estimates September 2002

Table 37. Unemployment by ward & London Central LSC boroughs. December 2001

Table 42. Job Centre Vacancies Notified in London Central LSC boroughs by 30 occupations, quarter ending July 2000 (Notified).

Table 50. School pupils with Special Educational Needs London Central LSC boroughs 2001

Table 51. Ethnic Breakdown of pupils of compulsory school age in maintained schools London Central LSC boroughs, January 1999

Table 52. Proportion of pupils in maintained schools for whom English is an additional language London Central LSC boroughs January 1999

Table 75. Average earnings of full-time employees in London Central LSC boroughs April 2001

Table 76. Deprivation ranking of London Central LSC boroughs

Table 77. Income support claimants in London Central LSC boroughs by statistical group, May 2000

Table 78. Eligibility for free school meals in London Central LSC boroughs January 2001

Table 79. Homeless households accepted each quarter by local authorities as being in priority need under the provisions the 1985 and 1986 Housing Acts

Table 80. Asylum seekers figures, average for September 2001

C. Focus on London 2000. ed. Dev Virdee. And Tricia Williams (HMSO 2003)

D. Office of National Statistics Neighbourhood Statistics Borough statistics on website 2004

ANNUAL PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT 2015

1. The Director of Public Health's proposed approach to the theme and content of the Annual Public Health report for 2015 is very welcome. It is in line with what I recommended last year in dialogue over the 2014 report.
2. It is vital as the inequalities in Croydon grow that the Council, other agencies and the community and voluntary organisations, have an in-depth understanding of them and their impact on public health and other social problems. The aim for the proposed 2015 Annual Report analysis to assist the work of the Opportunities and Fairness Commission is vital to its work, especially as the delay in its start makes meeting its original timetable difficult.
3. I submitted comments on the 2014 Annual Report to the 14 July Cabinet meeting and followed it up with a paper to the Director (attached as Appendix 1). He expressed his appreciation for my analysis of the trends in deprivation in Croydon and my suggestions 'of how we could widen our conceptual thinking about tackling this.' 'Whilst the public health team is committed to reduce inequalities through all its work, we do not have the staff capacity to deal with your paper in full. ... (W)e will take note of your suggestions for our further work, and our planning for next year's report in particular.'
4. While I am pleased that this has turned out to be the case, I have some reservations about the proposed depth of the analysis to be undertaken.

Public Health Priorities

5. Para 3.4 suggests a focus on the Council's public health priorities. This misses two elements of concern.
 - (1) The negative impact on well-being and therefore health of the growing population density in some parts of the Borough especially in the North resulting from the growth of the private rented sector especially through multiple occupation and the conversion of family houses into flats, with growing conflicts over neighbour noise, cars using residential streets as rat runs and car parking conflicts.
 - (2) The linkage of alcohol and drug related crime and health. This ignores the fact that these addictions are illnesses that affect all social classes and groups, and include many famous people. Many addicts are high functioning, maintain their jobs, and do not need to resort to crime. Yet the health impact on themselves and their families can be enormous. There is an urgent need for greater public understanding about the nature of addiction and a more understanding response by agencies. I have attempted to do this with a paper to members of the four Norbury Residents Association Committees, who have been concerned about the level of street drinking.

Inequalities analysis

6. In para 3.5 of the report tonight the Director states:

'There are many forms of health inequalities including those associated with geographic deprivation, gender and ethnicity, and other protected characteristics. To keep focus and manage within existing capacity, the report will focus on geographic deprivation alone.'

7. I think that this will still give too limited an understanding of how geographically concentrated health inequalities associated with gender, ethnicity and other protected characteristics will be, as discussed in my paper to the Director last year.

8. Having worked with IT statisticians on the Censuses in 1991 and 2001 in several local authority areas I am aware of the fact that the kind of analysis that I advocate should be capable of being done within current resources. If extra officer man hours are needed perhaps they could be made up by IT apprentices.

Spending on Public Health and Inequalities

9. In its answer (7 October 2014) to the Freedom of Information Inquiry by Jack Stanson, for the separate annual spend on some public health areas for 2014/15: the Council provided the following information:

| | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Sexual Health | £7,310,238 |
| Drug and Alcohol misuse | £2,713,371 |
| Alcohol misuse | £2,713,371 |
| Smoking | £1,285,059 |
| Obesity | £ 557,117 |
| Physical activity | £ 278,558 |
| | |
| Total | £14,857,71 |

10. It would underpin understanding of inequalities and tackling them if there is a geographic breakdown of the spending on all the public health priorities.

