

Living in Urban England

Attitudes and Aspirations



Jane Todorovic
Steve Wellington

November 2000

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU
Telephone 020 7944 3000
Internet service <http://www.detr.gov.uk/>

© Crown Copyright 2000

This publication (excluding the DETR logo) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

For any other use of this material, please write to HMSO, The Copyright Unit, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ Fax: 01603 723000 or e.mail: copyright@hmso.gov.uk.

Further copies of this report are available from:

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Publication Sale Centre
Unit 21
Goldthorpe Industrial Estate
Goldthorpe
Rotherham S63 9BL
Tel: 01709 891318
Fax: 01709 881673

ISBN 1 851124 43 8

Printed in Great Britain. Text printed on material containing 100% post-consumer waste.
Cover printed on material containing 75% post-consumer waste and 25% ECF pulp.

Acknowledgements

Some tables given an area type classification based on CACI ACORN codes, © CACI Limited 1994.
All rights reserved.

Source: OPCS (now ONS) and GRO (S) © Crown Copyright 1991. All rights reserved.

Notes on Tables

There may be some slight differences between figures in tables and totals due to rounding

November 2000

Living in Urban England

This paper brings together evidence from recent surveys about residents' views of the areas they live in. It provides insights from people living in all types of areas in England. However, it picks out issues of particular concern for residents of urban areas.

For the purposes of examining whether attitudes varied with the type of area a detailed classification of urban, suburban and rural has been developed while remembering that suburbs are often integral parts of our urban areas. The classification is based on ONS and English House Condition Survey data as one possible way to describe the character of local areas and it is not intended to be definitive.

The overarching finding of this analysis is that most people are satisfied with where they live and with the services they receive. However, the more urban the area the more likely the residents are to be dissatisfied, to report problems and to live in a poor quality neighbourhoods.

This is not to say the people in suburban and rural areas do not have problems. They do - particularly with access to services such as public transport and concerns over opportunities and facilities for children and young people.

KEY FINDINGS

- The overwhelming majority of people in England are satisfied with the area in which they live and the proportion identifying problems has decreased in recent years. However a sizeable minority, around a tenth of all households nationally, are dissatisfied. People in urban areas are much more likely to be dissatisfied than those in suburban and rural areas and there is also a correlation between deprivation and dissatisfaction.
- There are high levels of satisfaction with local services in England - in particular with schools, rubbish collection and the general appearance of the local neighbourhood. People living in urban areas are more likely to be dissatisfied with schools. Residents living in more suburban and rural areas are particularly dissatisfied with public transport and leisure facilities.
- Crime, vandalism and hooliganism, litter and rubbish are the most commonly reported problems in all area types. People in urban areas are more likely to report problems and more likely to consider them to be serious - this is particularly the case for crime and noise.
- Lack of green space and parks and concern about crime and personal safety are most likely to be identified as bad features of urban neighbourhoods. Opportunities for young people and children and public transport are most likely to be seen as the bad features of more suburban and rural neighbourhoods. All of these feature among the most frequently wanted improvements to neighbourhoods.
- People in London and other metropolitan areas are more likely to think that their area has changed over the previous two years. Of those people who identified a change twice as many thought that this had been negative rather than positive - this holds true for all types of area.

- Moving to live in a better area is one of the many motivations for moving - one in ten recent movers identified this as their main reason and it was more commonly cited by people who had moved within or into a suburban or rural area. However, such area related reasons are small in comparison to personal reasons for moving - such as separation or marriage - and property related reasons such as a bigger house. One survey attempted to measure the relative importance of a number of services in attracting recent movers to particular areas - schools were the most commonly identified service.
- Nearly one in five urban dwellings is in a poor environment compared to just 4% of dwellings located in suburban or rural areas. Urban areas are much more likely to have serious problems with air quality, heavy traffic, and nuisance from street parking and litter/rubbish dumping.

SATISFACTION WITH LOCAL AREAS

1. The overwhelming majority of people in England are satisfied with the area in which they live - 87% of households in 1999/2000. As table 1 shows, these levels of satisfaction have remained broadly similar over the 1990s with a slight increase in recent years. However, there is still a small proportion of households - 9% in 1999/2000 - that are dissatisfied with their area.

