

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

| | | |
|----|---------------------|--|
| 1. | Meeting: | Cabinet |
| 2. | Date: | 20th July 2011 |
| 3. | Title: | Indices of Deprivation 2010 |
| 4. | Directorate: | Chief Executive's - Commissioning, Policy & Performance |

5. Summary

The new Indices of Deprivation for 2010 were published by Communities for Local Government on 24th March 2011. These are the fourth version of the Indices of Deprivation which were first developed to support the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal in 2000. The indices aim to provide a consistent measure of deprivation for all areas in England and assist in monitoring the gap between the most deprived areas and national or borough averages.

Rotherham was ranked 48th most deprived district in England in the first Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) in 2000. The revised 2004 Index placed Rotherham at 63rd and the Borough improved further to 68th in the 2007 Index. The IMD 2010 now ranks Rotherham 53rd out of 326 districts. Given the baselines used, these trends indicate that relative deprivation reduced in Rotherham after 1998 but increased again after 2005. Analysis of the nature and distribution of deprivation, change over time and the implications are outlined in this report.

6. Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to:

- a) **Note this report and the increase in deprivation in Rotherham.**
- b) **Note concerns about the baseline used in the Indices of Deprivation 2010 which largely pre-dates the economic downturn and the anomalous trends within the Crime Domain.**
- c) **Note the continued importance of monitoring actual changes measured by relevant indicators to supplement the Indices of Deprivation.**
- d) **Note that the most deprived areas in Rotherham have experienced the largest increase in deprivation and continue to need targeted assistance, as do areas which are at risk of becoming very deprived.**
- e) **Agree that a scrutiny review examine the impact of regeneration funding on deprivation in Rotherham.**

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Introduction

The Indices of Deprivation were first published in 2000 to assist the targeting of the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund and have since become an important tool for measuring deprivation and targeting the most deprived areas. Following an overhaul of methodology, the Indices of Deprivation 2004 (ID 2004) were published. These have been followed by further Indices in 2007 (ID 2007) and 2010 (ID 2010) which used the same methodology as 2004 to allow comparison.

The Indices of Deprivation are based on information from a common date where possible for consistency. Time delays in publication means that most ID 2010 data relates to 2008/09 so does not take full account of the recent adverse economic climate. The Indices of Deprivation comprise seven thematic “domains”, each built up using several indicators. These domains are weighted and combined into the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) which provides an overall measure.

The 2000 Indices provided data for wards but since 2004, the Indices have been produced for “Super Output Areas” (SOAs). These areas typically contain 1,500 people, allowing small pockets of deprivation to be identified. In addition, there are six district summaries (see section 7.3) to allow comparison between local authorities. The number of English districts fell from 354 in 2007 to 326 in 2010 which partly explains the higher rank of Rotherham.

Rotherham’s overall rank (average of ward or SOA scores) fell from the 48th most deprived district to 63rd most deprived between 2000 and 2004, partly due to a revised methodology. In 2007, Rotherham fell to 68th most deprived district and the average rank of Rotherham SOAs out of 32,482 SOAs in England fell from 8,145 to 12,476 between 2004 and 2007, indicating a significant relative improvement. The number of Rotherham residents living in the most deprived 10% of English wards or SOAs fell from 58,000 in the IMD 2000 to 29,600 in the IMD 2004 and stabilised at 30,400 in the IMD 2007.

In the ID 2010 Rotherham’s overall rank increased to 53rd most deprived district out of 326 in England. The average rank of Rotherham SOAs fell from 12,476 to 11,951 between 2007 and 2010, indicating a relative deterioration. The number of Rotherham residents living in the most deprived 10% of English SOAs increased from 30,400 in the IMD 2007 to 44,170 in the IMD 2010.

7.2 Key Messages from the Indices of Deprivation 2010

- Deprivation in Rotherham has **increased** with the Borough now ranked **53rd** most deprived district on average IMD score, compared to 68th in 2007. Rotherham’s rank has deteriorated and the Borough remains amongst the 20% most deprived areas in England.
- The key drivers of deprivation in Rotherham remain **Health & Disability, Education & Skills** and **Employment**. Of these, Health & Disability deprivation is most widespread in Rotherham and has deteriorated most in relative terms since 2007. The table below shows the importance of each domain to deprivation in Rotherham and change since 2007.

