

The English Indices of Deprivation, 2019 – supplementary report on Healthier Lancashire and South Cumbria

www.lancashire.gov.uk

Published 18 November 2019

For further information, please contact us at:

**Business Intelligence
Lancashire County Council
2nd floor Christ Church Precinct
County Hall
Fishergate Hill
Preston
PR1 8XJ
E: BusinessIntelligence.insight@lancashire.gov.uk
W: www.lancashire.gov.uk/lancashire-insight**

Contents

Background and introduction	3
Local authority analysis	3
<i>Overall intensity of deprivation</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>How deprivation is distributed across the larger area</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>The overall volume, or 'scale', of deprivation</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Sub-domains.....</i>	<i>10</i>
Wards	14
Lower super output areas (LSOAs)	15

Background and introduction

This report is designed to sit alongside our main report. It looks at the wider area covered by the Healthier Lancashire and South Cumbria ICS. Lancashire and South Cumbria ICS is a partnership of organisations better known as 'Healthier Lancashire and South Cumbria' coming together to improve outcomes and care for local population of 1.7 million, whilst reducing pressures on services and making the best use of financial resources within the area.

All statistics in this report are taken from Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government: The English Indices of Deprivation 2019 via the GOV.UK website.

[Dashboards](#) have been produced to visualise the data alongside this analysis.

Local authority analysis

The pattern of deprivation across large areas such as lower-tier local authorities can be complex. In some areas, deprivation is concentrated in severe pockets, rather than evenly spread throughout. In other areas, the opposite picture is seen, with deprivation spread relatively evenly throughout the area, and with no highly deprived areas. The set of summary measures described in this section have been designed to help users understand deprivation patterns for higher-level areas such as local authority districts. The measures identify the overall intensity of deprivation, how deprivation is distributed across the larger area, and the overall volume, or 'scale', of deprivation. There is no single local authority summary measure that can be described as the 'best' measure. The seven sub-domains of deprivation are also analysed in this section.

There are four additional lower-tier authorities in the Lancashire and South Cumbria ICS footprint – Barrow-in-Furness, Copeland, South Lakeland in Cumbria and Craven in North Yorkshire. Only part of these authorities are within the boundary of the ICS but the local authority analysis looks at them as a whole.

Overall intensity of deprivation

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.



















Table 2 below looks at the change in the IMD rank of average rank measure since the 2015 index. Chorley, West Lancashire and Copeland have become relatively less deprived. Preston has the greatest percentile change, 7.6%, dropping from the 3rd to the 2nd decile, showing that the authority has become relatively more deprived. Even taking into account the boundary changes in England between the two indices, these represent real change in relative deprivation.

Table 1: Comparison between 2015 and 2019 on the IMD rank of average rank measure

Area	2015		2019		2015 to 2019	
	Percentile	Decile	Percentile	Decile	Change in percentile	Change in decile
Burnley	5.2%	1	3.5%	1	↓ -1.7%	→ 0
Chorley	57.1%	6	60.6%	7	↑ 3.5%	↑ 1
Fylde	66.9%	7	62.5%	7	↓ -4.4%	→ 0
Hyndburn	8.6%	1	5.7%	1	↓ -2.9%	→ 0
Lancaster	38.3%	4	35.3%	4	↓ -3.0%	→ 0
Pendle	12.9%	2	11.4%	2	↓ -1.5%	→ 0
Preston	22.1%	3	14.5%	2	↓ -7.6%	↓ -1
Ribble Valley	89.0%	9	89.0%	9	→ 0.0%	→ 0
Rossendale	30.1%	4	28.7%	3	↓ -1.4%	↓ -1
South Ribble	71.8%	8	66.2%	7	↓ -5.5%	↓ -1
West Lancashire	50.3%	6	56.2%	6	↑ 5.8%	→ 0
Wyre	51.2%	6	46.4%	5	↓ -4.9%	↓ -1
Blackburn with Darwen	7.4%	1	4.4%	1	↓ -2.9%	→ 0
Blackpool	1.2%	1	0.3%	1	↓ -0.9%	→ 0
Barrow-in-Furness	13.5%	2	13.9%	2	→ 0.4%	→ 0
Copeland	19.3%	2	24.6%	3	↑ 5.3%	↑ 1
Craven	76.7%	8	75.4%	8	↓ -1.3%	→ 0
South Lakeland	77.0%	8	76.3%	8	↓ -0.7%	→ 0