Conclusion

11. I hope that while endorsing the theme of the proposed 2015 Annual Public Health report you will agree that the Public Health Director should produce a more in depth analysis than he is currently proposing.

Sean Creighton
Norbury resident
January 2015
sean.creighton1947@btinternet.com

UNDERSTANDING DEPRIVATION IN CROYDON

Some Observations

I ntroduction

1. At the Children and Young Persons Scrutiny Sub-committee meeting on 22 July, an Education Department officer said that people in South Croydon chose to live there while those in North Croydon are forced to do so. She was not questioned as to what she meant by this. I can only assume that she meant that people moving into North Croydon are forced to do so because of cheaper housing costs compared with areas from where they are coming, and particularly the growing availability of private rented accommodation. This does raise questions about whether the levels of deprivation might increase in the North compared with the South, apart from areas like Fieldway and New Addington.

Croydon's Annual Health Report

2. The 14 July Cabinet meeting considered the draft report of the Director of Public Health. It had been decided to concentrate on health and wellbeing in New Addington and Fieldway, highlighting the positive initiatives being carried out particularly through community projects.

3. In a paper I sent to Cabinet members commenting on issues across the agenda of the 14 July meeting I included some thoughts on the draft report based on seeing the introductory Cabinet paper not the full draft.

'This takes a welcome approach looking at the assets in Fieldway and New Addington, an important part of looking at the strengths and weaknesses of areas officially regarded as 'deprived'. In 2000 Fieldway was ranked 578 and placed in the worst 10% block of deprived wards, while New Addington was ranked 1,180 and placed in the 20% block. (DETR. Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2000). Croydon was given Neighbourhood Renewal status, but a very small budget compared with many of the other 88 designated authorities.

It would appear that the interventions possible were not enough to make a significant difference to the adverse effects of other developments. If I have read *Tracking Neighbourhoods. The Economic Deprivation Index 2008*. Communities & Local Government 2009) correctly then in common with several other London Boroughs the percentage of Croydon's Lower level Super Output Areas among the 'greatest improvers' was only 2%, the best improver % being 11%. This compared with most LSOAs in the North East improving between 12 and 36%. The Economic Deprivation Index ranking published in *The English Indices of Deprivation 2007*. Communities & Local Government 2008) then Croydon's ranking deteriorated from 140 in 2001 to 109 in 2005 (1 being the most deprived). A study published last year by the Centre at LSE states: 'For example in Croydon, a highly populated London borough with pockets of extreme deprivation, NRF accounted for only 1% of expenditure, compared with 31% of expenditure in Easington, a small extensively deprived authority.' (NRF - Neighbourhood Renewal Fund) (*Labour's Record on Neighbourhood Renewal in England: Policy, Spending and Outcomes 1997-2010*. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion. 2013).

While by no means the worst affected London Borough the % change in estimated spending power per capita in Croydon between 2010/11 to 2013/14 was down 18%.

At the same time the previous Conservative administration reduced overall spending by 13% between 2009/10 and 2013/14 with substantial changes in the mix:

Highways and transport services up 31%
 Social care down 14%
 Housing services (GRFA only) down 8%
 Cultural and related services down 39%
 Environmental and regulatory services down 15%

Planning and development services down 69%

Central service sup 26%

This despite building up £ 11,336,000 in unallocated financial reserves.

(Hard Times, New Directions? The impact of the local government spending cuts in London. Interim Report. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion.)

The report on the Living Wage for Croydon states that Croydon 'is ranked in the 100 most deprived places in the country and 19th out of 32 London boroughs in terms of overall deprivation. It has some wards with low level so disadvantage and others are among the most deprived in England' (para 2.1), and that it faces the challenge of 'increased deprivation with significant areas of inequality' (para 2.2. bullet point four).'

4. I posed two questions:

- Should the Director Public Health be asked to include in the annual report a section setting out the overall incidence of deprivation in Croydon?
- Should the Director of Public Health and other appropriate Officers be asked to carry out an analysis of the social-economic changes in Fieldway and New Addington Wards starting with the analysis carried out for the start of the Neighbourhood Renewal programme in the Borough, setting out what the benefits were, the factors that may have held back further improvement, the current challenges and the programmes and policies currently being implemented into two wards with a view to submission to a future Cabinet meeting and to the Fairness Commission?'