ID 2010: Extent of Most Deprived 10% and 20% of England in Rotherham by Domain and Changes between ID 2007 and ID2010

| <u>English Percentiles:</u> | Most Deprived 10% | Change 2007-10 | Most Deprived 20% | Change 2007-10 |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Index of Multiple Deprivation | 17% | +5% | 33% | +1% |
| Income Deprivation | 14% | +1% | 30% | +3% |
| Employment Deprivation | 22% | +5% | 38% | 0% |
| Health Deprivation & Disability | 33% | +8% | 56% | +10% |
| Education & Skills Deprivation | 24% | -4% | 41% | -2% |
| Barriers to Housing & Services | 0% | 0 | 1% | 0 |
| Crime Deprivation | 11% | +8% | 26% | +12 |
| Living Environment Deprivation | 3% | 0 | 6% | 0 |

- **Improvements** in average rank are evident in the Education & Skills, Living Environment, and Employment Domains although the latter may no longer be realistic given the rise in worklessness since 2008.
- The greatest **deteriorations** in rank are in Crime and Health & Disability, although these are based on changes between 2005/6 and 2008/9. Recorded crime actually reduced during this period, more than the English average.
- Relative to England, **Education deprivation** in Rotherham overall has reduced but there have been increases in the most deprived areas.
- Deprivation has generally stayed the same in the least deprived areas, whilst it has increased most in those areas with the highest deprivation.
- There is evidence of polarisation between the most deprived and least deprived areas in Employment, Health, Education and Crime deprivation.
- 23% of Children are affected by **income deprivation** compared with 14% of working age adults, the gap being wider in the most deprived areas.

7.2.1 Analysis and Mapping of the Indices of Deprivation 2010

- The Indices of Deprivation 2010 provides a large amount of data for local areas within Rotherham. Please see **Appendix 1** for a detailed analysis of the ID 2010 information including how each Domain affects the Borough.
- The Indices of Deprivation 2010 data is mapped for all areas in South Yorkshire on the local statistics website **LASOS** (Stats on Maps) where it can be compared with other data, see: <http://www.lasos.org.uk/StatsMaps.aspx>

7.3 Overall District Deprivation Measures

- The **Rank of Average Score** is based on the average of IMD scores in a district. Rotherham's rank deteriorated from 68 in 2007 to 53 in 2010. The average score increased from 26.71 to 28.12, indicating a rise in deprivation.
- The **Rank of Average Ranks** is the average of IMD ranks in a district. The rank of average rank in Rotherham deteriorated from 76 to 52, reflecting a rise in deprivation relative to other areas.
- The **Extent** is the proportion of the district's population living in the most deprived SOAs in England (share of national deprivation). The rank of Extent deteriorated from 76 in 2007 to 51 in 2010 and the extent score increased from 0.29 to 0.33, indicating an increased share of national deprivation.

- **Local Concentration** is the average rank of the 10% most deprived SOAs in a district. Rotherham's Local Concentration rank deteriorated from 60 in 2007 to 48 in 2010.
- **Income Scale** is the number of people deprived of income. The rank of Income Scale improved from 45 in 2007 to 48 in 2010 and Income Scale reduced from 46,488 to 44,541, the only measure to improve in Rotherham.
- **Employment Scale** is the number of people deprived of employment. The rank of employment scale has deteriorated slightly from 38 to 36 and the employment scale (number workless) increased from 19,323 to 19,505.

7.4 RMBC Estimates for Wards

Although the Indices of Deprivation does not publish any ward data, it is possible to locally estimate scores for Rotherham wards using population weighted SOA scores.

| Most Deprived Wards ID 2004 (estimated IMD score in brackets) | Most Deprived Wards ID 2007 (estimated IMD score in brackets) | Most Deprived Wards ID 2010 (estimated IMD score in brackets) |
|--|--|--|
| Rotherham East (52) | Rotherham East (51) | Rotherham East (52) |
| Valley (42) | Valley (42) | Valley (44) |
| Rotherham West (38) | Rotherham West (38) | Rotherham West (40) |
| Maltby (35) | Boston Castle (35) | Maltby (37) |
| Boston Castle (35) | Maltby (33) | Boston Castle (37) |
| Wingfield (35) | Wingfield (33) | Wingfield (35) |

Rotherham East remains the most deprived ward in Rotherham by a good margin. Generally, deprivation has reduced most since 2004 in wards with average or low deprivation, notably Rother Vale and Hellaby. Between 2007 and 2010 all wards either became more deprived or saw little change. Deprivation increased most in the more deprived wards and also in the less deprived Wickersley.