Table 1: Trends in satisfaction with local area: 1992 to 1999/00							
<i>All households: England</i>							
Satisfaction with local area	Percentages						
	92	94/5	95/6	96/7	97/8	98/9	99/00
Very satisfied	51	51	53	51	52	53	51
Fairly satisfied	34	32	34	34	33	34	36
All satisfied	85	83	86	85	85	87	87
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	5	4	4	4	4	5
Slightly dissatisfied	6	8	6	6	7	6	5
Very dissatisfied	4	5	3	4	4	3	3
All dissatisfied	10	13	9	10	11	9	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Housing Attitudes Survey 1992: Surveys of English Housing 1994/95 - 1999/2000

2. But not all people are equally happy. The more urban the area the lower the levels of satisfaction and the higher the levels of dissatisfaction. In 1998/99 16% of heads of household in urban areas expressed dissatisfaction with their area, compared to 7% of households in suburban areas and 3% of households in rural areas.

Table 2: Satisfaction with local area by type of area: 1998/99
All households: England

Area type	Percentages				
	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither	Slightly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Urban	35	40	8	9	7
Suburban/urban	42	40	5	9	5
Suburban	55	34	4	5	2
Suburban/rural	64	28	3	3	1
Rural	77	19	2	2	1

Source: Survey of English Housing 1998/99

3. It is also possible to identify a relationship between satisfaction and deprivation. This is related, in turn, to area type as most deprived areas in England are concentrated in our cities and towns. In 1999/2000¹ groups more likely to have expressed dissatisfaction with their area included:
 - People living in a deprived area² (18%)
 - Lone parents (15%)
 - Unemployed heads of household (19%)
 - People living in social rented housing (15%)
4. These findings from national datasets are supported by a more localised survey of residents in deprived areas where there were much higher levels of dissatisfaction than nationally. On average 13% of respondents reported being very dissatisfied with their area compared with only 3 per cent nationally³.
5. It is important not to overstate the relationship between tenure and dissatisfaction - some homeowners (particularly those that have bought under the right to buy) are similar to social renters and have very little in common with other more affluent home owners. However there is evidence that people living in the social rented sector are more negative about how their area had changed. They are also more pessimistic about their future, refer to more neighbourhood problems and feel that the schools and the job opportunities associated with their neighbourhoods were worse. In contrast home owners are more optimistic, reporting fewer neighbourhood problems and with more positive views about local schools and job opportunities⁴.

1 Survey of English Housing 1999/2000

2 This definition of deprived area is the same as the definition used in the Survey of English Housing and is based on aggregating ACORN groups. See annex D for full definition.

3 Whitehead and Smith, 1998. Findings relate to 1995.

4 Murie, 1998

PROBLEMS WITH AREAS

- 6. Crime is the major cause for concern in all areas. In 1999/00 over half of all households (56%) reported crime as being a problem in their area, including 12% who regarded it as a serious problem. The next most frequently occurring problems were litter and rubbish, traffic, vandalism and hooliganism.
- 7. Over recent years there has been a substantial decrease in the proportion of households reporting problems (Table 3). This holds for almost every issue and is true across all types of area. In particular, perceptions of crime, vandalism and hooliganism, graffiti and dogs as problems have declined

Table 3: Trends in problems in the area: 1992 to 1999/00
All households: England

	Serious problem					Problem, but not serious					Not a problem				
	92	94	97	98	99	92	94	97	98	99	92	94	97	98	99
	/5	/8	/9	/9	/0	/5	/6	/9	/9	/0	/5	/8	/9	/9	/0
Vandalism & hooliganism	14	14	13	10	8	46	45	43	37	32	40	41	45	53	60
Graffiti	8	6	6	..	4	30	26	23	..	18	62	68	71	..	78
Crime	22	22	19	13	12	51	52	50	46	43	28	26	31	41	44
Dogs	21	16	12	10	9	34	26	22	20	20	44	58	65	70	71
Litter & rubbish	17	13	11	11	13	39	33	30	28	29	44	54	59	61	58
Racial Harassment	..	1	1	..	1	..	4	3	..	3	..	95	95	..	96
Traffic	-	-	-	16	15	-	-	-	26	26	-	-	-	58	59
Noise	..	6	6	7	6	..	19	18	19	18	..	75	76	74	77

Source: Housing Attitudes Survey 1992; Survey of English Housing 1994/95 - 1999/00

- 8. However, people living in urban areas in the late 1990s were more likely to report problems and more likely to consider them to be serious. Overall, crime was reported as a problem by 68% of urban residents compared to 59% in suburban areas and 45% in rural areas. Almost twice as many urban residents reported noise as a problem compared to those in the suburbs.