5. These points were not taken up in the discussion by any Cabinet members or backbenchers. In relation to the first question the report seems to have been a fete accompli, already printed, and therefore not amendable. As its publication was late anyway it was logical not to seek amendments. However, this need not have prevented a discussion on the second question. It is clear from talking to Councillors that they are reluctant to proposed amendments at Cabinet. The openness and transparency agenda should include the Cabinet being Able to respond to issues raised by members of the public or local organisations even if it just in the form of a decision to look at an issue further.

Census Analysis

6. Since the meeting I have been trying to make sense of the Census 2011 figures on the Croydon Observatory website for the ward I live in Norbury. Based on my experience of analysing the 1991 and 2001 Censuses, I find the information on Croydon Observatory to be very limited. A lot more sophisticated research is needed. I appreciate that there may be such analysis behind the scenes, and the purpose of the CO is just to give headlines. I have been looking in particular at the smaller areas within the ward (called LSOAs) in order to try and understand the differences between the different neighbourhoods in Norbury Ward.

7. The categories chosen for LSOA analysis do not provide a sufficiently nuanced insight into the complexities of the social-economic situation in each Ward, and in particular the differences that may exist between the situations experienced by the three main ethnic groups (whites, blacks and Asians).

8. Can further analysis be undertaken for each LSOA as follows:

- (1) Table: Population by age and gender. Analysis by ethnicity, tenure, and housing type (houses/flats).
- (2) Table: All people by ethnic group. Analysis by age, tenure, and housing type?)
- (3) Table: Economic activity breakdown, Can this be analysed by ethnicity?
- (4) Table: People with no qualifications and degree level qualifications, Can this be analysed by ethnicity, age and tenure?
- (6) Table: Households by housing tenure. Can this be analysed by ethnicity and by household composition?
- (7). Chart: Poor Living conditions. Can this be analysed by tenure, age, household composition and ethnicity?

- (8) Chart: People living in houses and living in flats. Can this be analysed by ethnicity, economic activity breakdown and household composition?
- (9) Chart: Vehicle ownership profile. Can this be analysed by ethnicity, tenure, economic activity, housing type, household composition?
9. Can other categories as in Norbury Ward Overviews be provided for each LSOA?

Occupation Group

Industry of employment

Qualifications

Households containing multiple ethnic groups

Population by country of birth

Method of travel to work

1

0. Can each LSOA's analysis be sub-divided into its enumeration districts so as to see the differences between small neighbourhoods within each LSOA?

Community Self-Help

11. While community self-help and public sector projects can help individuals with their health and wellbeing problems the effects are always going to be limited. There are forces outside their control which help determine where people are in relation to social deprivation. Also there are many people who need much more intensive support than many projects and services can provide.

Understanding the Process of Neighbourhood Decline

12. The processes that create decline into deprivation of neighbourhoods and their concentration of social excluded residents are complex. They include the effect on the individual residents. Often they experience a process of personal impoverishment, a drastic impoverishment of their sense of well-being with adverse effects on physical and mental health. This aspect of the 'spirituality' of human beings needs to form part of the analysis of why particular neighbourhoods are deprived, and what may be going on in others to push them into the downward spiral into decay. The concept of the process of 'impoverishment' has been missing from approaches to neighbourhood renewal since the adoption of the national strategy in the early 2000s. It was usefully given its due in a handbook commissioned by the European Commission: 'Rapid Appraisal Method of Social Exclusion and Poverty (RAMSEP)' by Emanuel Mastropietro. (CERFE/European Commission 2001).

13. RAMSEP definition: 'Social exclusion is the process produced by the accumulative and interaction between each other of various social and environmental risk factors, which tend to push human beings exposed to it and affected by it toward a state of poverty. Social exclusion is therefore a process of impoverishment.'

