

South Bristol/Urban 2: Socio-Economic Indicators

Introduction:

This paper looks at socio economic changes in South Bristol since the development of the Urban 2 Programme. The Programme has now been in place since May 2002 (therefore three years of a five year six month practical operating life) and it is therefore reasonable to ask if the Programme is still focussed on the appropriate outputs, including results and impacts, to use the remaining commitment to best effect and to bring about long term change in the target area.

This paper should be read in conjunction with the paper on outputs achieved thus far for URBAN.

The review also gives us the opportunity to concentrate on those outputs that the Programme is not achieving, and to consider commissioning projects to fill the gaps.

Statistical Background

The Community Implementation Programme (CIP) that the South Bristol URBAN II programme was based on used statistical evidence from the *Index of Local Deprivation 2000* and older sources.

The majority of statistics deployed in the CIP were based on out of date data at the time, for example the 1991 census; information from the 2001 census, for example, was not available before 2003, and the Quality of Life statistics collected by the City Council were not collected before 2000. The latest collated statistical evidence is from 2004, though this refers to the year of publication, not of collection, and, given that the first URBAN project was not in place until late 2002, the influence of URBAN in terms of both questions asked and the first specific information on young people in the statistics will not be available until at least September 2005. This is also true of the re-evaluation of baseline information, as the original information in the CIP has proved difficult to provenance. Some of the statistical evidence is based on ward level information, so may not be absolutely contiguous with information at Programme Level.

Poverty and Deprivation

The Index of Local Deprivation 2004 gives the most up-to-date picture of poverty and deprivation overall. This data clearly supports the original programme design – the most deprived areas were and remain the focus of the programme.

The evidence suggests that the structural problems in the target area continue to prove intractable: 14 of 21 Super Output Areas (SOA) in the URBAN target area are amongst the 10% worst in England for Multiple Deprivation, and 11 are in the worst 10% in Bristol.

Filwood ward is of particular concern. It features heavily in a number of sub-categories, including:

- Education, Skills and Training deprivation (Filwood SOAs ranked 1-3rd worst, 7 SOAs in worst 41 in Bristol and worst 10% nationally)
- Crime and Disorder (worst 6 SOAs in Bristol)
- Income Deprivation affecting Children (4 SOAs ranked in worst 10% in Bristol)

Measure 1.1: Employment, Skills and Training

The statistical evidence for this Measure was based on figures from the 1991 census (the most recent then available) but the bid writer acknowledged at the time that the figures were likely to under-estimate the worklessness figures for the target area. The main arguments for the Intervention can be summarised as:

- 1) High levels of worklessness relative to city, regional and national statistics:
- 2) Low levels of educational attainment
- 3) Significant barriers to accessing employment opportunities.

Income and Employment Domains for the Index of Deprivation

	<i>Income Ranking in England (& Bristol)</i>	<i>Unemployment Ranking in England (& Bristol)</i>
Bishopsworth	1328 (10)	1917 (11)
Filwood	258 (2)	673 (3)
Hartcliffe	1808 (12)	1705 (8)
Knowle	1006 (7)	1584 (7)
Whitchurch Park	1059 (9)	1226 (5)

(DETR 2000)

The available economic indicators related to employment and jobs indicate that for the Hartcliffe and Filwood wards in particular, there are helpful trends in employment generation, though admittedly from a low base. The number of jobs actually present in the two wards is now 5,000, with an additional 4,500 in the Whitchurch Park ward (though the majority of those jobs are outside the programme area) and 3,200 in the Bishopsworth ward.

The CIP noted that:

'A more detailed examination reveals that the target area is characterised by low levels of economic activity and high unemployment, including 194 people unemployed for over 1 year (July 2000, ONS / NOMIS Claimant Count). In addition, figures based on the 1991 Census for the target area estimate an economically inactive population of 28.6% against a national average of 22.6% and a city-wide rate of 20.8%.'