Table 4: Problems and serious problems by area type: 1998/99
All households: England

	Problem, but not serious					Serious problem				
	Urban	Suburban/ urban	Suburban	Suburban/ rural	Rural	Urban	Suburban/ urban	Suburban	Suburban/ rural	Rural
Vandalism	43	40	38	34	22	16	15	8	6	2
Crime	44	48	47	44	40	24	19	11	8	5
Litter	36	32	28	22	14	21	18	9	5	2
Noise	30	24	18	15	11	13	8	5	5	3
Traffic	30	27	25	25	22	25	18	15	14	10

Source: Survey of English Housing 1998/99

SERVICES AND FACILITIES

9. Most people in England are satisfied with their local services and facilities. This is particularly the case for schools, rubbish collection and the general appearance of their neighbourhood. Of those asked about the most regularly criticised services are public transport and leisure facilities.

Table 5: Levels of satisfaction with different types of service: 1997/98 & 1998/99
All households: England

	Percentages					
	Very good	Fairly good	All good	Fairly bad	Very bad	All bad
Public transport	34	45	79	13	8	21
Rubbish collection	64	31	95	3	2	5
Schools *	48	45	93	5	2	7
Leisure facilities*	20	42	63	23	14	37
General appearance*	29	57	86	11	3	14

*Source: Surveys of English Housing 1997/98 * and 1998/99*

10. Again the type of area affects attitudes. People living in urban areas are less dissatisfied with public transport than suburban and rural residents but more dissatisfied with schools - 21% describing them as fairly or very bad in 1997/98 - and the general appearance of their area.

Table 6: Satisfaction with services by type of area: 1997/98 & 1998/99
All households: England

	Good					Percentages Bad				
	Urban	Suburban/ urban	Suburban	Suburban/ rural	Rural	Urban	Suburban/ urban	Suburban	Suburban/ rural	Rural
Public transport	91	88	83	67	36	9	12	17	33	64
Rubbish collection	89	94	96	97	96	11	6	4	3	4
Schools*	79	92	94	96	91	21	8	6	4	9
Leisure facilities*	64	61	64	63	54	36	39	36	37	46
General appearance*	70	78	87	93	97	30	22	13	7	3

Source: Surveys of English Housing 1997/98 and 1998/99*

GOOD AND BAD ASPECTS OF AREAS

11. In 1999, features people generally liked about where they lived were: friendly people and neighbours (75%); access to the countryside (72%); parks and green space (69%); access to city and town centres (65%); and a peaceful and quiet neighbourhood (66%)⁵.
12. Features identified as bad were the amount of traffic (36%); opportunities and facilities for children and young people (34%); and the availability of jobs (29%). There is some evidence that people in urban areas were more likely to have concerns about personal safety and crime and people in suburban and rural areas were particularly concerned about facilities for young people and public transport⁶.
13. Opportunities for children and young people (40%) local amenities, park and leisure facilities (32%) public transport (29%) and crime and vandalism (26%) were most commonly identified as the aspects of the area that most needed improvement. Improvements in the reduction of crime and vandalism were identified by relatively more households in deprived areas than other areas⁷.
14. More focused work has been done on what the key features of a place are that makes it a desirable location. Top are good health facilities, a safe living environment, a reasonable cost of living and good education provision.

5 People's Panel: Wave 3 Supplementary Questions

6 Based on small sample sizes - indicative only

7 Survey of English Housing 1999/2000

Table 7: Quality of life attributes and concerns: the average person
Adults in Great Britain

Order	Attributes and concerns	% indicating 'very important'
1	Violent crime rates	71.7
2	Local health care provision	70.3
3	Levels of non-violent crime	65.7
4	Cost of living	58.8
5	Education provision	57.1
6	Pollution levels	56.1
7	Employment prospects	49.5
8	Housing costs	49.4
9	Wage levels	45.2
10	Shopping facilities	43.8
11	Unemployment levels	41.1
12	Travel to work times	36.1
13	Scenic quality of area	33.0
14	Climate	25.3
15	Sports facilities	23.8
16	Leisure opportunities	21.4

Source: *Quality of Life in Britain* ROGERSON R . University of Strathclyde, 1997

RECENT TRENDS

15. Most people think that the area where they live has remained stable over the previous few years. In England two-thirds of households thought that there had been no change to their area over the previous two years compared to 10% who thought it had got better and 24% who thought it had got worse.
16. People in London and other metropolitan areas were more likely to think there had been change compared to people in non-metropolitan areas⁸. But no matter what the area those householders who thought there had been change were about twice as likely to think it had been negative rather than positive.