If we look back at the last five published indices of deprivation in table 3 below, we can see that Blackpool has been in the 10% most deprived authorities since 2000. Barrow-in-Furness, Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley, Hyndburn and Preston have been in the 20% most deprived authorities since 2000. Chorley and West Lancashire have become relatively less deprived since 2000, moving up two deciles.

Table 2: Local authority deciles for IMD rank of average rank, all indices since 2000

Area	Decile (1 is 10% most deprived, 10 is 10% least deprived)					
	2000	2004	2007	2015	2019	Trend
Burnley	2	2	1	1	1	
Chorley	5	6	6	6	7	
Fylde	7	7	8	7	7	
Hyndburn	2	2	2	1	1	
Lancaster	4	4	4	4	4	
Pendle	2	2	2	2	2	
Preston	3	3	3	3	2	
Ribble Valley	8	8	9	9	9	
Rossendale	2	3	3	4	3	
South Ribble	7	7	7	8	7	
West Lancashire	4	4	5	6	6	
Wyre	5	6	6	6	5	
Blackburn with Darwen	1	2	1	1	1	
Blackpool	1	1	1	1	1	
Barrow-in-Furness	1	1	1	2	2	
Copeland	3	3	3	2	3	
Craven	8	8	8	8	8	
South Lakeland	8	8	8	8	8	

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 local authorities 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.

Table 4 below shows the IMD rank of average score. Barrow-in-Furness, Chorley, Lancaster and West Lancashire are all one decile lower on the rank of average score measure than the rank of average rank measure, showing that their deprivation is more polarised than other areas. Copeland is one decile higher, showing that deprivation in that district is less polarised than other areas. All the others are the same, with Barrow-in-Furness, Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle and Preston in the 20% most deprived and Ribble Valley in the 20% least deprived.

Table 3: IMD rank of average score and change since 2015

	2015			2019			2015 to 2019	2010 to 2015
	Rank of Average Score	Percentile	Decile	Rank of Average Score	Percentile	Decile	Change in percentile	Change in decile
Burnley	9	2.8%	1	8	2.5%	1	↓ -0.2%	→ 0
Chorley	175	53.7%	6	177	55.8%	6	↑ 2.2%	→ 0
Fylde	217	66.6%	7	195	61.5%	7	↓ -5.1%	→ 0
Hyndburn	26	8.0%	1	16	5.0%	1	↓ -2.9%	→ 0
Lancaster	105	32.2%	4	89	28.1%	3	↓ -4.1%	↓ -1
Pendle	38	11.7%	2	33	10.4%	2	↓ -1.2%	→ 0
Preston	61	18.7%	2	45	14.2%	2	↓ -4.5%	→ 0
Ribble Valley	292	89.6%	9	283	89.3%	9	↓ -0.3%	→ 0
Rossendale	108	33.1%	4	92	29.0%	3	↓ -4.1%	↓ -1
South Ribble	229	70.2%	8	204	64.4%	7	↓ -5.9%	↓ -1
West Lancashire	139	42.6%	5	155	48.9%	5	↑ 6.3%	→ 0
Wyre	145	44.5%	5	129	40.7%	5	↓ -3.8%	→ 0
Blackburn with Darwen	15	4.6%	1	9	2.8%	1	↓ -1.8%	→ 0
Blackpool	1	0.3%	1	1	0.3%	1	→ 0.0%	→ 0
Barrow-in-Furness	29	8.9%	1	31	9.8%	1	↑ 0.9%	→ 0
Copeland	72	22.1%	3	85	26.8%	3	↑ 4.7%	→ 0
Craven	253	77.6%	8	245	77.3%	8	↓ -0.3%	→ 0
South Lakeland	258	79.1%	8	250	78.9%	8	↓ -0.3%	→ 0

How deprivation is distributed across the larger area

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).