7.5 Closing the Gap Evaluation

2004 to 2010 Comparison

The Indices of Deprivation data from 2004 and 2010 allows analysis of changing deprivation patterns over six years (in data terms, 2002 to 2008). The conclusion from this analysis is that deprivation has changed little in absolute terms but has become slightly more concentrated in the most deprived areas, where deprivation has increased the most. The gap in average IMD score between the most and least deprived quintiles in Rotherham increased from 38.4 in 2004 to 41.8 in 2010.

| IMD Quintiles within Rotherham | Average Score IMD 2004 | Average Score IMD 2007 | Average Score IMD 2010 | Change 2004-10 | Change 2007-10 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Most Deprived 20% | 49.9 | 49.1 | 52.2 | + 2.3 | +3.1 |
| Most Deprived 20-40% | 35.6 | 34.4 | 36.4 | + 0.8 | + 2.0 |
| Average Areas | 25.8 | 23.9 | 25.1 | - 0.7 | +1.2 |
| Least Deprived 20-40% | 17.7 | 15.5 | 16.2 | - 1.5 | + 0.7 |
| Least Deprived 20% | 11.5 | 10.2 | 10.4 | - 1.1 | + 0.2 |
| Rotherham Average | 28.2 | 26.7 | 28.1 | - 0.1 | + 1.4 |

2007 to 2010 Comparison

Deprivation in Rotherham increased between 2007 and 2010 but the rise was focused on the most deprived areas. Deprivation in the least deprived 20% of the Borough hardly changed. A clear pattern emerges showing that the more deprived an area was in 2007, the greater the increase in deprivation has been since. Area based policies targeting resources at the most deprived areas have not prevented this trend but may have helped to minimise the impact. It is impossible to know what would have happened if there had been no Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

The Working Neighbourhoods Plan (WNP) 2008 defined a number of target areas based on Rotherham's previous Neighbourhood Renewal target areas which covered the main areas of high deprivation in the Borough. The analysis below shows that deprivation increased in all areas with only Rawmarsh being fairly static.

| WNP Target Area | IMD 2007 | IMD 20010 | Change |
|---|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Eastwood / Springwell Gardens | 54.9 | 56.6 | + 1.7 |
| Dalton / Thrybergh / East Herringthorpe | 51.9 | 55.3 | + 3.4 |
| Masbrough / Ferham / Bradgate | 50.6 | 52.0 | + 1.4 |
| Dinnington (Central) | 45.2 | 50.1 | + 4.9 |
| Herringthorpe / East Dene | 48.4 | 49.8 | + 1.4 |
| Maltby (East) | 44.3 | 48.4 | + 4.0 |
| Town Centre / Canklow / Clifton | 44.0 | 46.3 | + 2.2 |
| Wath (Central) | 40.3 | 45.1 | + 4.8 |
| Rawmarsh / Parkgate | 37.9 | 38.2 | + 0.3 |
| Kimberworth Park / Wingfield | 34.6 | 36.3 | + 1.8 |
| WNP Target Areas (all) | 45.3 | 47.5 | + 2.2 |
| Rotherham Borough | 26.7 | 28.1 | + 1.4 |

Overall, deprivation increased in the WNP target areas by more than the Borough average. In particular, deprivation in Maltby, Dinnington and Wath has increased significantly. Dinnington has been identified as an area of concern in other assessments, mainly as a result of rising crime, but health and education deprivation have also increased. The key factors driving deprivation increase in Maltby and Wath are employment and education, with health deprivation also rising in Wath.

Canklow, Ferham and East Herringthorpe were targeted under the 2010-11 Local Ambition Programme but any impacts are too recent to show in the ID 2010 data.

8. Finance

The Indices of Deprivation have been used in the past by the Government and other agencies in defining eligibility for regeneration funding, including the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF). Rotherham was not eligible for WNF because the Government tightened the criteria to target 66 authorities rather than the 88 which were NRF funded.

Whilst there is no current proposal to replace WNF, Rotherham is still likely to benefit from small scale external funding or programmes which seek to target the most deprived areas. The more widespread deprivation indicated in the ID 2010 compared with the ID 2007 means that more areas in the Borough could potentially benefit.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The Indices of Deprivation show relative ranking of deprivation across England and should be used in conjunction with other data to map actual deprivation levels. Data from the Crime Domain suggests that relative crime deprivation in Rotherham has increased but the Borough has actually improved and closed the gap with England.

