

# The English Indices of Deprivation 2015, local authority level analysis

## Executive Summary

The 2015 figures reveal that seven local authorities in the Lancashire-14 area; Blackpool, Burnley, Blackburn with Darwen, Hyndburn, Pendle, Lancaster and Preston; had at least one of their eight local authority deprivation summary measures ranked in the 50 most deprived positions. This was up from six authorities in the previous 2010 indices. Lancaster became the seventh owing to a relative deterioration of its local concentration ranking.

Between 2010 and 2015, the indices of deprivation results indicate a continuing trend of growing disparities between the most and least deprived areas of the county. There have also been, however, a mixture of favourable and less favourable results in Lancashire.

Blackpool, Burnley, Blackburn with Darwen and Hyndburn each had six of their eight local authority summary measures ranked in the 50 most deprived positions within England. Pendle had three, and Lancaster and Preston each had one. Preston, which has improved in six of its relative deprivation rankings, remained as one of the most deprived 50 local authorities, owing to its extent of deprivation ranking (46<sup>th</sup>).

Blackpool had the most deprived rankings in the Lancashire-14 area for all eight of the local authority summary measures. The authority also had the top most deprived rankings (1<sup>st</sup> in England) for the rank of average score measure and the rank of local concentration measure. This latter measure identifies 'hot spots' of very high levels of deprivation.

Only Ribble Valley and South Ribble had rankings that fell wholly within the least deprived 50% of local authorities.

The six authorities of Blackpool (12), Blackburn with Darwen (13), Burnley (16), Hyndburn (24), Pendle (31) and Preston (46) all had rankings within the 50 most deprived positions on the extent of deprivation measure.

Besides Preston recording relative improvement to six of its local authority summary measure rankings, Pendle, South Ribble, Chorley, West Lancashire and Rossendale also recorded some notable improvements to the majority, or some of their respective local authority domain rankings, in relative terms, compared to other local authorities.

By contrast, Wyre, Lancaster and Fylde districts have all recorded some marked deterioration to at least three of their respective local authority domain rankings, in relative terms, but notably, the rank of local concentration measure.

## Background and introduction

The English Indices of Deprivation 2015, the combined Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD 2015) and the local authority deprivation summary measures for the 326 local authorities within England were published on the 30 September 2015. Most of the datasets used to compile the indices relate to the 2012/13 financial year. Because patterns of deprivation across larger areas can be complex, which give rise to different rankings for each individual measure, there is no single local authority summary measure that can be described as the 'best' measure. Comparison of the different local authority summary measures is required to provide a more complete picture of deprivation within authority areas. Eight of the 34 local authority summary measures are analysed within this report.

Indices that help to identify small geographical areas of deprivation have been used in the UK since the mid-1970s. One of the first, the IMD 2000, used the 8,500 English wards as the basic geographic area of analysis. Subsequently, the indices for 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2015 have been based on a much smaller geographic area known as lower-layer super output areas (LSOAs). The LSOA geographic unit was introduced with the 2001 Census of Population, with each individual area designed to have a similar population size of approximately 1,500 persons, or 650 households on average.

The indices of deprivation are designed primarily to measure relative deprivation at the small-area LSOA level. Nevertheless, summary measures have been produced to help users understand deprivation patterns across a set of higher geographies, namely, local district authorities, upper tier local authorities (counties), local enterprise partnerships and clinical commissioning groups.

## Indices of Deprivation 2015 – the seven domains at the LSOA level.

The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 uses 37 separate indicators, which are grouped into seven domains of deprivation (see below). The seven domains are subsequently combined, using appropriate weights, to calculate the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD 2015). This is an overall measure of multiple deprivation experienced by people living in an area. Multiple deprivation levels have been calculated for each of the 32,844 LSOAs in England for the 2015 IMD. Each of these LSOAs is ranked according to its level of deprivation relative to that of other areas. Please note that owing to population changes, some LSOA boundaries have been split or merged since the 2010 IMD and the net number of LSOAs has risen from the 32,482 areas used in the previous 2004, 2007 and 2010 indices. Care should therefore be taken when comparing the number of LSOAs in the 2015 IMD and previous indices. Most of the datasets used to compile the 2015 indices relate to the 2012/13 financial year. The domain weightings are the same as those used since the 2004 IMD.

### Domain weights for the IMD 2015

Income deprivation	22.5%
Employment deprivation	22.5%
Education, Skills and Training deprivation	13.5%
Health deprivation and disability	13.5%
Barriers to housing and services	9.3%
Crime	9.3%
Living environment	9.3%

As for previous publications of the IMD since 2004, there is also supplementary information for each LSOA on the percentage of children (0-15 years) and older persons (60 or over) in England who live in income deprived families.

All the data and documents relating to the English Indices of Deprivation 2015 are available to download via the [GOV.UK website](http://gov.uk).

