



SCC Local Committee

Local Area Profile (Runnymede)

February 8th 2008

KEY ISSUE:

This report updates the Committee on the demographic characteristics of the Runnymede area based on recently published data, to provide a context for their work and to inform any self-reliance initiatives which may come forward.

SUMMARY:

The report highlights key statistical data from the Index of Multiple Deprivation update of December 2007, The Changing Face of Surrey, Surrey PCT's Public Health Strategic Needs Assessment 2007. It looks at the characteristics of the borough in a national and county context, and highlights partnership work undertaken in previously identified areas of Chertsey and Egham Hythe since 2005.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS:

The report is for information only.

Report by: Sylvia Carter, Local Committee & Partnership Officer

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:	Carolyn Rowe, Area Director
LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER:	Sylvia Carter
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	01932 794081
BACKGROUND PAPERS:	Census of Population 2001 (OPCS) Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007 (DCLG) The Changing Face of Surrey (SCC Policy & Performance Directorate)

Crime & Disorder Strategic Assessment for
Runnymede (2007)
Public Health Report 2007 (Surrey PCT)

1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This report gives an overview of the characteristics of the Runnymede borough area, based on various sets of data collected by Government and others. It explains how the assessment of the relative deprivation of the area has been reached, and gives the context for its ranking within Surrey.
- 1.2 The Local Committee has previously received demographic profile reports for Runnymede in 2003 and 2005.
- 1.3 The Government published its latest version of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) in December 2007. The IMD combines many data sets under seven main headings or “domains”, allowing the calculation of an overall score for every local authority area, and ranking in order of “relative deprivation”. Data is available below ward level, using Super Output Areas (SOAs) of neighbourhoods with populations of 1000-3000. This enables researchers to highlight small pockets of relative deprivation within a generally affluent area.
Surrey PCT published its Public Health Report in late 2007.
- 1.4 In 2000, Surrey County Council agreed its Self-Reliance Policy which used Census 2001 and IMD data to target areas which scored highly in a Surrey context in the IMD. These areas were targeted with funding for co-ordinated partnership work to develop sustainable integrated solutions which would address identified needs. There were no such areas within Runnymede.
- 1.5 The County Council’s self-reliance policy’s stated aims are to:
 - 1) Target help on disadvantaged individuals and communities so that they can become more self-reliant and enjoy a better quality of life;
 - 2) Work at long term solutions which will break the dependency cycle;
 - 3) Work in partnership with other government organisations, the business community and the voluntary sector.
- 1.6 Recently Surrey Police has moved to a neighbourhood focus, at the same time as the Department for Communities and Local Government has published guidance about developing and empowering neighbourhoods. The “Safer and Stronger” agenda emphasises the importance of building and supporting communities to be strong enough to resist disorder and anti-social acts from the outset.

2. DEFINITIONS OF RELATIVE DEPRIVATION

- 1.7 Professor Peter Townsend gave this definition in 1987:

“people can be said to be deprived if they lack the types of diet, clothing, housing, household facilities and fuel, and environmental, educational, working and social conditions, activities and facilities which are customary...People are in poverty if they lack the resources to escape deprivation.”

- 1.8 In an area such as Surrey which is populated by quite affluent households in the main, statutory services are often designed around the needs of the majority, for example the assumption may be made that most households have a car, and access to the internet. Where people live in areas of relative disadvantage compared to the county norm, services may need to be adapted to ensure that their needs are not overlooked.

3.0 CHARACTERISTICS OF RUNNYMEDE IN CONTEXT

- 3.1 In 2004 Runnymede had the smallest population of any Surrey borough, estimated as 78,500 by the Office for National Statistics. The Census of 2001 had shown that the number of households in Runnymede increased by about 11% over the decade 1991-2001.
- 3.2 The borough has four towns with populations exceeding 10,000 people, according to *A Profile of Surrey* in 2005: Addlestone (16,657), Chertsey (11,766), Egham (11,179), Englefield Green (11,180).
- 3.3 Surrey is the most urbanized shire county with 85% of its population living in urban areas, and is also the third most affluent county in England. In comparison with other local authority districts in England and Wales, the borough of Runnymede as a whole is not at all deprived. It is ranked within the least deprived 10% of local authority areas.
- 3.4 However it is important to look at data for much smaller areas and to make comparisons at local level in terms of relative need. The IMD 2007 enables this comparison, because data is provided for Super Output Areas (SOAs), which comprise a population of between 1000 and 3000 people. There are 32,482 SOAs in England & Wales, 709 of them in Surrey; and 51 in Runnymede, with each ward containing three or four SOAs within it.
- 3.5 The 2001 Census data indicated that there was a higher proportion of home owners in Runnymede than the national average, but a slighter higher than average proportion of 9% of households renting homes from the council (South East average 7.3%). The borough also had a higher than national average percentage of people living in non-permanent accommodation such as caravans and houseboats (4%), reflecting the traveller population locally.
- 3.6 The *Strategic Needs Assessment: the health of the people of Surrey* (Surrey PCT, Autumn 2007) notes that 4.8% of the county's population