The increase in deprivation which the Indices of Deprivation have indicated may increase the benefits to Rotherham from funding which targets areas of high deprivation. However, the degree to which the Coalition Government will use the ID 2010 to target resources towards areas of high deprivation is not yet clear.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The Indices of Deprivation are a key tool in policy development and needs assessment, helping to shape, inform and monitor interventions aimed at addressing deprivation. The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment will take account of the Indices of Deprivation alongside other information to provide an overall picture of need.

Increasing deprivation combined with the loss of external regeneration funding places reliance on mainstream resources to tackle deprivation. Ensuring that Rotherham improves in terms of employment, education, health, crime, environment and housing are key priorities for the Council and Partnership so it is essential that we measure and monitor deprivation levels. Another priority is that no community is left behind and deprivation data helps us to monitor the Closing the Gap agenda.

The Council is currently developing a Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy with key stakeholders including the NHS. This Strategy will become the overarching document for the Health and Wellbeing Board from September 2011, and will be used to inform commissioning and planning for all work relating to health and wellbeing, including public health. The Strategy will focus on priorities based on national evidence and guidance for reducing health inequalities, such as the Marmot Review, as well as local intelligence from the Indices of Deprivation, Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), and Health Profile for Rotherham. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy will become the responsibility of the Health and Wellbeing Board which will ensure that resources are targeted to the areas and issues where deprivation and health inequalities are greatest.

Despite recent improvements in Rotherham as a whole, persistent low educational attainment and adult skills in the most deprived areas need to be addressed to improve the life chances and employment opportunities for local people.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- Indices of Deprivation 2010 (CLG, March 2011)
- Indices of Deprivation 2010 National Summary (CLG, 2011)
- Indices of Deprivation 2007 (CLG, 2007)
- Indices of Deprivation 2004 (ODPM, 2004)

Contact Name:

Miles Crompton, Policy Officer, extension 22763

Miles.Crompton@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Analysis of the Indices of Deprivation 2010 Data for Rotherham

Overview

The Indices of Deprivation 2010 (ID 2010) data for Rotherham is published for 166 Super Output Areas so it is possible to identify geographical patterns and pockets of deprivation at the small area level. The seven ID 2010 domains provide good information about the nature of deprivation in any area although the Living Environment Domain and the Barriers to Housing and Services Domain are of more limited value than the others.

The Pattern of Deprivation in Rotherham

The general pattern of deprivation shown by the IMD 2010 in Rotherham is similar to that shown in the 2004 and 2007 indices with the central urban area being the main area of high deprivation. Almost all inner areas fall within the most deprived 20% of England, in most cases within the Top 10%. The most deprived urban core extends eastwards from Meadowbank, through Ferham and Canklow to the Town Centre and beyond through Eastwood, East Dene, East Herringthorpe and Dalton to reach Thrybergh. In addition there are an increased number of pockets of high deprivation within the Top 10% of England in parts of East Maltby, Dinnington, Rawmarsh, Aston, Flanderwell, Wath, Swinton and Thurcroft.

Kimberworth Park, Rockingham, Wingfield, Munsbrough and Bradgate form a large area of north east Rotherham which falls within the most deprived 10-20% of England. There are smaller pockets within the most deprived 10-20% found across the Borough, including parts of Rawmarsh, East Maltby and Dinnington.

The southern half of Rotherham tends to have lower deprivation than the northern half, with many areas having deprivation at or below the English average. Areas of low deprivation are typically found in suburban and rural areas, sometimes related to modern private housing estates. Areas with low deprivation include Moorgate, Stag/Brecks, South Anston, Todwick and parts of Wickersley, Hellaby and West Maltby. There are also smaller pockets of low deprivation in the north of the Borough such as Thorpe Hesley.