## Indices of Deprivation 2015 – the local authority level summary measures

As well as providing core information on each of the seven domains of deprivation for the 32,844 LSOAs, the 2015 Indices of Deprivation also provides 34 local authority summary measures for the 326 local authorities within England. The associated [technical report](#) outlines seven local authority measures which provide an overall picture of deprivation for each authority.

The eight local authority summary measures analysed in this report are:

- **Average of LSOA ranks** – is the population weighted average of the combined *ranks* for all the LSOAs in a local authority – ie it summarises the local authority as a whole, taking into account the ranks of both the deprived and the least deprived LSOAs. This measure can conceal local authorities with highly polarised levels of deprivation as extremely deprived LSOAs will be averaged out by less deprived areas.
- **Average of LSOA scores** – is the population weighted average of the combined *scores* for all the LSOAs in a local authority – ie it describes the local authority as a whole, taking into account the full range of LSOA scores across a local authority. Compared to the average rank measure, 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.
- **Extent** – is the proportion of a local authority's population living in the most deprived LSOAs in the country – ie it portrays how widespread high levels of deprivation are in a local authority. It uses a weighted measure of the population in the most deprived 30% of all areas which is designed to avoid the 'cliff edge' effect associated with the blunt cut-off points (such as the proportion of LSOAs within the most deprived 10% nationally, whereby areas ranked only a single place outside the 10% cut-off point are not

counted at all). Higher level geographies which have no LSOAs in the most deprived 30% of all areas of England will have a score of zero for this measure.

- **Local concentration** – is the population weighted average of the ranks of a local authority's most deprived LSOAs that contain exactly 10% of the local authority's population – ie it is useful way of identifying local authority 'hot spots' of high levels of deprivation. For example, an authority with 25% of LSOAs within the most deprived 1% of the rankings would receive a much higher score than an authority with 25% of LSOAs lying just within the 10% most deprived decile.
- **Income scale** – is the number of people in the local authority who are income deprived. If two districts have the same percentage of income deprived people, the authority with the larger number of income deprived people will be ranked as more deprived on this measure because more people are experiencing the deprivation.
- **Employments scale** – is the number of people in the local authority who are employment deprived. If two districts have the same percentage of employment deprived people, the authority with the larger number of employment deprived people will be ranked as more deprived on this measure because more people are experiencing the deprivation.
- **Income score** – is the percentage of the population in an area experiencing deprivation relating to low income. This includes those people that are out-of-work, and those in work but who have low earnings (and who satisfy the respective means tests).
- **Employment score** – is the percentage of the working age population in an area involuntarily excluded from the labour market.

Each local authority summary measure will give rise to a different set of relative rankings intended to capture the complex pattern of deprivation found at this geographical levels. It should be stressed, however, that when examining these rankings, no single measure is favoured over another as there is no single best way of describing or comparing England's 326 local authorities. The LSOA level data provides much greater detail than is available through the summaries alone.

Because patterns of deprivation across larger areas can be complex, which give rise to different rankings for each individual measure, there is no single local authority summary measure that can be described as the 'best' measure.

## **Comparability between the 2015, 2010, 2007 and 2004 indices of deprivation results**

Caution needs to be applied when analysing the indices of deprivation and when interpreting changes to the indices over time. In general, it is not possible to use the indices to quantify the differences in deprivation between areas. It is also important to emphasise that it is not possible to use any of the indices to measure changes in the level of deprivation in an area over time. The different versions of the indices should therefore not be construed as a time-series. It is, however, possible to investigate the changes in the *relative* rankings of deprivation between areas, and analyse changes in the distribution of deprivation between different versions of the indices.

## **Analysis of the 2015 deprivation summary measures for local authorities**

The ranks for the eight local authority summary measures in tables 1, 3 and 4. Table 2 outlines the scores, ranks, percentiles and deciles for the average score summary measure. The two summary measures for income deprivation and employment deprivation and related scores, rankings and decile rankings are in tables 3 and 4.

The 2015 figures reveal that seven local authorities within the Lancashire-14 area; Blackpool, Burnley, Blackburn with Darwen, Hyndburn, Pendle, Lancaster and Preston; had at least one of their eight local authority deprivation summary measures ranked in the 50 most deprived positions. This was up from six authorities in the previous 2010 indices. Lancaster became one of the most deprived 50 authorities, owing to a relative deterioration of its local concentration ranking, falling 23 places to 36<sup>th</sup> in 2015 for this measure. Wyre, although not in the most deprived 50 local authorities, lies within the most deprived 20% of authorities, also owing to the relative deterioration of its local concentration ranking, dropping 40 positions (and two deciles) for this measure between 2010 and 2015. This was the greatest relative deterioration recorded by a Lancashire authority.

Blackpool, Burnley, Blackburn with Darwen and Hyndburn each had six of their eight local authority summary measures ranked in the 50 most deprived positions, whilst Pendle had three, and the two authorities of Lancaster and Preston each had one summary measure ranked in the most deprived 50 places. Preston, which has improved in six of its relative deprivation rankings, remained as one of the most deprived 50 local authorities, owing to its extent of deprivation ranking (46<sup>th</sup>).