More recent figures from the 2001 IoD indicate 524 economically inactive persons claiming unemployment benefit in all four wards (Filwood still ranks 4th worth in rank for absolute numbers of unemployed claimants, with Whitchurch Park 7th and Hartcliffe 11th of 35), however there are indications that the sources of employment for local people are not themselves within the target area boundaries.

This appears to show that the thrust of the Programme in terms of existing output categories is broadly correct. However there are a number of initiatives in the target area that are already under way and seeking to address such issues in particular:

- The Objective 2 supported Pathways to Work Programme, which includes significant activity in Filwood,
- The SRB5 supported 'BEAT' and 'Towards A Working Community' projects, that have successfully supported activity in Hartcliffe and Withywood,
- The Imperial Park Fund, that supports employment related activities in Imperial Park.

This, coupled with the delay in provision of URBAN's forecast opportunity sites:

1. Symes Avenue, that has not required URBAN funding,
2. Hengrove Park, that has yet to develop to the point where job creation is a realistic possibility, and will in any event require far greater intervention than the Programme has available to support such a programme
3. Imperial Park (where opportunities to support employment have led to people assisted into jobs rather than actual job creation)
4. Hartcliffe Community Campus (in the same position as Hengrove Park, above)

has meant that although URBAN is committed to securing projects that will directly support the creation of real employment opportunities, the number of net jobs in the target area is likely to be less than 50% of that foreseen at the time of the application, or around 50 net jobs. Access to employment opportunities created in other areas of the city, which experience growth in absolute numbers of jobs available, and contrasts with the numbers of employed persons, may prove a better overall measure of the success of the Programme. The number of people, and in particular young people, directly assisted into employment, or into better quality employment, however, is likely to exceed the original target figure for jobs created.

The proposals for change are therefore built around the more achievable outcomes of improving skills in the target area (given the continuing low levels of educational achievement this is a key component of the forward strategy). The proposals for change also reflect longer than expected lead times in producing outputs in certain categories, for example although the LEAP project is one of the earliest approvals in URBAN (2003), the Higher and Further Education qualifications that this project will produce will not be completed in the very earliest cases until at least 2006, because of the nature of the H&FE courses that it supports, and the need that LEAP learners have for additional support. We therefore propose to slightly alter the wording of the output to reflect the longer than expected lead times.

Proposals for Change:

Participants on training/qualifications measures:	Increase to 1,000
Number of alternative curricular employment/education initiatives	Increase to 6
Number of Jobs Created and Safeguarded	Reduce to 110

Re-Wording:

Number of people holding higher level HE/FE qualifications: **change to:**
 Number of people starting a recognised further/higher Educational Qualification (and)
 Number of people completing at least one year of a recognised further/higher
 Educational Qualification

Increases/decreases

Young People Assisted into Employment

(defined as the number of young people who have been actively supported both before and after their employment has started through employment mentoring, coaching, and/or skills development. This support to be a minimum of 10 hours per individual. This would differ from 'Employment Advice and Guidance' as it is specific to a job or role, and is concerned with the individual's ability to keep a job and meeting its requirements, as opposed to advice and guidance on a specific employment option.) 300

This would cover employment opportunities of less than 30 hours/week and/or for less than 6 months, for example tutor posts and crèche/childcare workers

Proposed Additional Indicators

Number receiving employment advice and guidance (of which, Number receiving information only)

This change would allow URBAN to differentiate between young people offered significant advice and guidance (a minimum of 6 hours personal time with a development worker) and general information on employment options, which might take place in a group setting, or offer a young person a variety of choices.

No Of Short Term or Temporary Employment Opportunities Created

This will enable the Programme to capture information about both the 'taster' opportunities (such as, for example, seasonal crèche workers, short term play workers, and educational/youth work support staff).