Rotherham Population in the Most Deprived Parts of England 2004-2010

| English Percentiles | IMD 2004 | IMD 2007 | IMD 2010 | Change 2004 - 10 |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Most Deprived 10% | 11.9% | 12.0% | 17.4% | +5.5 |
| Most Deprived 10% to 20% | 21.3% | 20.3% | 15.9% | -5.4 |
| Most Deprived 20% to 30% | 15.6% | 13.2% | 12.7% | -2.9 |
| Most Deprived 30% to 50% | 22.4% | 19.7% | 21.7% | -0.7 |
| Least Deprived 30% to 50% | 20.7% | 23.6% | 21.9% | +1.2 |
| Least Deprived 30% | 8.1% | 11.2% | 10.4% | +2.3 |

The majority of Rotherham is more deprived than the national average although the percentage has reduced from 71.2% to 67.7% since 2004, despite the recent rise. However, the percentage within the most deprived 10% of England has increased significantly since 2007. The percentage of Rotherham in the most deprived 20% of England has remained remarkably consistent at around 33% since 2004 but there has been an intensification of deprivation into the Top 10% since 2007.

The percentage of Rotherham's population living in areas where deprivation is lower than the English average has increased from 28.8% to 32.3% since 2004. The percentage of Rotherham in the most deprived 20-50% of England has also reduced from 38% to 34.4% since 2004. These trends show that deprivation has reduced in areas of the Borough outside the most deprived 10% of England. Deprivation can be found throughout Rotherham and the Borough has no SOA within the least deprived 10% of England.

The Most & Least Deprived Areas in Rotherham

The most deprived SOA in Rotherham covers northern East Herringthorpe which was also the most deprived area in 2004 and 2007, and is amongst the most deprived 1% of England. Other communities which include areas within the most deprived 5% of England are Masbrough, Ferham, Canklow, Thrybergh, Eastwood, Dinnington, East Maltby, East Dene and the Town Centre.

Rotherham has fourteen SOAs (8%) in the least deprived 25% of England, all but one in the southern half of the Borough. The least deprived SOA in Rotherham is in south Wickersley. Other communities which include one or more SOAs in the least deprived 20% of England are Swallownest, Moorgate, Stag, Aston, South Anston, Kiveton Park and Harthill.

Local Changes in Deprivation - IMD 2007 to 2010

Despite the overall increase in deprivation, there were reductions in deprivation in 29% of Rotherham SOAs between 2007 and 2010. Reductions in deprivation were most evident in less deprived areas or where new housing estates have been built, adding new residents who are not deprived. The largest improvements since 2007 were in Ryecroft and Brampton where there has been new housing. Of areas with high deprivation, parts of Eastwood and East Dene showed notable reductions in deprivation.

71% of Rotherham SOAs showed increases in deprivation, particularly those in more deprived areas. By far the largest increase was in central Dinnington (see Closing the Gap? below). Other areas with SOAs where there was a significant increase in deprivation were Maltby, Rockingham, Kimberworth Park, Upper Haugh, East Herringthorpe, Thrybergh and the Town Centre.

Rotherham Performance on Different Domains

The Indices of Deprivation is divided into seven thematic Domains or categories. The nature of deprivation in Rotherham is revealed in the Domain rankings. The table below summarises how Rotherham fares on the various domains and indices.

Summary Table: Indices of Deprivation 2010 Rotherham

| English Percentiles: | Top 10% | Top 20% | Top 50% | Bottom 20% |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Index of Multiple Deprivation | 17% | 33% | 68% | 5% |
| Income Deprivation | 14% | 30% | 61% | 11% |
| - Affecting Children | 9% | 20% | 56% | 12% |
| - Affecting Older People | 8% | 23% | 68% | 8% |
| Employment Deprivation | 22% | 38% | 71% | 2% |
| Health Deprivation & Disability | 33% | 56% | 97% | 0% |
| Education & Skills Deprivation | 24% | 41% | 74% | 1% |
| Barriers to Housing & Services | 0% | 1% | 12% | 58% |
| Crime Deprivation | 11% | 26% | 67% | 5% |
| Living Environment Deprivation | 3% | 6% | 31% | 16% |

The table above shows that Health, Education and Employment are the key drivers of deprivation in Rotherham relative to England as a whole. Conversely, Barriers to Housing and Services are not a significant problem in Rotherham compared with the national average. Each of the seven Domains is analysed in detail below.

Income Deprivation

Rotherham does not score as highly on the Income Domain as might be expected because sickness and disability benefits are not counted. Income deprivation shows a similar distribution to overall deprivation although with more areas showing low deprivation. However, there is an additional pocket of income deprivation within the Top 10% in North Anston.