Table 8: Whether area changed over previous two years by area type: 1999-2000
Households resident for more than two years: England

	Percentages		
	Better	Worse	No change
England	10	24	66
London and metropolitan areas	13	29	58
Non-metropolitan areas	9	21	71

Source: *Survey of English Housing 1999/2000*

⁸ This is based on a previous ONS classification of local authority districts. London includes both Inner and Outer London, other metropolitan areas include Principal Metropolitan Cities, Other Metropolitan Areas and non-metropolitan areas are the rest.

17. Previous survey work shows that people's perceptions of past change appears to colour their view of what the future is likely to hold. In 1995/96 82% of those that thought there had been no change in the past two years expected none in the next two. Similarly 62% of those that thought their area had deteriorated expected this process to continue⁹. There are, however, indications that places which are seen as having poor environments can be turned round by new development which addresses environment eyesores and helps to improve the overall image of an area¹⁰.

REASONS FOR MOVING

18. About one in ten recent movers identified moving to a better area as the reason for their move - this was more common among people moving within or into suburban and rural areas. However for all types of area the main reasons were personal circumstances - such as separation or marriage - and property related reasons - such as wanting a larger or better house. While this pattern holds - generally - across all types of area it is interesting to note that job related reasons were among the most important reasons for those moving within or into urban areas.

Table 9: Main reason household heads gave for moving by current area: 1998-1999
All households resident for less than one year: England

	Percentages					
	All	Urban	Suburban/ urban	Suburban	Suburban/ rural	Rural
Property related	21	20	19	22	23	22
Personal reasons	27	18	28	29	29	26
Move to a better area	9	6	10	9	7	16
Job related reasons	11	14	8	10	14	14
Previous accommodation no longer available	5	8	4	5	3	1
Wanted to buy	6	6	5	6	5	7
To live independently	8	9	11	8	7	2
Other reasons	13	19	14	11	11	12

Source: Survey of English Housing : 1998 - 99

19. The fact that moving to a better area is of more importance to those households who had moved within or into a suburban or rural area suggests that people are more likely to think that 'better' areas for living are to be found in these locations. This finding is further supplemented by qualitative group discussions¹¹ which established that when choosing a location people were attracted by low crime rates, good health facilities, low cost of living, good shopping and good race relations. This work for the DETR shows that these features appeared to carry more importance in the complex weighing up processes that affect decisions about where to live than specific aspects of housing provision, employment, and leisure facilities. Households containing children were more concerned with the quality of local schools and other core concerns included the general neighbourhood appearance and

9 Survey of English Housing 1995/96

10 Report for the DETR on urban intensification

11 Report for the DETR on a programme of work on public attitudes to the built environment

community. There was a general preference for houses over flats. It was concluded that the combination of circumstances that people found most satisfactory was more likely to be found on the urban fringe than in urban areas. Particularly as, with improved transport and the increased incidence of commuting, people's choice of area is no longer as tightly constrained by issues of employment opportunities.

20. Another survey of recent movers¹² tried to measure the importance of a range of specific local services in the moving decisions. The most frequently cited were schools, followed by local parks, sports and library facilities. This was particularly the case for owner-occupiers. Social renters were most concerned with the standard and availability of council housing, whilst private renters were most interested in area facilities.