14. The Project suggested that:

- due to the set of risk factors there is an impoverishment process taking a non-poor individual down into poverty
- poverty involves a loss of identity, or a loss of wide-ranging control over the environment
- different forms of deprivation produce different ways of reacting to poverty
- different reactions to deprivation suggest different areas of poverty, the three main ones being: (a) transitional or intermittent, (b) overall condition of suffering, (c) extreme poverty involving a radical loss of control over one's existence

Risk Factors

15. The project identified 13 risk factors (some examples of detailed indicators are listed against each).

- Habitat. These include dwellings built in inappropriate areas, overcrowded areas, dwellings, continuous/deafening noise for long periods, pollution, toxic substance in the ground, low presence of parks, green area

- Health. Level of availability of services, incidence of AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases, illegal abortions, incidence of mental illness and physical disabilities, alcoholism, drug addiction
- Work. Unemployment: general, youth, long-term; under-employment; employment locations not protected by trade union
- Intelligence. Quality of educational services, level of cultural infrastructure, school drop rate, difficult of access to training, incidence of unemployment among those with school qualifications and degrees
- Crime. Level of existence and maintenance of street lighting; police presence; hooliganism and vandalism; juvenile delinquency; bullying; crimes and thefts usury; drug dealing
- Gender. Rape and sexual harassment, prostitution, adult women at home, discrimination in workplace, prejudice against single mothers
- Family. Level of under 5s and youth provision, incidence of families separated by divorce, domestic violence, large families, one-parent families
- Communication. Network of public transport, road network condition, internet cafes/points, newsagents/vendors, post offices
- Public Administration. Emergency services, responsive of local government, health and other service agencies
- Institutional Disorder. Discrimination, abuse of police authority, political conflict, emigration abroad, illegal immigration, conflict between immigrants and resident population, benefit stigmatisation, existence of cultural mediators/translators in public offices
- Social Security. Income support, support for homelessness, elderly, employment is dangerous/unhealthy conditions (e.g. building sites without protection), employment without accident and illness insurance
- Social abandonment. Non profit services of social assistance and home care, self-help groups, elderly people living alone, vagrancy and homelessness,
- Consumption (non-essential goods). Malls, shopping centres, travel agencies, high tech shops, meeting places, gyms and swimming pools, exclusive shops

Types of Poverty

16. RAMSEP suggested that there are three types of poverty:

- Intermittent/transitory: borders on non-poverty
- Overall poverty: involving serious lack of resources, use of survival strategies, and optimism, weak social ties
- Extreme poverty: involves resignation so that there is less control over the environment and evidence loss of identity

Individuals react differently to their deprivation. RAMSEP suggests that reactions involve different levels of loss of control of identify, caused by

- intensity of material deprivation - low availability of goods enjoyed and/or basic services benefited from
- loss of engagement in informal social networks and with formal social networks
- lack of will and capacity to act.

It 'is often possible to enter a vicious circle of impoverishment due to an illness, due to the lack of professional help, due to unstable housing conditions, due to a high crime rate in the areas, etc'.

Life-Histories

17. An important set of information about the process of impoverishment alongside the more traditional statistical analysis (e.g. using the Census) is the use of life-histories to illustrate the way the risk factors have affected people, and people's reactions to their impoverishment.

Effective Interventions

18. 'Knowing the intensity with which social and environmental risks occur in a given area (social exclusion) and investigating the ways in which these social risks impact on the lives of individuals (individual social exclusion profiles) therefore allows us to collect basic information in order to plan an efficient, relevant poverty prevent policy.' (RAMSEP Project)

19. 'An effective policy to combat poverty requires preventative actions aimed at blocking the process of impoverishment. This action will be linked on the one hand to supporting any inadequacies in services (health, education, housing, communication, social security, etc.) and on the other hand to improving their quality.' (RAMSEP Project)

20. The following renewal interventions are needed to block the process of impoverishment:

- improving employment opportunities
- improving income support
- addressing inadequacies in services, improving their quality and establishing new services
- improving the environment
- community development
- neighbourhood renewal strategies need to include interventions to block the process of impoverishment

The Language of Regeneration: Spiritual Capital

21. The language of regeneration and neighbourhood renewal talks about 'social', economic', 'environmental' regeneration, 'social exclusion', and 'social', economic' and 'environmental' capital. Yet we know that the fear of crime, the general decay of the state of the local environment, the lack of prospects, can all have adverse effects on individuals' sense of well-being and mental health. The experience of social exclusion or the onset of sudden crises, whether economic or health, can adversely affect the way people feel.

The constant experience of negative material conditions has an adverse effect on the human spirit. We should also be talking about 'spiritual capital'. This not the same as the religious concept of 'spirituality'.

A non-religious example is the conclusion of longitudinal historical medical research from the United States that the more intellectually stimulated very old people are, the healthier they remain.