The percentage of people living in SOAs in the top 10% most deprived has increased steadily from 12.0% in 2004, to 13.9% in 2007 and 14.2% in 2010. The percentage of people living in SOAs in the bottom 30% increased from 18.1% in 2004 to 24.7% in 2007 but reduced to 19.7% in 2010. This indicates that income deprivation has become slightly more concentrated in the most deprived areas. However, the gap in income deprivation between the most and least deprived areas in Rotherham has reduced since 2007.

17.6% of Rotherham's population are defined as "deprived of income", slightly lower than in 2007. The highest rate is 52% in East Herringthorpe North (as in 2004 and 2007) and the lowest is 3%, only a mile south in the Dovedale Road area off Herringthorpe Valley Road.

Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index

This is a child poverty index within the Income Domain which shows the proportion of children in households deprived of income. Rotherham has an above average percentage of children affected by income deprivation at 23.4%. Child poverty is more polarised than other types of deprivation with significant areas showing both high and low deprivation, ranging from 61% in East Herringthorpe North to 0% in Whiston North. Child poverty is more polarised than income deprivation generally with the most deprived 10% of SOAs having levels almost 15 times higher than the least deprived.

Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index

This is an index within the Income Domain showing the proportion of people aged 60+ who are deprived of income. The Rotherham average has increased from 18% to 22% which is higher than the overall proportion. Income deprivation for older people is concentrated in central Rotherham with a Top 10% pocket in Aston North West. The highest rate is 61% in East Herringthorpe, contrasting with the lowest at 0% in Moorgate West. Rotherham does not have a high concentration of very deprived older people but over two thirds are more deprived than the English average.

Employment Deprivation

Employment deprivation is relatively high in Rotherham, caused by high rates of long term sickness as well as unemployment. Clearly, the picture has changed since 2008, the base year for the ID 2010, and more recent trends should be taken into account in any assessment (see below).

Employment is the only domain which has not changed significantly from the ID 2000 which allows easy comparison over time. The percentage of people deprived of employment in Rotherham fell from 16.6% in the ID 2000 to 14.6% in 2004 and 13.2% in 2007, rising slightly to 13.4% in 2010. The most recent data shows that employment deprivation has since increased to 15.9%. Although worklessness in Rotherham is clearly high, it is worth noting that the rate is lower now than it was in the year 2000.

The long term picture for employment deprivation in the Borough between 1998/9 and 2008/9 was positive but there is evidence of polarisation since 2007. Despite the long term improvement, Rotherham's rate of 13.4% remains well above the 10.1% deprived of employment in England.

Employment deprivation is concentrated in central Rotherham with large pockets at Maltby and Dinnington, and scattered smaller pockets in Rockingham, Munsbrough, Wath, Swinton, Rawmarsh, Flanderwell, Thurcroft and North Anston. The highest rate is 33% in East Herringthorpe North and the lowest is 4% in Aston East.

Health Deprivation & Disability

Health and Disability deprivation is the most significant and widespread form of deprivation in Rotherham relative to England as a whole, with almost every part of the Borough being above the English average. Over half of areas in Rotherham are in the most deprived 20% of England, with no areas in the least deprived 20%.

The percentage of people living in SOAs in the top 10% most deprived has increased since 2004, from 20.5% to 24.1% in 2007 to 32.7% in 2010. However, the percentage of people living in SOAs that fall within the top 30% most deprived has been more stable, reducing from 65.1% in 2004 to 62.0% in 2007 and rising to 68.4% in 2010. These patterns indicate that the greatest increase in health deprivation has taken place in the most deprived areas, confirmed by the average Health deprivation score in the most deprived SOAs which has risen from 1.64 to 1.82 since 2007.

High health deprivation is widespread across central Rotherham but there are many other pockets of high health deprivation in other communities including Wath, Swinton, Maltby, Rawmarsh, Kimberworth Park, Dinnington, Aston and Thurcroft. The most deprived area is Canklow and the Town Centre is similar. The least deprived area is Wickersley South but there are few areas of Rotherham with low health deprivation.

Education, Skills & Training Deprivation

Indicators of educational deprivation provide a picture of the problems in Rotherham, reflecting both the attainment of children and young people, and adult qualification levels. The highest deprivation rankings on any domain are for education, with two of Rotherham's SOAs amongst the most deprived 1% of England. The percentage of people living in SOAs in the top 10% most deprived increased slightly from 27.1% in 2004 to 28.3% in 2007 but fell to 24.5% in 2010. The average education rank of Rotherham SOAs also improved, indicating that, in relative terms, education deprivation has reduced Boroughwide. However, the average Education score in deprived areas has remained static since 2007 whilst the least deprived areas have improved scores, indicating polarisation between the most and least deprived areas.