**Table 1: Local authority deprivation summaries from the 2015 Indices of Deprivation (2010) – ranks<sup>[1]</sup> for six of the local authority deprivation measures.**

Local authority	IMD Rank of average rank 2015 (2010)	IMD Rank of average score 2015 (2010)	IMD Rank of extent 2015 (2010)	IMD Rank of local concentration 2015 (2010)	Rank of income scale 2015 (2010)	Rank of employment scale 2015 (2010)	IMD In 50 most deprived 2015 (2010) <sup>[2]</sup>
Blackburn with Darwen	24 (28)	15 (17)	13 (14)	20 (7)	83 (70)	80 (75)	Y (Y)
Blackpool	4 (10)	1 (6)	12 (16)	1 (1)	68 (74)	61 (63)	Y (Y)
Burnley	17 (21)	9 (11)	16 (19)	8 (4)	130 (125)	129 (115)	Y (Y)
Chorley	186 (173)	175 (156)	146 (132)	137 (118)	195 (206)	181 (166)	
Fylde	218 (235)	217 (236)	196 (218)	191 (220)	275 (280)	262 (253)	
Hyndburn	28 (40)	26 (34)	24 (33)	41 (27)	159 (152)	155 (137)	Y (Y)
Lancaster	125 (133)	105 (116)	100 (104)	36 (59)	127 (127)	125 (113)	Y
Pendle	42 (41)	38 (33)	31 (32)	62 (29)	150 (135)	151 (138)	Y (Y)
Preston	72 (59)	61 (45)	46 (34)	60 (23)	110 (104)	106 (97)	Y (Y)
Ribble Valley	290 (285)	292 (290)	302 (294)	309 (312)	323 (323)	315 (305)	
Rosendale	98 (90)	108 (98)	109 (103)	117 (123)	222 (228)	209 (199)	
South Ribble	234 (207)	229 (206)	208 (190)	201 (189)	224 (229)	202 (186)	
West Lancashire	164 (153)	139 (136)	121 (117)	75 (79)	154 (145)	156 (136)	
Wyre	167 (185)	145 (163)	141 (135)	61 (101)	174 (174)	171 (162)	

[1] Rankings out of 326 English local authorities (where rank 1 = most deprived and rank 32,844 = least deprived).

[2] Local authorities in the 50 most deprived rankings for any of the six local authority domains (Y = YES).

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government – The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 and 2010 via the GOV.UK website.

The local concentration measure, which is a useful way of identifying local authority 'hot spots', is a particular problem for certain Lancashire authorities. Blackpool recorded the worst local concentration result out of the 326 English local authorities, whilst Burnley, Blackburn with Darwen, Lancaster and Hyndburn recorded the 8<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, 36<sup>th</sup> and 41<sup>st</sup> most deprived local concentration rankings, respectively.

Tables 1 and 2 show that Blackpool also recorded the most deprived average score and ranking within England, with the four East Lancashire authorities of Burnley, Blackburn with Darwen, Hyndburn and Pendle ranked in 9<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 26<sup>th</sup> and 38<sup>th</sup> positions, respectively.

In terms of average rank, Blackpool was placed in the 4<sup>th</sup> most deprived position, with the four East Lancashire authorities of Burnley, Blackburn with Darwen, Hyndburn and Pendle, ranked in 17<sup>th</sup>, 24<sup>th</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup> and 42<sup>nd</sup> places, respectively.

The six authorities of Blackpool (12), Blackburn with Darwen (13), Burnley (16), Hyndburn (24), Pendle (31) and Preston (46) all had rankings within the 50 most deprived positions on the extent of deprivation measure. Ribble Valley was one of only 25 authorities within England to score 0 within the extent of deprivation domain, which indicated that none of its LSOAs fell within the most deprived 30% of the national rankings.

**Table 2: Local authority deprivation summaries from the 2015 Indices of Deprivation (2010) - changes in the rank of average score between 2010 and 2015**

-	2010			2015			2010 to 2015	2010 to 2015
Local Authority	Rank of Average Score & Decile (1 to 10)	Percentile	Average Score	Rank of Average Score & Decile (1 to 10)	Percentile	Average Score	Change in percentile	Change in Rank of Average Score (and Decile)
Blackburn with Darwen	17 (1)	5.21	35.23	15 (1)	4.60	34.189	-0.61	-2 (0)
Blackpool	6 (1)	1.84	40.39	1 (1)	0.31	41.997	-1.53	-5 (0)
Burnley	11 (1)	3.37	37.32	9 (1)	2.76	36.05	-0.61	-2 (0)
Chorley	156 (5)	47.85	17.97	175 (6)	53.68	17.41	5.83	19 (+1)
Fylde	236 (8)	72.39	12.82	217 (7)	66.56	14.375	-5.83	-19 (-1)
Hyndburn	34 (2)	10.43	30.53	26 (1)	7.98	32.102	-2.45	-8 (-1)
Lancaster	116 (4)	35.58	21.88	105 (4)	32.21	23.321	-3.37	-11 (0)
Pendle	33 (2)	10.12	30.72	38 (2)	11.66	29.62	1.54	5 (0)
Preston	45 (2)	13.80	29.36	61 (2)	18.71	27.404	4.91	16 (0)
Ribble Valley	290 (9)	88.96	9.88	292 (9)	89.57	10.185	0.61	2 (0)
Rossendale	98 (4)	30.06	23.52	108 (4)	33.13	23.155	3.07	10 (0)
South Ribble	206 (7)	63.19	14.77	229 (8)	70.25	13.702	7.06	23 (+1)
West Lancashire	136 (5)	41.72	20.10	139 (5)	42.64	19.983	0.92	3 (0)
Wyre	163 (5)	50.0	17.33	145 (5)	44.48	19.389	-5.52	-18 (0)