Burnley, Pendle, Hyndburn and Preston, along with Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool unitary authorities are in the 10% most deprived in England on this measure. Eleven authorities have become relatively more deprived and seven relatively less deprived on this measure since 2015. The largest change in percentile is Preston, -5.6% and a drop by one place in decile. Lancaster and South Ribble have also dropped down one decile.

Table 4: IMD rank of extent and change since 2015

Area	2015			2019			2015 to 2019	
	Rank of Extent	Percentile	Decile	Rank of Extent	Percentile	Decile	Change in percentile	Change in decile
Burnley	16	4.9%	1	9	2.8%	1	↓ -2.1%	→ 0
Chorley	146	44.8%	5	144	45.4%	5	↑ 0.6%	→ 0
Fylde	196	60.1%	6	174	54.9%	6	↓ -5.2%	→ 0
Hyndburn	24	7.4%	1	17	5.4%	1	↓ -2.0%	→ 0
Lancaster	100	30.7%	4	89	28.1%	3	↓ -2.6%	↓ -1
Pendle	31	9.5%	1	29	9.1%	1	↓ -0.4%	→ 0
Preston	46	14.1%	2	27	8.5%	1	↓ -5.6%	↓ -1
Ribble Valley	302	92.6%	10	295	93.1%	10	↑ 0.4%	→ 0
Rossendale	109	33.4%	4	94	29.7%	3	↓ -3.8%	↓ -1
South Ribble	208	63.8%	7	185	58.4%	6	↓ -5.4%	↓ -1
West Lancashire	121	37.1%	4	125	39.4%	4	↑ 2.3%	→ 0
Wyre	141	43.3%	5	132	41.6%	5	↓ -1.6%	→ 0
Blackburn with Darwen	13	4.0%	1	7	2.2%	1	↓ -1.8%	→ 0
Blackpool	12	3.7%	1	5	1.6%	1	↓ -2.1%	→ 0
Barrow-in-Furness	34	10.4%	2	36	11.4%	2	↑ 0.9%	→ 0
Copeland	87	26.7%	3	92	29.0%	3	↑ 2.3%	→ 0
Craven	236	72.4%	8	236	74.4%	8	↑ 2.1%	→ 0
South Lakeland	302	92.6%	10	295	93.1%	10	↑ 0.4%	→ 0

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.

Barrow-in-Furness, Blackburn with Darwen, Blackpool, Burnley and Hyndburn are in the most deprived decile for this indicator and all, except Blackpool, which is already the most deprived, have got relatively worse since 2015.

Lancaster, Wyre, Pendle and Preston are in the 20% most deprived lower-tier local authority areas within England on the IMD rank of local concentration measure. All except Preston have got relatively worse since 2015.