QUALITY OF LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

21. People are concerned about their local environment. The top six issues of local concern in 1996/97 were traffic congestion (27% of respondents), fouling by dogs (25%), litter and rubbish (24%) losing green belt land (23%), traffic exhaust fumes/ urban smog (21%) and quality of drinking water (18%)¹³.
22. The quality of local environments has also been assessed by trained property surveyors who undertook audits of local areas as part of the 1996 English House Condition Survey. This analysis shows that nearly one in five (18.7%) of urban dwellings were assessed to be in poor environments¹⁴ compared to just 4% of dwellings located in suburban or rural areas. Compared to other types of area, urban areas were much more likely to have problems with:
- Poor ambient air quality
 - Heavy traffic
 - Nuisance from street parking
 - Litter/rubbish/dumping
 - Scruffy gardens
 - Vandalism
 - Graffiti

¹² Murie, 1998

¹³ Survey of Public Attitudes to the Environment 1996/97

¹⁴ Poor environment is defined as having significant problems in the local environment, poor visual quality of local environment or over 10% of dwellings in area classed as defective.

Table 10: Problems in urban and other areas: 1996
Surveyors' assessment of problems in local environments

	Urban areas	Percentages Suburban and rural areas
Air quality	58.4	24
Heavy traffic	71.2	48.5
Nuisance from street parking	69.3	47.1
Litter/rubbish/dumping	58.5	37.5
Scruffy gardens	58.7	41.3
Vandalism	27.5	31.9
Graffiti	46.3	32

Source: English House Condition Survey 1996

23. Looking just at major problems urban areas were much more likely to have serious problems with: poor air quality (5.5% in urban areas compared to 0.8% in other areas); heavy traffic (13.8% compared to 3.3%); nuisance from street parking (17% compared to 4.2%); and litter/rubbish/dumping (2.8% compared to 0.7%).

ANNEX A

Data sources

This paper is based on published and unpublished analysis of the following data sources:

Surveys of English Housing 1994/95 - 1999/00
English House Condition Survey 1996
Housing Attitudes Survey 1992
British Social Attitudes Survey 1996 - 1998
People's Panel: Third Wave Supplementary Questions 1999
Survey of Public Attitudes to the Environment 1996/97

It also includes findings from the following published reports:

Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget: Key results from the residents' baseline social surveys
Whitehead C and Smith L (Discussion paper 100, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge)

Attitudes to Housing in England: 1996, Alan Murie (University of Birmingham, 1998)

Quality of Life in Britain, Rogerson R. (University of Strathclyde, 1997)

ANNEX B

A definition of urban, suburban and rural areas in England

A ward-based classification of suburban areas has been developed in the Department to allow further analysis of geographically referenced datasets. The classification has been derived from a classification of areas developed by ONS (Meryl Wallace and Chris Denham: The ONS classification of wards SMPS 60, London, HMSO), which categorises wards using 1991 Census data. The classification identifies 43 clusters and 14 groups.¹⁵

The mean population density for each cluster was derived, and clusters were then cross-tabulated against the 1996 English House Condition Survey, which includes a surveyor’s assessment of the type of area each dwelling surveyed is located in. Clusters where more than 65% of dwellings were deemed to be in suburban areas according to the EHCS were initially regarded as suburban. However, this identified several anomalies, and the classification was further refined by examining population density information, the 1998 Index of Local Deprivation, and the geographic location of anomalous wards classified as suburban.

In broad terms this area classification can be described as follows:

Urban	Inner city areas and centres of towns
Suburban/urban	Areas close to urban centres, includes many social housing estates
Suburban centres	Typical suburbia, includes some housing estates well outside city/town centres
Suburban/rural	Estates in rural type areas
Rural	More isolated rural areas

Table B1 sets out further details of the classification of areas. The classification also has some limitations. Although it is largely data driven, it also relies on a degree of judgement both by EHCS surveyors, and ultimately decisions about which type of area each ONS cluster falls into. Whilst these decisions are broadly empirically sound and have been subject to intuitive scrutiny, it is likely that there is a small margin of error in the way some wards have been classified.

It should be noted that there is an on-going review of definitions of rural and urban definitions being undertaken by Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions, Office for National Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and the Countryside Agency. This was prompted by the Performance and Innovation Unit report on Rural Economies and will conclude in summer 2001.

¹⁵ It should be noted that the classification is © Crown Copyright 1996.