22. The 'wellbeing agenda' comes closest to this concept.

23. To what extent are Croydon Officers using the RAMSEP approach in their planning?

Sean Creighton
Norbury resident
sean.creighton1947@btinternet.com

Box 1: A View of Croydon

'Croydon has not got have enough jobs for all the people who live in it. Central and North Croydon are already overcrowded with people in terms of the transport and car parking infrastructure and rubbish and litter. The railway, road and bus networks are overloaded. The Westfield/Hammerson development will not lift off in the way that the Westfield complexes in Stratford and White City have because of the overloaded transport system. The big employers, whose workers underpinned the retailers in the Whitgift Centre, have left the Borough. Public sector jobs have been cut. As employers cut back on workers and or cut wages there is less money for the local economy.

The projected 16,000 increase in the number of residents will further strain the system with people having to go out of Croydon for work. The building jobs will be short term; and the retail jobs low paid. Attempting to regenerate the neglected district centres could make things worse. The Growth Plan seems to be based on cramming more people in without improvements to the infrastructure. The quality of life has dramatically deteriorated in some of the districts with the increase in population and the further competition to use road space, both in terms of traffic flow and parking. There are not enough schools to meet the needs of children of the growing population. Moving around Croydon is now an uncomfortable challenge. More flats and houses along the London Rd will simply increase the number of residents. Unless there are more jobs there will be an increase in poverty. Proposals to increase the night time economy will add to the existing unacceptable level of noise.

For many long term residents the quality of life has deteriorated so much in the last 5-6 years that more and more are talking about moving out of Croydon. Council officers talk about people wanting to live in South Croydon but are forced to live in North Croydon because they have no other options because of housing costs. The high population turnover, especially in the North leads to disengagement from social and political action, and the danger of increasing racism and xenophobia.

The Council's Growth Plan seems committed to making these problems worse. Instead of a Growth Plan the Council should be adopting a strategy of reducing the population in North Croydon and easing the pressures on the infrastructure.'

Extract: WHAT KIND OF ECONOMY DO WE NEED IN CROYDON? Croydon Council's Growth Plan and District Centre Investment; Growth For All. A Commentary with Recommendations by a Working Party of Croydon Trades Union Council (August 2014)

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE PEOPLE AND THEIR LIVES IN NORBURY?

(Work in progress draft)

Introduction

1. Norbury is an urban development area running south of Streatham along the London Rd leading to Croydon Town. It spans the section of the road known as Norbury High Rd. It also follows the Borough boundary with Lambeth up to Crown Lane on the northern edge and Norbury Hill to Beulah Hill and round to Crown Lane. It is an artificially created area as a ward for election purposes. The area of each electoral ward is different because each has a different history of development, related to such factors as whether it developed as mainly residential, mixed-residential/employment, or mainly employment; and whether they grow out of a historic village or are a major district or town centre. Their characteristics are also shaped by the extent to which they are served by public transport, especially whether or not they have or are within easy access of a station.

2. Because Norbury goes up to Crown Lane and Beulah Hill and because the public transport links from the station area to there are very poor Norbury ward is two un-connected sections: the disconnected [art being around and from Norwood Grove to Crown Lane. It is likely that residents in this area may see a more natural link to parts of Norwood both in Croydon and Lambeth. This may also be a reason why the area lacks any residents associations, whereas the neighbourhoods on both sides of Norbury High St stretch of London Rd have four.

3. The 2011 Census tells us a lot about the ward area at a fixed point in time. There is a continual process of change so it provides a starting off point. All the figures in this analysis are from the 2011 Census.

Population

4. 16,476 people live in the area:

| | Age to and inc. 15 | | 15-64 | | 65+ | |
|---------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| Norbury | 3,448 | 20.93% | 10,821 | 65.68% | 2,207 | 13.4% |
| Croydon | | | | | | 12.21% |

5. The 15-25 age group, comprising those still at school, at university and young adults who are in or not in work make up 2,260 (13.05%).

6. Households with dependent children comprise 2,766. Those with non-dependent children comprise 807. There are 951 lone parent families (15.70%; Croydon 15.97%).