Table 5: IMD rank of local concentration and change since 2015

Area	2015			2019			2015 to 2019	
	Rank of Local Concentration	Percentile	Decile	Rank of Local Concentration	Percentile	Decile	Change in percentile	Change in decile
Burnley	8	2.5%	1	6	1.9%	1	↓ -0.6%	→ 0
Chorley	137	42.0%	5	135	42.6%	5	↑ 0.6%	→ 0
Fylde	191	58.6%	6	164	51.7%	6	↓ -6.9%	→ 0
Hyndburn	41	12.6%	2	27	8.5%	1	↓ -4.1%	↓ -1
Lancaster	36	11.0%	2	33	10.4%	2	↓ -0.6%	→ 0
Pendle	62	19.0%	2	55	17.4%	2	↓ -1.7%	→ 0
Preston	60	18.4%	2	61	19.2%	2	↑ 0.8%	→ 0
Ribble Valley	309	94.8%	10	300	94.6%	10	↓ -0.1%	→ 0
Rossendale	117	35.9%	4	88	27.8%	3	↓ -8.1%	↓ -1
South Ribble	201	61.7%	7	178	56.2%	6	↓ -5.5%	↓ -1
West Lancashire	75	23.0%	3	83	26.2%	3	↑ 3.2%	→ 0
Wyre	61	18.7%	2	40	12.6%	2	↓ -6.1%	→ 0
Blackburn with Darwen	20	6.1%	1	18	5.7%	1	↓ -0.5%	→ 0
Blackpool	1	0.3%	1	1	0.3%	1	→ 0.0%	→ 0
Barrow-in-Furness	10	3.1%	1	9	2.8%	1	↓ -0.2%	→ 0
Copeland	72	22.1%	3	78	24.6%	3	↑ 2.5%	→ 0
Craven	251	77.0%	8	260	82.0%	9	↑ 5.0%	↑ 1
South Lakeland	292	89.6%	9	284	89.6%	9	→ 0.0%	→ 0









































































The overall volume, or ‘scale’, of deprivation

Two of the seven domains are population linked and can therefore be used to define the percentage of the population experiencing deprivation and the scale of deprivation (the number experiencing deprivation).

1. **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.
2. **Employments scale** – is the number of working age 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.
3. **Income score** – is the percentage of the population in an area experiencing deprivation relating to low income.
4. **Employment score** – is the percentage of the working age population in an area involuntarily excluded from the labour market.

Table 7 shows that Blackpool has the largest number and proportion of its population both employment and income deprived in the ICS. The percentage employment deprived is the largest in England.

Table 6: Number of employment and income deprived people

Area	Number of people employment deprived (employment scale)	Employment average score	Number of people income deprived (income scale)	Income average score	Number of children aged 0-15 in income deprived families (calculated from IDACI score)	Number of older people, 60+, income deprived (calculated from IDAOPI score)
Burnley	 8,010	0.163	 17,641	0.203	 4,481	 3,854
Chorley	 5,728	0.091	 11,243	0.102	 2,479	 3,252
Fylde	 3,839	0.096	 7,364	0.096	 1,327	 2,686
Hyndburn	 6,792	0.151	 14,538	0.182	 3,607	 3,431
Lancaster	 8,671	0.106	 18,039	0.129	 4,129	 5,029
Pendle	 6,648	0.132	 15,040	0.168	 3,453	 3,990
Preston	 10,539	0.123	 22,633	0.162	 5,632	 5,251
Ribble Valley	 1,887	0.06	 3,292	0.057	 594	 1,211
Rossendale	 4,855	0.122	 10,065	0.145	 2,400	 2,542
South Ribble	 4,977	0.081	 9,942	0.091	 2,346	 2,875
West Lancashire	 6,585	0.105	 13,834	0.123	 3,102	 4,283
Wyre	 6,361	0.112	 13,688	0.125	 2,835	 4,663
Blackburn with Darwen	 13,778	0.162	 31,358	0.212	 7,794	 6,694
Blackpool	 16,532	0.209	 34,610	0.247	 7,796	 8,394
Barrow-in-Furness	 5,753	0.152	 10,722	0.159	 2,267	 2,615
Copeland	 4,938	0.128	 8,933	0.13	 1,907	 2,351
Craven	 1,869	0.064	 3,737	0.067	 622	 1,487
South Lakeland	 3,292	0.061	 6,504	0.063	 1,080	 2,637

Sub-domains

Table 8 looks at the seven domains of deprivation within each district ordered by their relative ranking. Health is one of the two lowest ranked domains in 15/18 local authorities, living environment in 9/18 areas and employment in 8/18 areas.