Note: Local authorities within decile one are the most deprived and those in decile 10 are the least deprived.

Percentile figures cover a range from 0.31 to 100.

Source Department for Communities and Local Government – The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 and 2010.

Table 3 shows that Blackpool has the greatest income scale score in the Lancashire-14 area with 36,489 people experiencing income deprivation in the 2015 indices, followed by Blackburn with Darwen with 31,779 persons, Preston with 23,194 people, Lancaster with 18,950 persons and Burnley with 18,171 people. Although Burnley has the fifth smallest population within the Lancashire-14 area, the authority has the fifth largest number of residents experiencing income deprivation, ranked in 130<sup>th</sup> position within England (just in the fourth most deprived decile - on the borderline with the fifth decile). The 2013 mid-year population figures showed that Burnley was ranked in 272<sup>nd</sup> place (55<sup>th</sup> smallest) out of the 326 local authorities within England, falling in the second lowest decile (the local authorities with the smallest 10% to 20% of total resident populations).

Looking at the income deprivation average score, which represents the proportion of the population in an area experiencing deprivation relating to low income, table 2 shows that Blackpool (25.7%) has the third most deprived percentage and ranking at the local authority level in England, with more than a quarter of the population experiencing income deprivation. The local authorities of Blackburn with Darwen (21.5%), Burnley (20.9%), Hyndburn (18.8%), Pendle (17.8%) and Preston (16.6%) all had a sixth or more of their respective populations experiencing income deprivation. Ribble Valley (6.2%) had the lowest percentage within the Lancashire-14 area by a considerable margin and had the 11<sup>th</sup> least deprived income deprivation score ranking within England.

**Table 3: Local authority deprivation summaries from the 2015 Indices of Deprivation (2010) – income deprivation scores (%)<sup>[1]</sup>, scales (numbers)<sup>[1]</sup>, ranks<sup>[2]</sup> and deciles<sup>[2]</sup>.**

Local authority	2015 Income Average Score <sup>[1]</sup>	2015 Rank of income average Score <sup>[2]</sup>	2015 Decile rank of income average Score <sup>[2]</sup>	2015 Income scale (2010) <sup>[1]</sup>	2015 Rank of income scale (2010) <sup>[2]</sup>	2015 Decile rank of income scale (2010) <sup>[2]</sup>
Blackburn with Darwen	21.5%	22	1	31,779 (33,691)	83 (70)	3 (3)
Blackpool	25.7%	3	1	36,489 (32,570)	68 (74)	3 (3)
Burnley	20.9%	28	1	18,171 (18,460)	130 (125)	4 (4)
Chorley	11.3%	186	6	12,053 (10,956)	195 (206)	6 (7)
Fylde	10.3%	209	7	7,760 (7,162)	275 (280)	9 (9)
Hyndburn	18.8%	48	2	15,031 (14,942)	159 (152)	5 (5)
Lancaster	13.6%	133	5	18,950 (18,272)	127 (127)	4 (4)
Pendle	17.8%	60	2	15,897 (16,781)	150 (135)	5 (5)
Preston	16.6%	80	3	23,194 (22,918)	110 (104)	4 (4)
Ribble Valley	6.2%	316	10	3,521 (3,335)	323 (323)	10 (10)
Rosendale	15.6%	97	3	10,638 (9,881)	222 (228)	7 (7)
South Ribble	9.7%	225	7	10,497 (9,776)	224 (229)	7 (8)
West Lancashire	13.9%	128	4	15,364 (15,414)	154 (145)	5 (5)
Wyre	13.0%	144	5	14,008 (13,107)	174 (174)	6 (6)

[1] Where higher figures signify greater deprivation. The income average score represents the percentage of the resident population who are experiencing income deprivation. The income scale represents the number of people who are income deprived.

[2] Rank 1 = most deprived.

Source Department for Communities and Local Government – The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 and 2010 via the [GOV.UK](http://gov.uk) website.