Ethnicity

7. Visually Norbury appears to have a very diverse population in terms of colour and ethnicity.

| Norbury | White | | White not from British Isles | | Mixed heritage | | Indian sub-continent | |
|---------|--------------|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | 5,937 | 37.68% | 1,911 | 11.6% | 789 | 4.79% | 3,605 | 21.88% |
| Croydon | | 55.09% | | 6.29% | | | | |
| Norbury | Other Asians | | Of whom Chinese | Black Caribbean & African | | Non-white | | |
| | 1,066 | 6.47% | 312 | 4,105 | 24.91% | 60% | | |
| Croydon | | | | | 25.02% | 45% | | |

8. With its higher non-white population Norbury is very different from the rest of Croydon. However, the nature of nationality and ethnicity is not quite as simple as this suggests.

| | Born in British Isles | | Born EU | |
|---------|-----------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Norbury | 9,532 | 57.86% | 1,153 | 7% |
| Croydon | | 71.52% | | 2.88% |

9. The countries that joined the EU after April 2001 are:

2004: Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia

2007: Bulgaria, Romania

2013: Croatia

10. The other complication in understanding the nationality/ethnic composition of Norbury's population is that 11,992 (72.79%) hold UK passports, only slightly lower than Croydon as a whole. i.e. many of those born abroad are now British citizens.

11. This mixture of people from different national and ethnic backgrounds reflects the attraction of Norbury's cheaper housing to those who lived further north in London and those more recently settled here. However, while Norbury is therefore a multi-ethnic/national/cultural area this does not mean that people mix between their ethnic/nationality/cultural groupings.

Language

12. Language is not as much of a problem as some people may perceive when they hear the multitude of languages when out and about. 72.49% of Norbury households have English as their main language. Only 15.63% have no one who can speak English. These households may be mainly more recent arrivals. This needs to be considered in the context of the fact that previous groups settling here often did not learn English for many years (e.g. White Russians after the First World War and Poles after the Second World War). The English who have moved to live abroad are notorious for not learning the local language and living in essentially segregated areas. However the lack of English in Norbury is higher than across Croydon as a whole (82.63% are English speaking households).

Religion

13. A further complication relates to the religion of Norbury residents.

| | Christian | | Islam | | No religion | |
|---------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|-------------|--------|
| Norbury | 8,516 | 51.69% | 2,933 | 17.8% | 2,090 | 12.69% |
| Croydon | | 56.42% | | 8.12% | | 19.99% |
| England | | 59.39% | | 5.02% | | 24.74% |

14. So Norbury’s residents are more religious than in Croydon as a whole.

15. Key questions the Council analysis of the Census 2011 does not show are the nationality and ethnicity breakdowns of households in terms of language and religion.

Tensions

16. There are two latent tensions within the Norbury population:

(1) Some white British resentment about the growing numbers of non-whites and East European whites. This is reflected in overt hostility to East Europeans who are conceived off as taking jobs from Britons, of undercutting wages, and of being heavy drinkers on the street. This is also reflected in comments about the lack of shops catering for English food, particularly the large number run by people with an Indian sub-continent and Middle-Eastern sub-continent heritage.

(2) Resentment towards the Islamic population even though like Christians it has own separate branches (mainly Sunni and Shia).

17. These resentments did not seem to be articulated in the 2014 local elections. UKIP did poorly, despite the fact that it had a candidate of African diaspora heritage and a second being Polish. However, the electoral turnout was low, and lower than in 2006 (2010’s turnout was boosted by the General Election on the same day). This reflects a combination of apathy and disenchantment with party and Council politics so that even those with resentments abstained. Overall ward analysis of the election results may well mask some neighbourhoods where voting was different from the ward average.

Child Poverty

18. Just over 6% of children in Norbury live in poverty, as defined as living in households where no adult is in work. This is slightly lower than Croydon as a whole (c6.4%) but higher than London (c.5.6%).

19. However child poverty is much higher when the level of income is taken into account defined as at below 60% of the national median, or in households in receipt of income support or jobseekers allowance. This means that in Norbury just over 25% of children under 16 years old live in poverty (Croydon just over 27%; London just over 28%).

Housing

20. Norbury residents are mainly in owner-occupation and private rented properties.

| | Outright owner-occupation | | Owner-occupation - mortgage/loan | | Private landlord/letting agent | | Social rented | |
|---------|---------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Norbury | 1,622 | 26.79% | 1,999 | 33.01% | 1,359 | 22.44% | 837 | 13.83% |
| Croydon | | 24.06% | | 34.72% | | 19.83% | | 17.85% |

21. The low level of Council and housing association social housing is due to such reasons such as:

- The low level of building Council housing in Croydon throughout the 20thC
- The resistance of local authorities in the Surrey area (which became part of Greater London in 1964/5) to Inner London Councils building in Outer London, a resistance which continued and also affected housing associations from the mid-1960s.
- The subsidy system in the 1960s which encouraged inner London Boroughs to build high rise and system build estates within their own Boroughs.
- The right to the buy from the late 1970s which enabled many Council tenants to buy, to the point that many properties on Council estates are now rented out by private landlords.