is aged over 80, whereas in Runnymede the proportion is higher at nearly 6.5% aged 80+. The report projects that the number of 0-4 year olds will remain fairly constant as the birth rate is maintained. It also notes that Runnymede has a statistically higher rate than the Surrey average for hospital admissions for alcohol-related problems, and a higher rate of lung cancer, and deaths from breast cancer, than the county overall. However, the rate of mental health difficulties in the borough is lower than the Surrey average (notably in Englefield Green East, Virginia Water, Thorpe, Egham Town, Foxhills and Chertsey South) which suggests a high degree of mental wellbeing in the area. The drug-related crime rate (per 1000 population) in Runnymede for 2006-7 was the third lowest in the county.

4 RUNNYMEDE DIFFERENCES AT SMALL AREA LEVEL

- 4.1 Three Super Output Areas (SOAs) in Runnymede appear within the top 50 most “deprived” small areas in Surrey based on overall IMD score:
- Chertsey St Ann’s (ranked 11th in Surrey)
 - Addlestone Bourneside (45th)
 - Englefield Green West (47th)

- 4.2 For each of these small areas, there are key “domains” for which their score is high. In the case of Chertsey St Ann’s, relatively low education and skills attainment, together with a higher proportion of older people on low incomes, largely explains its overall ranking within Surrey.

The education and skills indicator is made up of four data sets: Key Stages 2-4 data on the attainment of children in local schools, the proportion of students leaving school at 16, the proportion going on to university, and the proportion of working age adults (aged 25-54) in the area with no or low educational qualifications (based on Census). The Surrey average for people aged 16-74 without any educational qualifications is 8.3%, whereas in Chertsey St Ann’s the proportion is 34%. This score remains unchanged from IMD 2004, but the school educational data has been updated with results from 2004-5, so that Chertsey St Ann’s has now the highest score in Surrey by a clear margin for the Education, Skills and Training indicator – and is ranked 1,731 out of 32, 482 for England and Wales (**Appendix 1**). This suggests that a lack of educational qualifications amongst parents in this small area is being replicated, with a lack of educational aspiration in their children.

- 4.3 None of Runnymede’s SOAs score high for overall Income Deprivation, but Addlestone Bourneside and Englefield Green West appear at 19 and 20 within the top twenty SOAs in Surrey ranked for income deprivation affecting children. Foxhills and Englefield Green West also score relatively highly for income deprivation affecting people over 60.

- 4.4 Egham Hythe's score for the Living Environment indicator remains high, but it is anticipated that this will change shortly. The borough council won a Planning Inquiry to allow a housing association to build new homes in the Wapshott Road area, to replace housing which fell below Decent Homes standards. This indicator also includes air pollution and road traffic accident data (from 2005) as well as housing data.

5. MIGRATION TRENDS

- 5.1 The Changing Face of Surrey (a snapshot of inward international migration in 2007) was prepared for Surrey County Council in September 2007, and summarised the available evidence on the number and origins of recent migrants to Surrey from abroad.
- 5.2 The report found that in Surrey 10,350 overseas nationals had registered for national insurance number in 2005/6, and 9,990 in 2006/7. The total number of overseas nationals over the five year period 2002-2007 was 38,140. The percentage growth in migrant numbers was roughly in line with that for the South East as a whole. About a third originated from the EU Accession states, and of those around half were Polish, who formed the largest group. Other recent arrivals were from South Africa, India, Australia, Phillipines, China and a range of other nations.
- 5.3 The borough of Runnymede had the fifth highest number of overseas nationals registering for a NI number in 2006/7 in Surrey. Possible factors affecting the number of new registrations in the borough include available economic opportunities, the cost and supply of accommodation, and the location of Royal Holloway college, University of London in the borough.