In table 4, the employment deprivation scale figures, which report on the number of people of working age involuntarily excluded from the labour market, show that Blackpool also has the largest number of the working age population (18,323 people) who were  
Lancashire County Council - Business Intelligence Team

experiencing employment deprivation in the 2015 indices, followed by Blackburn with Darwen (15,333 persons), Preston (11,586 people) Lancaster (9,541 persons) and Burnley (9,259 people). Ribble Valley (2,195 persons) had the 12<sup>th</sup> lowest number of people experiencing employment deprivation within England in the 2015 indices and was the least deprived on this measure within the Lancashire-14 area. Fylde (4,230 people) had the second lowest number and Rossendale (5,484 persons) the third lowest within Lancashire.

**Table 4: Local authority deprivation summaries from the 2015 Indices of Deprivation (2010) – employment deprivation scores (%) <sup>[1]</sup>, scales (numbers) <sup>[1]</sup>, ranks <sup>[2]</sup> and deciles <sup>[2]</sup>.**

Local authority	2015 Employment average score <sup>[1]</sup>	2015 Rank of employment average score <sup>[2]</sup>	2015 Decile rank of employment average score <sup>[2]</sup>	2015 Employment scale (2010) <sup>[1]</sup>	Rank of Employment scale 2015 (2010) <sup>[2]</sup>	Decile rank of employment scale 2015 (2010) <sup>[2]</sup>
Blackburn with Darwen	18.0%	20	1	15,333.75 (12,860)	80 (75)	3 (3)
Blackpool	22.8%	2	1	18,323.75 (14,692)	61 (63)	2 (2)
Burnley	18.5%	14	1	9,259.25 (8,261)	129 (115)	4 (4)
Chorley	10.8%	150	5	6,671.5 (5,875)	181 (166)	6 (6)
Fylde	10.6%	155	5	4,230.25 (3,584)	262 (253)	9 (8)
Hyndburn	16.8%	33	2	7,655.5 (6,967)	155 (137)	5 (5)
Lancaster	11.6%	128	4	9,541 (8,483)	125 (113)	4 (4)
Pendle	15.2%	52	2	7,765.5 (6,884)	151 (138)	5 (5)
Preston	13.4%	85	3	11,586.5 (10,162)	106 (97)	4 (3)
Ribble Valley	7.0%	268	9	2,195.25 (2,113)	315 (305)	10 (10)
Rossendale	13.8%	77	3	5,484.75 (4,777)	209 (199)	7 (7)
South Ribble	9.3%	194	6	5,750 (5,194)	202 (186)	7 (6)
West Lancashire	12.2%	112	4	7,634 (7,073)	156 (136)	5 (5)
Wyre	12.3%	109	4	6,949.5 (5,919)	171 (162)	6 (5)

[1] Where higher figures signify greater deprivation. The employment average scores represent the percentage of working age people who are experiencing employment deprivation. The employment scale represents the number of people who are employment deprived.

[2] Rank 1 = most deprived.

Source Department for Communities and Local Government – The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 and 2010 via the [GOV.UK](http://gov.uk) website.

Similarly, for the employment deprivation average score indicator, which represents the proportion of the population who are involuntarily excluded from the labour market, table 3 shows that Blackpool (22.8%) had the second most deprived ranking and percentage out of the 326 local authorities within England, with more than a fifth of the working age population experiencing employment deprivation. The local authorities of Burnley (18.5%), Blackburn with Darwen (18.0%), Hyndburn (16.8%) and Pendle (15.2%) also had more than a seventh of their respective working age populations experiencing employment deprivation. By contrast, the percentage for Ribble Valley was 7.0%, which placed the authority in the 9<sup>th</sup> decile with the 59<sup>th</sup> lowest ranking.

### **Focus on the most and least deprived local authorities within the Lancashire-14 area**

Blackpool had the most deprived rankings in the Lancashire-14 area for all eight of the local authority summary measures. The authority also had the most deprived rankings in England for the rank of average score measure and the rank of local concentration measure. This latter measure identifies 'hot spots' of very high levels of deprivation. Blackpool (22.8%) had the 2<sup>nd</sup> greatest percentage in terms of its working age population who were experiencing employment deprivation and the 3<sup>rd</sup> greatest percentage (25.7%) in relation to its resident population who were experiencing income deprivation. For the rank of average rank measure, Blackpool was the 4<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority nationally and the 12<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority in respect of the extent of deprivation measure (a weighted average of the most deprived 30% of neighbourhoods in each authority). Blackpool had both the greatest number of persons experiencing income deprivation (36,489) and employment deprivation (18,323) within Lancashire.

Based on the combined 2015 Index of Multiple Deprivation, Blackpool has the greatest percentage (20.2%) of Lower-layer Super Output Area (LSOA) neighbourhoods that are ranked within the most deprived 1 per cent of areas – some 19 of its 94 LSOAs. Four of Blackpool's LSOAs have appeared within the most deprived 1% of the rankings in the last four versions of the indices (2004, 2007, 2010 and 2015) based on the IMD. In relation to the most deprived 10 per cent of areas within England, 36 (38.3%) of Blackpool's 94 LSOA neighbourhoods are ranked within the most deprived 10 per cent of areas: This is the seventh greatest percentage within England. Fifteen (16%) of Blackpool's 94 Lower-layer Super Output Area (LSOA) neighbourhoods, or roughly a sixth, are ranked within the most deprived 10% of the rankings for at least six of the seven individual domains used within the 2015 English Indices of Deprivation.