Education, skills and training is second lowest in Pendle. Income is in the top two in Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool. Barriers to housing and services is the domain relatively least deprived in 13 of the 18 areas, but is 2nd most deprived in South Lakeland. Crime is the relatively least deprived domain in Copeland, Craven and South Lakeland.

Table 7: Deprivation domains sorted by their relative rank within the district

Area	Most deprived						Least deprived
Burnley	Health (R6, D1)	Employment (R9, D1)	Crime (R11, D1)	Income (R20, D1)	Education, skills & training (R22, D1)	Living Environment (R33, D2)	Barriers to housing and services (R311, D10)
Chorley	Health (R103, D4)	Employment (R159, D6)	Living Environment (R162, D6)	Crime (R181, D6)	Income (R186, D6)	Education, skills & training (R228, D8)	Barriers to housing and services (R282, D9)
Fylde	Health (R97, D4)	Employment (R121, D4)	Living Environment (R163, D6)	Income (R188, D6)	Education, skills & training (R248, D8)	Crime (R254, D9)	Barriers to housing and services (R300, D10)
Hyndburn	Health (R7, D1)	Living Environment (R20, D1)	Employment (R23, D1)	Income (R37, D2)	Crime (R48, D2)	Education, skills & training (R52, D2)	Barriers to housing and services (R317, D10)
Lancaster	Living Environment (R49, D2)	Health (R62, D2)	Crime (R124, D4)	Employment (R129, D5)	Income (R131, D5)	Education, skills & training (R180, D6)	Barriers to housing and services (R274, D9)
Pendle	Living Environment (R6, D1)	Education, skills & training (R33, D2)	Health (R38, D2)	Employment (R48, D2)	Income (R51, D2)	Crime (R115, D4)	Barriers to housing and services (R314, D10)
Preston	Health (R31, D1)	Living Environment (R39, D2)	Crime (R42, D2)	Income (R61, D2)	Employment (R62, D2)	Education, skills & training (R120, D4)	Barriers to housing and services (R294, D10)
Ribble Valley	Living Environment (R114, D4)	Health (R209, D7)	Barriers to housing and services (R218, D7)	Employment (R256, D9)	Crime (R284, D9)	Income (R295, D10)	Education, skills & training (R303, D10)
Rossendale	Employment (R56, D2)	Living Environment (R65, D3)	Health (R75, D3)	Income (R80, D3)	Crime (R117, D4)	Education, skills & training (R133, D5)	Barriers to housing and services (R249, D8)
South Ribble	Living Environment (R99, D4)	Health (R116, D4)	Employment (R179, D6)	Crime (R201, D7)	Income (R213, D7)	Education, skills & training (R235, D8)	Barriers to housing and services (R304, D10)
West Lancashire	Employment (R124, D4)	Health (R130, D5)	Income (R144, D5)	Education, skills & training (R190, D6)	Barriers to housing and services (R197, D7)	Crime (R230, D8)	Living Environment (R233, D8)
Wyre	Health (R71, D3)	Employment (R102, D4)	Income (R127, D5)	Living Environment (R152, D5)	Education, skills & training (R181, D6)	Crime (R213, D7)	Barriers to housing and services (R289, D10)
Blackburn with Darwen	Health (R11, D1)	Income (R18, D1)	Employment (R18, D1)	Education, skills & training (R29, D1)	Living Environment (R47, D2)	Crime (R56, D2)	Barriers to housing and services (R305, D10)
Blackpool	Income (R1, D1)	Health (R1, D1)	Employment (R2, D1)	Education, skills & training (R8, D1)	Living Environment (R15, D1)	Crime (R16, D1)	Barriers to housing and services (R308, D10)
Barrow-in-Furness	Health (R4, D1)	Employment (R38, D2)	Living Environment (R50, D2)	Income (R84, D3)	Education, skills & training (R93, D3)	Crime (R210, D7)	Barriers to housing and services (R316, D10)
Copeland	Health (R29, D1)	Employment (R59, D2)	Education, skills & training (R68, D3)	Income (R115, D4)	Living Environment (R178, D6)	Barriers to housing and services (R215, D7)	Crime (R271, D9)
Craven	Living Environment (R28, D1)	Health (R223, D8)	Employment (R236, D8)	Barriers to housing and services (R238, D8)	Education, skills & training (R255, D9)	Income (R274, D9)	Crime (R309, D10)
South Lakeland	Living Environment (R43, D2)	Barriers to housing and services (R199, D7)	Health (R217, D7)	Employment (R248, D8)	Education, skills & training (R254, D8)	Income (R284, D9)	Crime (R303, D10)