Many parts of the Borough have high levels of education & skills deprivation, especially the eastern sides of Rotherham and Rawmarsh, encompassing Eastwood, Kilnhurst, Herringthorpe and Thrybergh. Notable pockets of high deprivation are in Kimberworth Park, Masbrough, East Maltby and Dinnington. There are also many scattered small pockets of high deprivation from Brampton to North Anston. The most deprived SOA for education in 2004, 2007 and 2010 has been East Herringthorpe North, although the area has improved its rank from 12 to 72. Areas of low education deprivation dominate the southern suburbs of Rotherham, including the least deprived area at Moorgate West (as in 2004 and 2007).

On the Children and Young People Sub-domain, which measures attainment, Canklow is ranked 14 in England and 24% of the Borough is in the 10% most deprived nationally. Attainment is quite polarised with many suburban and semi-rural areas being less deprived than the national average.

On the Skills Sub-domain, which measures adult qualifications in 2001, East Herringthorpe North is ranked 20 in England. Generally skill levels are low although not extremely so and there is less polarisation than with attainment, with only 16.4% of the Borough being less deprived than the English average.

Barriers to Housing and Services

This domain combines access to local services with overcrowding, homelessness and housing affordability. This mixture of indicators limits the relevance of this domain as it does not measure a single theme. With 88% of the Borough less deprived than the English average, these barriers are not a serious problem in Rotherham. The percentage of SOAs in the least deprived 30% for barriers to housing and services deprivation has improved from 52.4% in 2004 to 77.7% in 2007 and 73.4% in 2010, indicating a long term improvement in the relative position of Rotherham. The most deprived areas tend to be rural, notably Dinnington North East & Firbeck. The least deprived area is Swinton Central (as in 2004 and 2007).

Crime Deprivation

Considerable caution is needed in interpreting this domain for a number of reasons. At the small area level, offences may affect visitors (eg. to shops, pubs etc) as well as residents and workers. Local crime rates also vary considerably over time, far more so than benefit claims or ill-health. In addition, changes in rank are relative to other areas of similar rank so can be misleading about actual crime trends.

Rotherham has a crime rate similar to the national average and in 2007 just over half of the Borough is more deprived than England as a whole. In 2010, this had increased to two thirds of the Borough despite a larger reduction in crime locally (-23%) compared to England (-19%). This anomaly has been raised with CLG but as yet there has been no satisfactory explanation.

The percentage of SOAs in the top 10% most deprived increased from 1.8% in 2004 to 3.0% in 2007 and reached 11.0% in 2010. 4.4% of Rotherham is in the most deprived 5% of England which indicates that crime has become more concentrated in deprived areas. SOAs with crime deprivation in the bottom 30% increased from 10.2% to 15.1% between 2004 and 2007 but reduced back to 10.6% in 2010.

There has been a growing number of areas where crime is very high in a national context. Notable pockets of high crime in 2010 are in East Dene & Clifton, Masbrough & Ferham, Thrybergh, Swinton, Rawmarsh, Dinnington and East Maltby. Low crime rates are most evident in rural and suburban areas. Crime rates can vary greatly over short distances, illustrated by the highest crime rate being in Clifton whilst the second lowest is just over a mile away at Stag.

Living Environment Deprivation

The Living Environment Domain uses indicators measuring different aspects of the environment. Homes without central heating and poor air quality favour inner city areas, especially in London. The indicators used portray Rotherham as having a better than average living environment. The population living in areas where environmental deprivation is in the least deprived 30% of England has increased from 15.1% in 2004 to 25.9% in 2007 to reach 32.9% in 2010, indicating that relative environmental deprivation has reduced in many areas.

There are some areas of high environmental deprivation in Rotherham, mainly in areas of older private housing, the highest ranked being Eastwood Village and Ferham. Other pockets are in the Town Centre, Wentworth and to a lesser degree in Parkgate, Masbrough, Meadowbank, Clifton and Listerdale. Most of the Borough has lower environmental deprivation than average and an area of modern private housing in West Maltby emerges as the least deprived area.