6 SELF RELIANCE WORK IN RUNNYMEDE

- 6.1 Since 2005, a small multi-agency working group has met to co-ordinate work in two wards of the borough which were highlighted as a result of the 2004 Index of Multiple Deprivation results: Chertsey St Ann's and Egham Hythe. The group comprises representatives from the borough council, police, primary care trust, voluntary sector and county council. The aim is to build on and co-ordinate existing partner activity to achieve mainstream and sustainable improvements.
- 6.2 Initially, the group analysed the IMD data in more depth, and undertook "walkabouts" in the relevant Super Output Areas, to identify possible areas of need. Subsequently, the group consulted borough, county and voluntary sector representatives working with people in the two areas to find out more about their perceptions of local issues. In 2007, two networking lunches were organised, one for each ward, to which front-line staff and local members were invited for an update on

forthcoming developments on their “patch”. A range of improvements were identified to progress through the working group’s influence.

Examples have included:

- bringing forward proposals for a new pedestrian crossing at the junction of Pycroft and Chilsey Green Roads to enable children to cross safely to Gogmore Park and the town;
- refurbishment and upgrading of Chertsey’s Brookside play area for younger children;
- a new noticeboard at Chertsey Library to draw in visitors who may not otherwise consider using the library;
- road resurfacing in the relevant Chertsey SOA;
- contributions to the new parks in Hythe;
- analysis of road accident data for Egham Hythe;
- support for family learning and transition to secondary school in Egham Hythe.

- 6.3 Following the revised scores for IMD 2007 there has been a shift in
the the areas with the highest relative deprivation within the borough (as outlined in 4.2). A review of the focus of the multi-agency working group will be undertaken in Spring 2008 as a result.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 This report has highlighted the latest evidence about trends and needs in the area. The information will be used to inform work with partners locally.

APPENDIX 1

The Index of Multiple Deprivation

The IMD uses seven key headings or domains indicating a particular need or lack in the population. People may be counted in one or more of the domains, depending on the number of types of deprivation they experience. Extensive consultation with local authority associations was undertaken at the time these domains were defined for IMD 2004. Each domain has a different weighting in the overall score, so they are not all equal in terms of importance. The domains are (in order of significance):

- Income
- Employment
- Health Deprivation & Disability
- Education, Skills & Training
- Barriers to Housing and Services
- Crime
- Living Environment

Within these seven domains there are 37 individual data sets or indicators, including benefits and unemployment claims, hospital admissions, mortality rates, crime figures, housing amenities (inside WC, central heating), road traffic accidents etc.

There are also two sub-sets of the Income domain:

- Income Deprivation affecting Children
- Income Deprivation affecting Older People.

The first of these data sets was used by Children's Services county-wide to identify where Sure Start childrens' centres should be located.

Table showing top 20 in Surrey: Education, Skills and Training Deprivation

Rank	SOA name	WARD	Score	Rank in England	2004 rank
1	Runnymede 006D	Chertsey St Ann`s	60.85	1731	4
2	Guildford 012D	Westborough	54.36	2541	3
3	Waverley 002E	Farnham Upper Hale	53.69	2645	6
4	Woking 004F	Maybury and Sheerwater	52.05	2863	10
5	Guildford 010C	Ash Wharf	50.16	3188	7
6	Spelthorne 001C	Stanwell North	48.10	3539	5
7	Surrey Heath 004C	Old Dean	47.08	3728	9
8	Mole Valley 011D	Holmwoods	46.00	3929	22
9	Guildford 007C	Stoke	46.00	3931	2
10	Guildford 009B	Westborough	45.32	4074	8
11	Waverley 005C	Godalming Binscombe	44.79	4174	19
12	Reigate and Banstead 016E	Horley West	44.54	4222	14
13	Guildford 007D	Stoke	44.42	4242	15
14	Woking 005B	Goldsworth East	43.31	4512	12
15	Guildford 012C	Westborough	39.96	5268	1
16	Elmbridge 017D	Cobham Fairmile	39.77	5315	32
17	Elmbridge 008A	Walton Ambleside	39.55	5377	16
18	Spelthorne 002D	Stanwell North	39.39	5415	23
19	Epsom and Ewell 005A	Court	38.71	5596	25
20	Spelthorne 002C	Ashford North and Stanwell South	37.00	6040	21

APPENDIX 2**Table 1: National insurance number registrations for overseas nationals by Surrey District in 2005-6 and 2006-7 (source: Dept of Work and Pensions)**

Borough	2005-6	2006-7
Elmbridge	1 300	1 310
Epsom & Ewell	570	570
Guildford	1 920	1 780
Mole Valley	570	540
Reigate & Banstead	1 050	1 020
Runnymede	920	920
Spelthorne	880	770
Surrey Heath	650	750
Tandridge	390	370
Waverley	710	690
Woking	1 390	1 270
Total	10,350	9,990