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About this slide pack

This is part of the supporting evidence for the IGAU’s response to the revised Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF). It accompanies another slide pack named: ‘Spatial patterns of income deprivation in Greater Manchester: Which places have been improving and declining?’

We have investigated where deprivation is concentrated in GM, and how this pattern has changed since 2001.

The objective of this pack is to assess the location of proposed GMSF employment sites in relation to GM’s ‘severely income deprived’ places.
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Our work on the changing pattern of severe income deprivation

Detailed methodological information and findings can be found in the accompanying slide pack*

Some key features of the analysis:

• Based on the income deprivation domain of the 2004 and 2015 English Indices of Deprivation, enabling an analysis of absolute change in income deprivation rates between 2001 and 2013.

• LSOAs with income deprivation rates of at least 36.9% were defined as ‘severely income deprived’, or SID. Threshold determined by taking an extreme value by nation standards: the national mean plus two times the standard deviation in 2001.

• SID places were either one LSOA in size or clusters of contiguous LSOAs. Building up clusters in this way means we can talk about *real named places*, rather than stand-alone LSOAs with no recognisable name.

*See: Spatial patterns of income deprivation in Greater Manchester: Which places have been improving and declining?
Findings: the changing pattern of severe income deprivation

In 2001 there was...

- **a deep income deprivation problem** in the centre, stretching from East Manchester to North, through Salford city, and down the East side of the Oxford Rd corridor
- and several other large clusters in major town centres, such as Bolton and Oldham

By 2013...

- there were a greater number of clusters (60 compared to 56 in 2001), but fewer SID LSOAs (159 compared to 222).
- The **large central cluster was smaller**, having broken down into nine smaller parts, including Moss Side and North-East Salford.

*Nb. See accompanying appendix (separate word document) for tables showing names of all SID clusters in 2001 and 2013, and related statistics.*
Findings: the changing pattern of severe income deprivation

- Many SID clusters that reduced in size were close to GM’s centre, but also several in outer places such as Wythenshawe and Bolton.
- Others stayed the same size since 2001, such as Laithwaite (to the west of Wigan), and North-West Middleton.
- Clusters such as the Brinnington cluster and the Little Hulton and Farnworth cluster grew larger.

- In addition, some clusters saw improving income deprivation rates. Again, many of these were close to GM’s centre. But also in places such as Rochdale, Laithwaite, and Little Hulton and Farnworth.
- Some clusters experienced worsening rates of income deprivation between 2001 and 2013. Brinnington, Central Oldham, and Hattersley were three such clusters.
Based these two measures of change, plus a third – change in income deprivation rate using 2013 cluster geography as constant – we established a typology of four categories.

SID places that got **worse on three measures**

SID places that got **worse on two measures**

SID places that got **better on two measures**

SID places that got **better on three measures**

Findings: the changing pattern of severe income deprivation

Nb. Typology based on change between 2001 and 2013 as a composite of the following three measures: 1) change in cluster size, 2) change in income deprivation rate, and 3) change in income deprivation rate using 2013 cluster geography as constant.
Proposed GMSF employment sites

We focus only on newly proposed employment spaces in this slide pack. These are found outside of the Core Growth and Inner areas.

The GMSF plans to create 2,731,000m$^2$ of industry and warehousing space – to be built within the plan period of 2018-2037. 146,000m$^2$ of office space is planned for around Manchester Airport.

This map shows all eighteen sites, grouped by colour into three major development areas outlined in the plan.

Sites in relation to GM’s SID places (1)

This map shows the proposed sites with three-mile buffers drawn from each site’s centroid\(^1\).

Two thirds (40/60) of clusters categorised as ‘severely income deprived’ are within a three-mile radius of at least one proposed employment site\(^2\). 21 were worse on either two or three measures of change (out of a total of 30 of these types).

86,138 income deprived people live in SID clusters that are within a three-mile radius of at least one development; 17% of GM’s total income deprived population.

Randomly allocating 18 sites with 3-mile buffers across GM could have resulted in similar coverage of SID places. As such, we now take a more stringent test.

\(^1\) Buffer areas created from travel time analysis would be a next step in this research.

\(^2\) SID places are within a 3-mile radius of a given site’s centroid if the centroid of at least one of their constituent LSOAs are within the 3-mile buffer.
Sites in relation to GM’s SID places (2)

This map shows a one-mile buffer around each site perimeter\(^1\) – a sharper test of the proximity of sites to SID places.