Burnley had six of its eight local authority summary measures ranked in the most deprived 50 positions within England. Of these, four measures had the 2<sup>nd</sup> most deprived positions within the Lancashire-14 area and two measures had the 3<sup>rd</sup> most deprived rankings.

These six rankings ranged from the 8<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority in England for the local concentration measure; the 9<sup>th</sup> most deprived for the rank of average score to the 28<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority for the income domain average summary score, which denoted that 20.9% of the residents in Burnley (more than a fifth) were experiencing income deprivation.

Blackburn with Darwen also had six of the eight local authority summary measures ranked in the most deprived 50 positions within England. Of these, two measures had the 2<sup>nd</sup> most deprived positions within the Lancashire-14 area and four measures had the 3<sup>rd</sup> most deprived rankings within Lancashire. These six rankings ranged from the 13<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority in England for the extent of deprivation measure, to the 24<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority in terms of the rank of average rank.

Hyndburn district had six of the eight local authority summary measures ranked in the most deprived 50 positions within England as well. Of these, five measures had the 4<sup>th</sup> most deprived positions within the Lancashire-14 area and one measures had the 5<sup>th</sup> most deprived ranking. These six rankings ranged from the 24<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority in England for the extent of deprivation measure to the 48<sup>th</sup> most deprived in terms of the income domain average summary score, which indicated that 18.8% of the residents in Hyndburn were experiencing income deprivation.

Pendle had three of the eight local authority summary measures ranked in the most deprived 50 positions within England. Of these, all three measures had the 5<sup>th</sup> most deprived positions within the Lancashire-14 area. These three rankings ranged from the 31<sup>st</sup> most deprived authority in England for the extent of deprivation measure; the 38<sup>th</sup> most deprived authority in England in respect of the rank of average score; to the 42<sup>nd</sup> most deprived in terms of rank of average rank. Pendle's employment domain average summary score



was ranked just outside of the most deprived 50 local authorities in 52<sup>nd</sup> position, which signified that 15.2% of Pendle's working age population were experiencing employment deprivation.

For Ribble Valley, the 2015 results reveal that the authority recorded the least deprived scores and rankings out of all 14 Lancashire authorities for each of the local authority level summary measures. Ribble Valley was one of only 25 authorities within England to score 0 within the extent of deprivation domain, which indicated that none of its LSOAs fell within the most deprived 30% of the national rankings. The district also had the fourth least deprived score on the income scale within England (the number income deprived = 3,521) and the 11<sup>th</sup> least deprived ranking for the percentage of persons who are income deprived (income average score = 6.2%). Similarly, for the employment scale, Ribble Valley had the 12<sup>th</sup> lowest number of persons who were employment deprived (2,195) and the 59<sup>th</sup> least deprived ranking for the proportion of persons who are employment deprived (employment average score = 7.0%).

## Analysis by decile rankings

Excluding the income scale and employment scale results, which tend to skew the results, owing to some very large populations within some of the 326 authorities, the summary measures for the remaining six indicators analysed in this report place Blackpool, Burnley and Blackburn with Darwen in the most deprived decile, or 10% of local authorities. The results for Hyndburn and Pendle place these two authorities in the most deprived quintile as they have rankings in both the most deprived decile (1 to 10%) and second most deprived decile (10% to 20%). The rankings for Preston all lie within the second and third most deprived deciles (10% to 30%) in respect of these six measures and the results for Rossendale fall in the second most deprived quintile (20% to 40%).

**Table 5: Local authority deprivation summary measures from the 2015 Indices of Deprivation (2010) – Decile rankings<sup>[1]</sup> for six of the local authority summary measures and change between 2010 and 2015.**

Local authority	Decile rank of IMD average rank 2015 (2010)	Decile rank of IMD average score 2015 (2010)	Decile rank of IMD extent 2015 (2010)	Decile rank of IMD local concentration 2015 (2010)	Decile rank of income scale 2015 (2010)	Decile rank of employment scale 2015 (2010)	IMD In 50 most deprived 2015 (2010) <sup>[2]</sup>
Blackburn with Darwen	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	3 (3)	3 (3)	Y (Y)
Blackpool	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	3 (3)	2 (2)	Y (Y)
Burnley	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	4 (4)	4 (4)	Y (Y)
Chorley	6 (6)	6 (5)	5 (5)	5 (4)	6 (7)	6 (6)	
Fylde	7 (8)	7 (8)	6 (7)	6 (7)	9 (9)	9 (8)	
Hyndburn	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (1)	2 (1)	5 (5)	5 (5)	Y (Y)
Lancaster	4 (5)	4 (4)	4 (4)	2 (2)	4 (4)	4 (4)	Y
Pendle	2 (2)	2 (1)	1 (1)	2 (1)	5 (5)	5 (5)	Y (Y)
Preston	3 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (1)	4 (4)	4 (3)	Y (Y)
Ribble Valley	9 (9)	9 (9)	10 (10)	10 (10)	10 (10)	10 (10)	
Rossendale	3 (3)	4 (3)	4 (4)	4 (4)	7 (7)	7 (7)	
South Ribble	8 (7)	8 (7)	7 (6)	7 (6)	7 (8)	7 (6)	
West Lancashire	6 (5)	5 (5)	4 (4)	3 (3)	5 (5)	5 (5)	
Wyre	6 (6)	5 (5)	5 (5)	2 (4)	6 (6)	6 (5)	