Table B1: Classification of areas

Type of ONS area ¹⁶	Average population density	% of dwellings classified as suburban by EHCS surveyors	Type of area, classified by DETR
Agricultural Heartland	0.26	0.3%	Rural
Remoter Coast & Country	0.42	1.3%	Rural
Accessible Countryside	0.46	5.2%	Rural
Affluent Villages	0.81	10.7%	Rural
Industrial Margins	2.81	28.4%	Rural
Transient Populations	3.37	55.5%	Suburban/Rural
Concentrations of Affluence	4.87	44.1%	Suburban/Rural
Town and Country	5.66	45.7%	Suburban/Rural
Established Prosperity	6.08	38.1%	Suburban/Rural
Green Belt	8.9	55.2%	Suburban/Rural
Remoter Retirement Areas	11.43	52.4%	Suburban/Rural
Coastal very elderly	13.37	59.2%	Suburban/Rural
Edge of Town	13.97	70.1%	Suburban
Outer Suburbs	14.28	69.9%	Suburban
Welsh Coalfields	14.37	58.1%	Suburban/Rural
Miners Terraces	16.52	54.6%	Suburban/Urban
Better-off Retired	17.03	71.4%	Suburban
Primary Production	18.2	67.2%	Suburban
Small Towns	18.73	71.1%	Suburban
West Midland Manufacturing	19.95	66.2%	Suburban/Urban
Leafier Suburbs	21.85	74.3%	Suburban
Retirement Areas	24.19	51.0%	Suburban/Rural
Mixed Economies	29.04	82.8%	Suburban
Expanding Towns	29.11	83.4%	Suburban
Growth Points	30.04	80.6%	Suburban
Better-off Manufacturing	31.42	80.2%	Suburban
Classic Commuters	32.21	76.7%	Suburban
Heavy Industry	33.06	70.1%	Suburban/Urban
Scottish Public Housing	35.15	84.4%	Suburban/Urban
Traditional Manufacturing	35.26	86.1%	Suburban/Urban
Industrial Towns	37.84	55.6%	Suburban/Urban
Declining Resorts	38.53	37.0%	Suburban/Urban
Margins of Deprivation	38.92	55.2%	Suburban/Urban
Low Amenity Housing	41.3	70.9%	Suburban/urban
High Rise Housing	42.93	65.8%	Suburban/Urban
Urban Achievers	47.43	50.0%	Suburban/Urban
Ethnic Groups in Industry	54.65	45.7%	Urban
Textile Town Terraces	55.27	52.6%	Suburban/Urban
Scottish Inner City	71.35	17.2%	Urban
Inner London	80.14	34.0%	Urban
Cosmopolitan London	84.56	39.5%	Urban
Young Singles	87.1	14.7%	Urban
London Public Housing	90.4	10.8%	Urban
England average	20.33		

¹⁶ These types of area are labels for bringing together districts that have similar characteristics. They do not therefore refer directly to geographical areas even when titles would suggest that this is the case. A full discussion of this ONS classification is in: The ONS classification of local and health authorities of Great Britain Wallace M. and Denham C., HMSO, 1996.

ANNEX C

Background tables using area classification

Table C1: Tenure by type of area: England
All Households: England

	Percentages							Total
	Own outright	Buying on mortgage	All owners	Council tenant	RSL tenant	All social renters	Private renting	
Urban	13	28	42	28	11	39	19	100
Suburban/urban	21	39	59	23	6	29	12	100
Suburban	28	47	75	15	4	19	7	100
Suburban/rural	32	46	77	9	4	12	10	100
Rural	36	41	77	7	3	11	12	100
All England	26	43	69	16	5	21	10	100

	Thousands							Total
	Own outright	Buying on mortgage	All owners	Council tenant	RSL tenant	All social renters	Private renting	
Urban	244	521	766	515	202	717	351	1833
Suburban/urban	996	1855	2852	1110	282	1391	558	4801
Suburban	2425	4032	6457	1277	363	1640	569	8666
Suburban/rural	1280	1826	3106	343	141	484	419	4009
Rural	375	435	809	76	35	112	130	1050
All England	5337	8691	14027	3324	1028	4352	2044	20423

Source: Survey of English Housing 1998/99

Table C2: Household composition by type of area
All Households: England

	Percentages						Total
	Couple no children	Couple with children	Lone parent with dependent children	Large adult household	Single male household	Single female household	
Urban	22	16	12	14	20	17	100
Suburban/urban	31	21	8	8	16	17	100
Suburban	39	22	6	6	11	15	100
Suburban/rural	41	23	5	5	11	15	100
Rural	46	23	3	5	10	13	100
All England	36	22	7	7	13	16	100

