



## Report of The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate

Meeting: Inner South Leeds Area Committee

Date: Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> February 2008

Subject: Indices of Deprivation and Working Neighbourhoods Fund

<p><b>Electoral Wards Affected:</b></p> <p>Beeston &amp; Holbeck City &amp; Hunslet Middleton Park</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)</p>	<p><b>Specific Implications For:</b></p> <p>Equality and Diversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Community Cohesion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Narrowing the Gap <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Council Function <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Delegated Executive Function available for Call In <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Delegated Executive Function not available for Call In Details set out in the report <input type="checkbox"/></p>

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report highlights the positive changes that have been highlighted for this area by the recent publication of the 2007 Indices of Deprivation (IoD). The report indicates that on the basis of positive improvement in the Leeds deprivation levels that the Government has determined that the City will not become eligible for the Working Neighbourhoods Fund, which is seen as the successor programme to the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund. The report also highlights those projects operating locally which presently utilise NRF, and as a result will need to find other sources of income if they are to be sustained.

### 2.0 INDICES OF DEPRIVATION

2.1 New IoD data were published by the Department for Communities and Local Government on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2007. The methodology underpinning the IoD 2004 and the IoD 2007 are largely the same (though there have been small changes to some of the underlying indicators). Because of the limited variations between the way both data sets have been calculated it is reasonable to assume that comparison between the two Indices is legitimate.

2.2 The majority of indicators used in the compilation of the 2007 IoD are derived from data arising produced in 2005, (2001/2 for the 2004 IoD). Consequently on the ground small changes may have occurred in actual data since the collection date, but nevertheless this information is the most accurate presently available.

2.3 Leeds has seen significant improvements in the number of areas which are considered to be suffering from deprivation and in the relative depth of that deprivation. The area of Leeds

is subdivided into 476 Super Output Areas (each comprising approximately 1500 people). Of these 476 areas 415 had an improvement in their IoD ranking (87%), with 61 seeing a fall (13%). In addition compared to 2004 there was a sizable shift in rankings against other SOAs nationally. For example in 2004 the most deprived SOA in Leeds ranked 36 (out of 32,000 nationally) and four ranked in the most deprived 100. In 2007 no areas were in the worst 100 with the most deprived SOA in Leeds ranking 113.

- 2.4 Detailed analysis in respect of the Beeston Hill and Holbeck Intensive Neighbourhood Management Area is contained in appendix a. This shows that of the 7 SOAs in the area all 7 have improved in terms of overall IoD (although not all 7 have improved on all the elements that comprise the IoD), and that this improvement has led to 2 of these areas no longer being classified as within the top 3% most deprived SOAs nationally. There are a small number of issues that have worsened across various SOAs. However whilst one area may have got progressively worse in respect of one domain, frequently neighbouring areas will have improved. The greatest consistency of issues that have worsened relate to income deprivation affecting children, families and older people.

### **3.0 WORKING NEIGHBOURHOODS FUND (WNF)**

- 3.1 Following on from the publication of the IoD data, the Government announced which authorities would in the future be eligible to receive WNF. This fund is being seen as a replacement for Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF), but the priorities are very different, reflecting the Government's concern that employment, skills and training are the key issues holding back the country's most deprived areas.
- 3.2 Leeds was not named as one of the 66 Authorities which would receive this new fund. However 21 Authorities which previously received NRF were awarded transitional funding for 2 years to enable them to progressively move away from dependency on NRF funding. In 2007/8 Leeds will receive £8.9m and £3.5m the following year. For comparison, in 2007/8 Leeds received £14.8m from NRF. This funding is supporting a wide range of projects delivered by the public and VCF sectors and its loss will have a significant impact on the potential to develop programmes which tackle local problems. Many of these projects have been felt to be extremely effective and they have helped to secure the improvements that have been witnessed through the IoD data.
- 3.3 Within the Council, work is ongoing to review the existing Neighbourhood Renewal programme and to develop a transitional exit programme that minimises where possible the impact of the loss of funding on beneficiaries sustains improvements made to date and supports activity that will contribute to the achievement of the emerging service improvement priorities in the Leeds Strategic Plan.
- 3.4 The full list of existing projects which actively benefit the South Leeds Area and are in receipt of NRF is contained in appendix 2. It needs to be noted that several of these projects work across the city or a number of areas of the city and the identified financial allocation reflects that wider geographical working.
- 3.5 Given the extent of the reduction in grant funding, it is inevitable that there will be some impact upon the Neighbourhood Renewal Area. However, until decisions are made regarding the allocation of the transitional funding and projects have had the opportunity to determine their capacity to fund from mainstream resources or attract additional funding, it will not be possible to determine the extent of that impact and whether the impact is immediate impact or one deferred by a (reduced) allocation of transitional funding.
- 3.6 It is intended that further reports will be taken to the Area Committee on this issue, which may influence the way in which wellbeing funding is allocated. However, the Committee's potential to pick up support for projects losing NRF is limited by the size of the budget and the existing commitment to a range of projects. Similarly it is proposed to bring a progress report back to this board once the likely impact on the area is known.

## **4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress that has been made in the area, as evidenced by the new loD data.