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Why we should care about spatial inequalities

- Social injustices
  - Large differences in life chances (e.g. health, pay, university access)
  - Differences in public and private amenities (e.g. environment, shops, schools, green space, safety)
- Wide local differences inhibit social interaction, social cohesion and shared identity, and encourage segregation and securitisation
Two kinds of questions

• How are social and economic characteristics distributed over space (questions of proximity, distance, clustering, concentration) – and what are the trends?
• What is the extent and nature of differences between places – and what are the trends?
The spatial distribution of poverty in London


The analysis

• Looks at the spatial distribution of poverty using a proxy indicator (household rates of means-tested benefit claims)
• Detailed analysis of the period 2001-2008 (growth) and 2008-2011 (recession)
• With a less detailed update to 2013
• Just London at present, work is extending to other cities (n.b Greater Manchester Poverty Monitor at www.gmpag.org has much useful data)
Overall findings

- Poverty rates fell fastest in highly deprived areas in Inner London
  - But, inner London still more deprived, on average
- Poverty rates rose in “middling” Outer London areas
- Less polarised distribution overall
Change in Neighbourhood Poverty Rates 2001 to 2011

- A slight majority of “the poor” (53 per cent) by this measure live in Outer London in 2011
- Proportion of highest poverty neighbourhoods in Inner London falls from 77 per cent to 55 per cent
Poverty 2001, using the unadjusted means-tested benefits rate by households (UMBRH)

UMBRH 2001 (household poverty rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U01_bands</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>less than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Green</td>
<td>25-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>35-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>45-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>55% or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poverty 2011, using the unadjusted means-tested benefits rate by households (UMBRH)

UMBRH 2011 (household poverty rate)

U11_bands
- Green: less than 25%
- Light Green: 25-35%
- Yellow: 35-45%
- Orange: 45-55%
- Red: 55% or more
More socially mixed neighbourhoods, but are we on our way....

From this?

To this?
Possible explanations

• Longer term decentralisation of low-waged work [and these industries most vulnerable to recession]
• Regeneration benefiting Inner London poor
• Gentrification or ‘densification’ diluting Inner London poor
• Displacement or new settlement patterns due to trend to housing subsidy in private rented sector
Poverty rates declined in Inner London, as population increased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London sub-region</th>
<th>LSOA UMBRH band 2001</th>
<th>Change 2001-08 (per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inner London - East</strong></td>
<td>&lt; 25%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-35%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-45%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-55%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55% or more</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inner London - West</strong></td>
<td>&lt; 25%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-35%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-45%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-55%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55% or more</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outer London - East &amp; North East</strong></td>
<td>&lt; 25%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-35%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-45%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-55%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55% or more</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Implications

• Increased demands on services in areas not traditionally geared up to meet them.
• Threats to provision of labour to support Inner London economy.
• Implications of long journeys for household and community life.
• Segregation and invisibility of the poor.
Deprived Neighbourhoods in England under Labour (1997-2010) and the Coalition (2010-2015)


Labour policies

2001-2007
Cross government National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, NRU, floor targets
Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) – mandatory local plans
Specific programmes – neighbourhoods management/wardens
Housing Market Renewal
At the same time as large scale public service improvements

2007-2010
Subnational Review of Regeneration - emphasis on economic regeneration, larger scale
Working Neighbourhoods Fund replaces NRF
Coalition Policies

Coalition 2010 –2015

• All existing funds and programmes cancelled
• No central government responsibility for poorest neighbourhoods, no mandatory activity for LAs
• No monitoring of spatial inequalities
• ‘Regeneration through growth’ – LEPs, City Deals, Enterprise Zones, Regional Growth Fund
• Helping local leaders: Community organisers, Big Local

Continues but substantially accelerates Labour’s policy shifts.

Logic for intervention:

• Restore growth
• Liberate private sector “community-led regeneration”
Underlying the shifts

Change in emphasis

• From **structural economic problems** to **concentrated worklessness**
• From **social justice** to **economic efficiency**
• From a **broad range of desired outcomes** to a **narrower focus on economic outcomes**
• From a commitment to **redistributive spending** to offset the consequences of market failure, to an emphasis on restoring **market functioning** in order to remove the need for ongoing spending.
• From the **neighbourhood** as the prime site of intervention and planning to the **region or subregion**
Worklessness rates, poorest neighbourhoods (in 2000) vs rest

- 10% highest in 2000
- England, all others
But new workless neighbourhoods emerging

Worklessness % gap over England non-poor neighbourhoods

- Worst.10pc.in.2000
- Contemporary worst
Poverty (UMBR) gaps rose in recession and still not back to pre-crisis levels

Gap: 43.6%

Gap: 46.3%

Gap: 45.6%

1st Decile (highest poverty)

10th Decile (lowest poverty)
After a fall under Labour, some signs of a rise in neighbourhood dissatisfaction
But still some closing of GCSE gaps

Gaps in GCSE Attainment between Most and Least Deprived Deciles of IDACI (Income deprivation affecting children index)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 A*-C grades</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A*-C incl. English and Maths</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After a fall under Labour, no real change in relative burglary risk

![Graph showing relative burglary rates and risks over time. The graph includes data for NRF districts, 20% most deprived neighborhoods, and burglary rates in the 20% most deprived neighborhoods (BCS/CSEW). The data spans from 2001 to 2013, with a decline in relative risk observed after 2003.](image-url)
In summary

• Some evidence of progress under Labour (during growth)
• Slowing down or stalling under the Coalition (under recession)
• Overall, gaps still very wide – difficult to see how they are going to be substantially reduced.
• But not evidence overall of widening inequalities or new spirals of decline (yet)
So what’s going on?

• May be too early to pick up any policy change effects. Certainly too early to pick up effects of welfare reform and rising poverty from 2013.
• May be that the investments of the 2000s have made neighbourhoods more resilient (e.g., less vacant housing, better services, multi-agency working).
• Maybe that the worst is over in terms of industrial restructuring and steep neighbourhood decline.
• Maybe that aggregate analysis hides wide regional disparities. New poor neighbourhoods emerging.
Concluding Comments

• Change is slow. Overall, the geography of poverty still largely reflects the geography of the industrial revolution.
• We’re still in a period of transition to a post-industrial economy, and still living with the legacy of rapid economic decline. Still large spatial inequalities on many counts.
• But shifts are occurring – new kinds of poorer neighbourhoods and changes in the social geography of cities.
England’s most deprived areas

1. East of the Jaywick area of Clacton-on-Sea Tendring District
2. West of the Grant Thorold area of Grimsby North East Lincolnshire
3. West of the Revoe area Blackpool
4. West of the Anfield area Liverpool
5. East of Grange Park/West of Normoss area Blackpool
6. Speke area Liverpool
7. West of Burnley area Lancashire
8. South of Queenstown Blackpool
9. East of the Weir area Rochdale
10. Collyhurst area Manchester
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