Notes: Read from left to right for most to least deprived; R is rank of average rank, out of 317; and D is the decile that rank falls into. Colours refer to the domain.

Table 9 looks at the change in domains by percentile between 2015 and 2019. The income domain has become relatively more deprived in all areas apart from West Lancashire where it has stayed the same. However, as we saw above, the number of income deprived people in the ICS has reduced which suggests that income deprivation as a whole across England has lessened. It seems to be the income deprivation affecting children measure which is driving this change because all areas, except Barrow-in-Furness and Craven, have become relatively more deprived on this indicator, whereas only Blackburn with Darwen, Copeland, Preston and Wyre have become more deprived on the income deprivation affecting older people index.

Similarly with employment deprivation, all areas have become relatively more employment deprived apart from Barrow-in-Furness and Chorley, which have improved and Blackpool, which has stayed the same (at the most employment deprived in England). All areas, apart from Barrow-in-Furness and Preston have become more education deprived. The other domains show a more mixed picture. South Ribble has become more deprived across all seven domains; South Lakeland, Wyre and Blackburn with Darwen have become more deprived across six of the seven domains.

Some change, estimated at up to 2.8%, might be due to local authority boundary changes, rather than a real change in relative deprivation.

Table 8: Change in percentile between 2015 and 2019

NAME	IMD Percentile	Income Percentile	Employment Percentile	Education Percentile	Health Percentile	Crime Percentile	Barriers to housing and services Percentile	Living Environment Percentile	IDACI Percentile	IDAOP1 Percentile
Barrow-in-Furness	↑ 0.4%	↓ -0.5%	↑ 1.9%	↑ 1.4%	↓ -0.3%	↑ 17.8%	↑ 0.3%	↑ 3.5%	↑ 0.9%	↑ 4.6%
Blackburn with Darwen	↓ -2.9%	↓ -5.1%	↓ -1.4%	↓ -1.6%	↓ -1.4%	↑ 6.3%	↓ -0.1%	↓ -2.0%	↓ -7.9%	↓ -0.6%
Blackpool	↓ -0.9%	↓ -1.8%	→ 0.0%	↓ -2.1%	↓ -0.3%	↑ 0.4%	↓ -2.8%	↓ -2.6%	↓ -3.0%	↑ 0.2%
Burnley	↓ -1.7%	↓ -4.1%	↓ -1.1%	↓ -2.0%	↑ 0.1%	↓ -4.2%	↑ 7.9%	↓ -2.5%	↓ -5.7%	↑ 1.3%
Chorley	↑ 3.5%	↓ -1.4%	↑ 2.0%	↓ -3.2%	↑ 8.3%	↑ 5.6%	↓ -2.1%	↑ 10.9%	↓ -1.0%	↑ 4.2%