22. The ratio of owner occupation and private renting may well have changed in the favour of the latter since the 2011 Census data was collected, because ‘buy to let’ landlords have been buying up

houses previously owned by owner occupiers who have either died, gone into care homes, or moved away. They have been able to out compete with potential owner occupiers, contributing to pushing up sale prices and making it more difficult for first time buyers.

23. The high level of private rented housing, with its short tenancies, creates a high mobility among part of Norbury's population, especially in the neighbourhoods where the percentage of private renting is higher. It also allows new settlers their chance to obtain housing, whether moving south from more expensive London areas or being new settlers in the country, especially from EU countries. The quality of private rented housing is something that has concerned the Council and the new Labour administration intends to intervene more effectively to ensure that tenants living conditions are at an acceptable level.

24. In 2011 those living in overcrowded conditions were just slightly lower than Croydon as a whole just over 16%. This is most likely to occur in private rented housing. Just under 3% of households live in property without central heating - this being roughly the same across Croydon.

Car ownership

25. In some areas car ownership is an indication of levels of income, in others of availability of public transport.

| Households | No car or van | | 1 car or van | | 2 cars or vans plus | |
|------------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------|---------------------|-------|
| Norbury | 2,060 | 34.02% | 2,608 | 43.07% | 1,387 | 22.91 |
| Croydon | | 33.46% | | 43.57% | | 22.97 |

26. These levels of no and low ownership are most likely to be due to the public transport availability especially for those living along London Rd and in walking distance of Norbury Station, but may also reflect lower incomes. If Norbury house prices and rents rise and a more affluent group of people settle in it then it is possible that the lack of car ownership will decline. This will result in more problems with traffic flows and parking.

Employment

| People | Norbury | | Croydon |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Not economically active age 16-74 | 4,242 | 35.55% | 34.24% |
| Economically active 16-74 | 7,691 | | |
| Travel to work outside Croydon | | 38% | c33% |
| Managers, senior officials, professionals, technical | 3,323 | 43.21% | 43.61% |
| Administrative and secretarial | 1,112 | 14.46% | 14.70% |
| Skilled trades | 789 | 10.26% | 9.55% |
| Others | 2,467 | 32.08% | 32.14% |

27. Because Norbury has a railway station and several bus routes through the area it seems to encourage people to travel to work by public transport rather than cars or vans.

| People | Travel to work car/van | | Travel to work by public transport | | Motorcycle, scooter or moped. | | Bicycle | |
|---------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|---------|--------|
| Norbury | 2,510 | 21.03% | 4,009 | 33.6% | 88 | 0.74% | 135 | 1.13% |
| Croydon | | 24.17% | | | | 0.58% | | 0.183% |

Smaller Areas within Norbury Ward

28. The Ward comprises a number of neighbourhoods. The 2011 Census analysis provides detailed figures for 9 smaller areas. Preliminary analysis of these shows there are important differences

between them. These areas are made up of clusters of ‘enumeration districts’ and the logic behind their combination seems strange. Only analysis of each ‘enumeration district’ would give a real insight into the existence of any pockets of concentrated socio-economic problems faced by their residents.

29. Just one LSOA shows the differences: the one include Norwood Grove Recreation Ground and the area north east of it to the Lambeth boundary.

| | 65+ year olds | Children 0-15 | White British | Indian sub-continent | Black people | Degree level qualifications | Owner-occupation | Social renting | Private renting | Lack of cars vans |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| N. Norbury LSOA | 16.97% | 19.64% | 41.68% | 22.54% | 13.95% | 42% | 78.5% | 3.61% | Under 10% | 20% |
| Norbury | 13.4% | 20.93% | | 27.23% | 19.52% | 34% | 59.76% | 13.83% | 22.44% | 34.02% |

30. This area then seems to be relatively affluent and less ethnically/nationality diverse than other parts of the Norbury ward.

30. In other words the inequalities in Norbury Ward appear to be much more concentrated along the two sides of residential streets on both sides of Norbury High St. but there will also be differences between the LSOAs these comprise.

Sean Creighton
 Norbury resident
 January 2015
 sean.creighton1947@btinternet.com