	Thousands						Total
	Couple no children	Couple with children	Lone parent with dependent children	Large adult household	Single male household	Single female household	
Urban	400	294	211	252	365	311	1833
Suburban/urban	1467	985	400	396	752	801	4801
Suburban	3354	1945	515	559	960	1333	8666
Suburban/rural	1657	938	185	192	453	585	4009
Rural	478	246	34	51	101	140	1050
All England	7385	4420	1348	1451	2640	3179	20423

Source: Survey of English Housing 1998/99

Table C3: Economic status of head of household by type of area
All Households: England

	Percentages							Total
	Employed full time (includes Govt. training)	Employed part time	Unemployed	Retired	Sick/ Disabled	Student	Other	
Urban	47	8	6	19	8	3	9	100
Suburban/urban	50	6	4	25	8	1	6	100
Suburban	55	6	2	29	4	-	4	100
Suburban/rural	55	6	2	31	3	1	3	100
Rural	58	7	1	29	2	-	3	100
All England	53	6	3	28	5	1	5	100

	Thousands							Total*
	Employed full time	Employed part time	Unemployed	Retired	Sick/ disabled	Student	Other	
Urban	860	138	110	344	141	59	173	1826
Suburban/urban	2376	283	204	1193	364	66	304	4789
Suburban	4716	502	211	2521	359	22	314	8643
Suburban/rural	2215	225	79	1230	124	21	103	3996
Rural	606	73	11	305	23	2	30	1050
All England	10813	1224	616	5605	1011	170	926	20366

Source: Survey of English Housing 1998/99

* Does not include unknowns

Table C4: Social class of head of household by type of area
All Households: England

							Percentages	
	Professional	Intermediate	Skilled non-manual	Skilled manual	Partly skilled	Unskilled	Total	
Urban	7	30	17	23	15	8	100	
Suburban/urban	5	22	14	31	20	8	100	
Suburban	7	30	15	28	14	5	100	
Suburban/rural	9	34	14	25	13	4	100	
Rural	13	38	11	23	12	4	100	
All England	7	29	15	27	16	6	100	
							Thousands	
	Professional	Intermediate	Skilled non-manual	Skilled manual	Partly skilled	Unskilled	Total*	
Urban	121	494	284	373	252	126	1650	
Suburban/urban	215	1026	646	1403	896	388	4574	
Suburban	595	2506	1288	2402	1220	443	8454	
Suburban/rural	339	1336	553	967	523	167	3885	
Rural	129	382	109	232	122	40	1014	
All England	1404	5766	2888	5395	3020	1164	19637	

Source: Survey of English Housing 1998/99 * Does not include unknown

ANNEX D

A definition of deprived areas

The ACORN classification is a means of classifying areas according to various Census characteristics devised by CACI limited. An ACORN code is assigned to each Census Enumeration Districts (ED) which is then copied to all postcodes with the ED.

This results in six ACORN major categories and 17 groups. Each ACORN group is further divided in a number of area types (not shown here). The descriptions are CACI's.

Category A: Affluent suburban and rural areas

1. Wealth Achievers, Suburban Areas
2. Affluent Greys, Rural Communities
3. Prosperous Pensioners, Retirement Areas

Category B: Affluent family areas

4. Affluent Executives, Family Areas
5. Well-Off Workers, Family Areas

Category C: Affluent urban areas

6. Affluent Urbanites, Town and City Areas
7. Prosperous Professional, Metropolitan Areas
8. Better Off Executives, Inner City Area

Category D: Mature home owning areas

9. Comfortable Middle Ageds, Mature Home Owning Areas
10. Skilled Workers, Home Owning Areas

Category E: New home owning areas

11. New Home Owners, Mature Communities
12. White Collar Workers, Better-Off Multi-Ethnic Areas

Category F: Council estates and low income areas

13. Older People, Less Prosperous Areas
14. Council Estate Residents, Better-Off Homes
15. Council Estate Residents, High Unemployment
16. Council Estate Residents, Greatest Hardship
17. People in Multi-ethics, Low-Income Areas

The deprived area definition consists of Groups 13, 15, 16 and 17. It also includes from Group 14: council areas with young families and many lone parents, multi-occupied terraces and multi-ethnic areas, low rise council housing and less well-off families; and from Group 8: partially gentrified multi-ethnic areas.