Copeland	↑ 5.3%	↓ -4.8%	↓ -0.7%	↓ -2.8%	↑ 0.6%	↑ 24.1%	↑ 39.6%	↑ 17.5%	↓ -2.1%	↓ -3.9%
Craven	↓ -1.3%	↓ -0.1%	↓ -0.1%	↓ -10.0%	↓ -1.4%	↑ 5.8%	↑ 1.2%	↓ -2.2%	↑ 2.0%	↑ 1.4%
Fylde	↓ -4.4%	↓ -2.7%	↓ -8.5%	↓ -11.0%	↓ -2.8%	↑ 4.1%	↑ 0.5%	↓ -11.8%	↓ -6.0%	↑ 2.6%
Hyndburn	↓ -2.9%	↓ -3.1%	↓ -0.4%	↓ -2.0%	↑ 0.1%	↓ -1.1%	↑ 0.3%	↓ -2.0%	↓ -8.2%	↑ 1.4%
Lancaster	↓ -3.0%	↓ -8.7%	↓ -8.1%	↓ -16.5%	↑ 0.5%	↑ 3.8%	↑ 9.4%	↑ 2.0%	↓ -6.3%	↑ 0.5%
Pendle	↓ -1.5%	↓ -1.7%	↓ -1.4%	↓ -6.2%	↑ 4.6%	↑ 8.7%	↑ 1.5%	↓ -3.6%	↓ -3.0%	↑ 1.1%
Preston	↓ -7.6%	↓ -9.0%	↓ -10.8%	↑ 0.4%	↑ 2.7%	↓ -8.5%	↑ 0.4%	↓ -6.4%	↓ -6.7%	↓ -3.8%
Ribble Valley	→ 0.0%	↓ -3.6%	↓ -1.5%	↓ -1.3%	↓ -0.9%	→ 0.0%	↓ -1.8%	↑ 1.3%	↓ -1.0%	↑ 1.4%
Rossendale	↓ -1.4%	↓ -2.4%	↓ -3.5%	↓ -9.0%	↑ 9.9%	↑ 1.9%	↓ -11.9%	↑ 0.3%	↓ -2.7%	↑ 4.0%
South Lakeland	↓ -0.7%	↓ -0.6%	↓ -3.1%	↓ -4.5%	↑ 8.0%	↓ -2.9%	↓ -1.3%	↓ -3.0%	↓ -0.8%	→ 0.0%
South Ribble	↓ -5.5%	↓ -4.0%	↓ -3.3%	↓ -1.6%	↓ -5.4%	↓ -6.5%	↓ -0.1%	↓ -12.9%	↓ -3.9%	↑ 1.3%
West Lancashire	↑ 5.8%	↑ 0.3%	↓ -0.1%	↓ -5.1%	↑ 16.2%	↑ 21.9%	↑ 2.6%	↓ -4.1%	↓ -3.6%	↑ 3.8%
Wyre	↓ -4.9%	↓ -8.1%	↓ -6.5%	↓ -5.8%	↓ -0.9%	↑ 8.3%	↓ -1.8%	↓ -4.2%	↓ -9.5%	↓ -0.4%

Wards

MHCLG do not publish rankings for wards however, they do provide the methodology in Appendix A of the [research report](#) to calculate them. 2019 ward boundaries have been used for this calculation in Lancashire and South Cumbria ICS. Only wards that fall within the ICS boundaries have been analysed.

22% of wards are in the 10% most deprived, whereas only 5% of wards are in the 10% least deprived in England. Table 10 below shows the fifteen most deprived wards in the area. Four wards are in Blackpool, including the two most deprived. Three are in Barrow-in-Furness and three in Burnley.

Table 9: 15 most deprived wards in Lancashire and South Cumbria ICS

District	Ward Name	IMD rank	IMD perc
Blackpool	Bloomfield	1	0.01%
Blackpool	Claremont	2	0.03%
Barrow-in-Furness	Central	8	0.11%
Blackpool	Talbot	14	0.19%
Blackburn with Darwen	Blackburn Central	16	0.22%
Blackpool	Brunswick	26	0.35%
Burnley	Trinity	29	0.39%
Burnley	Bank Hall	32	0.43%
Wyre	Pharos	34	0.46%
Hyndburn	Central	38	0.51%
Burnley	Daneshouse with Stoneyholme	46	0.62%
Barrow-in-Furness	Hindpool	49	0.66%
Lancaster	Poulton	68	0.92%
Hyndburn	Spring Hill	70	0.94%
Barrow-in-Furness	Barrow Island	76	1.03%

The least deprived ward is Ribby-with-Wrea in Fylde.