[1] Rankings out of 326 English local authorities (where rank 1 = most deprived and rank 32,844 = least deprived).

[2] Local authorities in the 50 most deprived rankings for any of the six local authority domains (Y = YES).

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government – The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 and 2010 via the GOV.UK website.

The results for Lancaster, Wyre and West Lancashire all show a very wide spread of rankings. For Wyre, its rankings are distributed over 5 deciles, whilst the respective rankings for Lancaster and West Lancashire are spread across a range of 4 deciles. Excluding the income and employment scale measures, the rankings the remaining six summary measures for Lancaster range from 36<sup>th</sup>

(second most deprived decile) in relation to the local concentration of deprivation measure, to 133rd (5<sup>th</sup> most deprived decile – 40% to 50%) for the income deprivation average score measure – a spread of 98 rankings. The rankings for Wyre range from 61<sup>st</sup> position (2<sup>nd</sup> most deprived decile), again, in respect of the local concentration measure to 167<sup>th</sup> place (6<sup>th</sup> most deprived decile – 50% to 60%) for the rank of average rank measure – a spread of 107 rankings. For West Lancashire, the rankings range from 75<sup>th</sup> (third most deprived decile – 20% to 30%), once again, in relation to the local concentration measure, to 164<sup>th</sup> (6<sup>th</sup> most deprived decile – 50% to 60%) for the rank of average rank measure – a spread of 90 rankings.

Ribble Valley recorded the least deprived scores and rankings out of all 14 Lancashire authorities for each of the eight local authority measures and was one of only 25 authorities within England to score 0 in respect of the extent of deprivation summary.

The results for Ribble Valley all fall within the least deprived quintile (20%). Other than Ribble Valley, South Ribble is the only other authority that has results that fall wholly within the least deprived 50% of the rankings with regard to the eight summary measures in this report.

In addition to Ribble Valley and South Ribble, Chorley and the Fylde districts are the only other Lancashire authorities that have none of their respective summary rankings which fall in the most deprived third of the rankings. Indeed, the results for Chorley all fall in the middle quintile (40% to 60%). The Fylde also has a wide spread of rankings. Excluding the income and employment scale measures, the positions for Fylde district span 64 ranks, from the 155<sup>th</sup> position (5<sup>th</sup> most deprived decile - 40% to 50%) for the employment deprivation average score measure (10.6%) to 218<sup>th</sup> place (7<sup>th</sup> most deprived decile – 60% to 70%) for the rank of average rank measure. Excluding the 218<sup>th</sup> ranking position, which falls just in the least deprived third of the rankings, the results for the Fylde fall within the middle third of the rankings for these six measures.

## **Analysis of the relative change in the local authority summary measure rankings between the 2010 and 2015 Indices of Deprivation**

Between 2010 and 2015, the indices of deprivation results indicate a disappointing trend of growing disparities between the most and least deprived areas of the county. There have also been, however, a mixture of favourable and less favourable results in Lancashire.

The least deprived local authority in Lancashire, Ribble Valley, recorded relative improvements to five of its local authority deprivation domain rankings between 2010 and 2015, whilst Blackpool saw a relative deterioration to five of its rankings.

Preston recorded relative improvement to six of its local authority summary measure rankings, especially the local concentration ranking, which moved down the relative deprivation rankings by 37 places for this measure. Pendle, South Ribble, Chorley, West Lancashire and Rossendale have also all recorded some notable improvements to the majority, or some of their respective local authority domain rankings, in relative terms, compared to other local authorities.

By contrast, Wyre, Lancaster and Fylde districts have all recorded some marked deterioration to at least three of their respective local authority domain rankings, in relative terms, but notably, the rank of local concentration measure. The relative rankings for the local concentration measure have deteriorated by 40 places in Wyre, by 29 places in Fylde district and 23 positions in Lancaster. Lancaster became one of the most deprived 50 authorities, owing to a relative deterioration of its local concentration ranking, falling 23 places to 36<sup>th</sup> in 2015 for this measure. Wyre, although not in the most deprived 50 local authorities, lies within the most deprived 20% of authorities, also owing to the relative deterioration of its local concentration ranking, dropping 40 positions (and two deciles) between 2010 and 2015. This was the greatest relative deterioration recorded by a Lancashire authority for any of the eight measures analysed in this report. The relative deprivation rankings for the Fylde district deteriorated for five of the six measures between 2010 and 2015. This resulted in South Ribble having the second least deprived rankings within the Lancashire-14 area, in relative terms, for four of the measures in 2015, rather than the Fylde district.

Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley and Hyndburn have recorded a mixed set of results with all three authorities recording relative improvements to the same three local authority domain indicators (rank of local concentration, income rank of scale and employment rank of scale). These relative improvements were however not sufficient to result in relative enhancements to their respective rank of average rank, rank of average score or rank of extent positions, all of which deteriorated between the 2010 and 2015 results.

**Table 6: Change in the rankings for six of the local authority summary measures between 2010 and 2015**

Local authority	Change in IMD Rank of average rank, 2010 to 2015	Change in IMD Rank of average score, 2010 to 2015	Change in IMD Rank of extent, 2010 to 2015	Change in IMD Rank of local concentration 2010 to 2015	Change in Income – rank of scale, 2010 to 2015	Change in Employment – rank of scale, 2010 to 2015	In 50 most deprived authorities 2015 (2010 in brackets) <sup>[2]</sup> Y = YES
Blackburn with Darwen	-4	-2	-1	+13	+13	+5	Y (Y)
Blackpool	-6	-5	-4	=	-6	-2	Y (Y)
Burnley	-4	-2	-3	+4	+5	+14	Y (Y)
Chorley	+13	+19	+14	+19	-11	+15	
Fylde	-17	-19	-22	-29	-5	+9	
Hyndburn	-12	-8	-9	+14	+7	+18	Y (Y)
Lancaster	-8	-11	-4	-23	=	+12	Y
Pendle	+1	+5	-1	+33	+15	+13	Y (Y)
Preston	+13	+16	+12	+37	+6	+9	Y (Y)
Ribble Valley	+5	+2	+8	-3	=	+10	
Rosendale	+8	+10	+6	-6	-6	+10	
South Ribble	+27	+23	+18	+12	-5	+16	
West Lancashire	+11	+3	+4	-4	+9	+20	
Wyre	-18	-18	+6	-40	=	+9	

[1] Rankings out of 326 English local authorities (where rank 1 is the most deprived).

[2] Local authorities in the 50 most deprived rankings for any of the six local authority domains.

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government – The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 and 2010 via the GOV.UK website.

With the exception of Blackpool, the relative employment scale ranks have improved for 13 of the authorities in the Lancashire-14 area, this is despite the number of working age people experiencing employment deprivation increasing in all Lancashire authorities. Figures have increased by 82 persons (3.9%) in Ribble Valley to 3,631 people (24.7%) in Blackpool between 2010 and 2015. This indicates that other authorities have recorded a greater increase in the number of people experiencing employment deprivation.

The relative rankings for the income deprivation scale measure have improved for 6 of the Lancashire authorities between 2010 and 2015 indices, although the number of persons experiencing income deprivation has only fallen in four of these local authorities: Numbers fell in Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley, Pendle and West Lancashire, but rose in Preston and Hyndburn. The relative rankings deteriorated in 5 of the Lancashire authorities (Blackpool, Chorley, Rosendale, South Ribble and Fylde district), with the number of people experiencing income deprivation increasing in all of these areas. The rankings for Lancaster, Wyre and Ribble Valley were unchanged on the previous 2010 indices, although the number of people experiencing income deprivation increased in these three areas between 2010 and 2015. This indicates that there has been a wide variety in the relative pace of increases and decreases with regard to the number of people experiencing employment deprivation across the 326 authorities between the 2010 and 2015 indices.

**Table 7: Local authority and Lower-layer Super Output Area Ranks split by decile**

Decile	Local authority ranks by decile	Lower-layer Super Output Area ranks by decile
Decile 1 (most deprived 10%)	1 to 33	1 to 3,284
Decile 2 (second most deprived 10%)	34 to 65	3,285 to 6,568
Decile 3 (third most deprived 10%)	66 to 98	6,569 to 9,853
Decile 4 (fourth most deprived 10%)	99 to 130	9,854 to 13,137
Decile 5 (fifth most deprived 10%)	131 to 163	13,138 to 16,422

Decile 6 (sixth most deprived 10% / 5 <sup>th</sup> least deprived 10%)	164 to 196	16,423 to 19,706
Decile 7 (4 <sup>th</sup> least deprived 10%)	197 to 228	19,707 to 22,990
Decile 8 (3 <sup>rd</sup> least deprived 10%)	229 to 261	22,991 to 26,275
Decile 9 (2 <sup>nd</sup> least deprived 10%)	262 to 293	26,276 to 29,559
Decile 10 (least deprived 10%)	294 to 326	29,560 to 32,844

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government – The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 Research report via the [GOV.UK](http://GOV.UK) website.

Last updated October 2015