18 out of 60 severely income deprived clusters are within one mile of at least one site perimeter (30%). Eight of these 18 are SID places that have been getting worse since 2001 (27% of all SID places that have been getting worse).

19,235 income deprived people live in SID places that are within one mile of at least one site perimeter. This is 4% of GM’s total income deprived population.

---

\(^1\) Site perimeters, rather than centroids, were used to create buffers due to some sites themselves being larger than 1-mile in length/coverage (e.g., Northern Gateway).
Sites in relation to GM’s SID places (3)

To what extent are the sites near the places that have been getting worse?

This map takes seven multi-LSOA clusters that got worse since 2001, and marks a one mile buffer around their perimeters.

Three of these severely income deprived cluster than got worse on the measures used overlap with a proposed employment site – these are Central Oldham, Brinnington, and Top of Heady Heap and Heady Hill. The other four do not, but do have a site within three miles of their centroids (not shown here).
M62 North-East corridor

Now we take a close look at the three major development areas.

Twelve SID clusters are within three miles\(^1\) of the M62 North-East corridor developments; the largest in terms of LSOAs being Rochdale, Central Oldham, and Charlestown and Higher Blackley. This is 20% of the 60 SID clusters in GM in 2013.

26,623 income deprived people were living in these twelve clusters in 2013, which accounts for 5% of the total income deprived population of Greater Manchester.

Five clusters got worse since 2001 – either in terms of their income deprivation rate, their size, or both. For example, the Oldham cluster’s rate increased by one percentage point, from 44% in 2001 to 45% in 2013.

\(^1\) SID places are within a 3-mile radius of a given site’s centroid if the centroid of at least one of their constituent LSOAs are within the 3-mile buffer.
Ten severely income deprived places are within the three-mile buffer zone of the developments that make up the Wigan/Bolton growth corridor. This makes up 17% of the 60 SID clusters in GM in 2013. 13,2973 income deprived people were living in these clusters in 2013, accounting for 3% of the total income deprived population of GM.

Little Hulton and Farnworth, and Laithwaite are the largest, made up of seven and five LSOAs respectively. Both improved on the two income deprivation rate change measures.

Four SID places within the buffer zone got worse on two or three of the change measures used. All were one LSOA in size in 2013.

1 SID places are within a 3-mile radius of a given site’s centroid if the centroid of at least one of their constituent LSOAs are within the 3-mile buffer.
Manchester Airport

Three severely income deprived clusters are within three miles\(^1\) of the Manchester Airport developments. Whilst Wythenshawe improved on all three of the change measures, it was still the fifth largest cluster in 2013, with an income deprivation rate of 42%.

6466 income deprived people were living in these clusters in 2013, accounting for 1% of the total income deprived population of Greater Manchester.

Baguley is the only SID place out of the three that got worse, on two of the three measures of change: it stayed the same size as a single LSOA place, and its income deprivation rate increased slightly (< 1 percentage point) to 38%.

\(^1\) SID places are within a 3-mile radius of a given site’s centroid if the centroid of at least one of their constituent LSOAs are within the 3-mile buffer.
Areas not covered by the plans

Twenty SID places fall outside three mile buffer zones (1/3 of clusters). Eight were part of the large central cluster and have been improving.

Ten of the remaining 12 are one LSOA in size. Six of these are located around the central Bolton cluster – particular to the North East. These got worse on either two or three change typology measures.

The final two clusters outside buffer zones are two LSOAs in size. Hattersley shrank from four LSOAs in 2001, but its income deprivation rate got marginally worse (< 1 percentage point).

The income deprivation rate of South Partington decreased by five percentage points from 45% in 2001 to 40% in 2013. The cluster remained the same size across this period.
Proximity as a first step

Our analysis here is concerned with the location of new developments vis-à-vis the location of severely income deprived neighbourhoods.

It shows that many of the proposed developments in the revised spatial framework are in a good locations to benefit areas that need better access to opportunity. But proximity is only a first step.

Ensuring that residents of low income neighbourhoods benefit from these developments will require:

- Attention to the quality of work available at these sites
- Long term skills planning and delivery
- Business support and local supply chain development
- Reliable and affordable local transport links
- Support to address other barriers to labour market participation and progress (such as poor health and unaffordable childcare)

The spatial framework presents some opportunities for more inclusive economic growth in GM. Other strategies will need to be put in place to ensure these are realised.