Lower super output areas (LSOAs)

Table 11 below shows the 25 most deprived LSOAs in the Lancashire and South Cumbria ICS.¹ The most deprived 10 LSOAs are all in Blackpool, and they have also been in the most deprived 10% in England for the last four times the indices of multiple deprivation have been calculated.

Table 10: 25 most deprived LSOAs in Lancashire and South Cumbria ICS

Code	Name	District	IMD Rank ¹	IMD Perc
E01012673	Blackpool 010A	Blackpool	2	0.0%
E01012681	Blackpool 006A	Blackpool	3	0.0%
E01012672	Blackpool 013B	Blackpool	4	0.0%
E01012671	Blackpool 013A	Blackpool	5	0.0%
E01012751	Blackpool 013D	Blackpool	6	0.0%
E01012737	Blackpool 010E	Blackpool	7	0.0%
E01012670	Blackpool 011A	Blackpool	8	0.0%
E01012682	Blackpool 008D	Blackpool	9	0.0%
E01012683	Blackpool 006B	Blackpool	11	0.0%
E01012674	Blackpool 013C	Blackpool	12	0.0%
E01024858	Burnley 007C	Burnley	15	0.0%
E01012679	Blackpool 008B	Blackpool	16	0.0%
E01024908	Burnley 010E	Burnley	17	0.1%
E01012675	Blackpool 010B	Blackpool	20	0.1%
E01012736	Blackpool 010D	Blackpool	28	0.1%
E01012622	Blackburn with Darwen 009C	Blackburn with Darwen	29	0.1%
E01025117	Lancaster 009C	Lancaster	33	0.1%
E01012655	Blackburn with Darwen 006E	Blackburn with Darwen	35	0.1%
E01012721	Blackpool 007C	Blackpool	52	0.2%
E01012738	Blackpool 011D	Blackpool	59	0.2%
E01024906	Burnley 014B	Burnley	61	0.2%
E01012720	Blackpool 007B	Blackpool	87	0.3%
E01012724	Blackpool 007D	Blackpool	92	0.3%
E01025584	Wyre 001F	Wyre	96	0.3%
E01019143	Barrow-in-Furness 008C	Barrow-in-Furness	99	0.3%

¹ Rank out of 32,844

¹ To find the area covered by an LSOA, use our mapping system, [MARIO](#), 'Find' tab (next to maps), 'Find Census Area' and type the code into the box.

In contrast, table 12 shows that the least deprived LSOA is in Ribble Valley.

Table 11: 10 least deprived LSOAs

Code	Name	District	IMD Rank	IMD Perc
E01025332	Ribble Valley 008C	Ribble Valley	32719	99.6%
E01025341	Ribble Valley 005C	Ribble Valley	32635	99.4%
E01024968	Chorley 005B	Chorley	32482	98.9%
E01032486	Blackburn with Darwen 018F	Blackburn with Darwen	32389	98.6%
E01025410	South Ribble 003C	South Ribble	32337	98.5%
E01025510	West Lancashire 005A	West Lancashire	32308	98.4%
E01019393	South Lakeland 014E	South Lakeland	32127	97.8%
E01024950	Chorley 004C	Chorley	32099	97.7%
E01019362	South Lakeland 005B	South Lakeland	31975	97.4%
E01025454	South Ribble 010C	South Ribble	31964	97.3%

¹ Rank out of 32,844

The graph in Figure 2 shows the LSOAs profile across the deciles for the Lancashire- and South Cumbria ICS. Nearly 22% of LSOAs are in the 20% most deprived; 15% of LSOAs are in the 20% least deprived in England.

Figure 1: LSOAs by decile, IMD rank of rank