Priority 2: Our Place

Measure 2.1 'Improving the Environment'

The Programme Complement argued that the target area contained a '*large amount of neglected open space and lack of facilities*' characterised by '*poor water and air quality added to by problems of graffiti and litter*'.

The ward level local environmental quality measures are generally quite healthy with background nitrogen levels lower than average across the entire URBAN area, though in three of five wards they are slowly increasing (source: Environmental Quality 2003). However the target area continues to be characterised by large areas of 'green desert', rough turf and brownfield sites.

URBAN's targets for improving these sites were based on arbitrary figures which were always subject to assessment and change, even in the 'final' version of the output based report produced by EKOS Consulting in 2002/3. No allowance was made, for example, of base building costs associated with public buildings and the costs associated with long term improvements to public green space were yet to be determined, leading to challenging target figures for improvements to public areas.

Nonetheless, the concentration that URBAN has put in this measure into sustainable public capital projects has already visibly improved the area, through the SpaceMakers project, the CSV Roots environmental programme, and the Hartcliffe Community Campus Millennium Green projects. Further projects in development in this Measure include:

- The Withywood Centre
- The Archimedia Project
- Northern Slopes Initiative
- 'Restore' Furniture and Recycling Project (though this may come in under Measure 1.1 instead), and
- Environmental Awareness and Education projects

The difficulties in this Measure come from a confusion of purpose around transport and health. Currently, ward level statistics (Quality of Life questionnaire 2003) indicate that across the target area an above-average number of people go to work by car, or as a passenger in a car, rather than walk, cycle, or take the bus. Yet this may not be a surprise in a ward that has a lower than average number of employment opportunities, and a significant number of economically active people.

Transport was not recognised in the Programme Complement as a priority for action, and the outputs specified therefore have little direct justification in the original neighbourhood statistics. The Neighbourhood Renewal programmes in Filwood and in Hartcliffe and Withywood have transport as a low priority, and it is therefore questionable if URBAN should be targeting this at all.

The cost of building public space is more expensive than at first realised, and therefore the total square meterage likely to be created or improved is likely to be less than at first anticipated, but I do not propose changing the targets at this stage. The green spaces created/improved targets also look challenging but achievable.

Proposals for Change:

Additional Suggested Indicator:

Number of Public Buildings Created or Improved

5

This would reflect the number of interventions towards achieving the target square meterage. It is not designed to represent an additional target.

Suggested Deleted indicators

Km of upgraded cycle track

Number of community-based transport schemes

Transport is not in the Action Plan or SPD, and is therefore an inappropriate use of URBAN resources, and may be ineligible as an activity in its own right, rather than as a component of another environmental or economic improvement programme.

Measure 2.2 Crime and Drugs

As noted above, Filwood is a particular ‘hotspot’ when it comes to crime and drugs, exceeding the citywide average for criminal incidents by almost 50%. Particular issues include violent crime excluding domestic violence, where there were 422 incidents (citywide average 251), domestic violence 106 (70), general non-criminal disturbances 1092 (547), and burglary 243 (163). There were also 710 abandoned vehicles, compared with a citywide average of 267, 24 racist incidents (17) and 406 instances of criminal damage (160).

Comparable figures for Hartcliffe are much closer to the citywide averages, with total crime instances, vehicle crime, racist incidents, and robbery below citywide averages, though general disturbances are 886 compared to 547, and criminal damage 258 incidents (160).

However, it was never the URBAN philosophy that the response to crime figures should be to support more direct anti-crime initiatives like Street Wardens, locks on doors schemes or CCTV schemes. The URBAN response was predicated around diversionary activities in order to offer young people an alternative to crimes caused by boredom, lack of prospects, or lack of opportunities.

This Measure has consistently suffered in the definition of what exactly a ‘Diversionary Scheme’ is, and how it is measured in real terms. The Programme has taken a pragmatic view of what constitutes an individual diversionary scheme, in that it has allowed project promoters to make their own determination, subject to multiple activity schemes delivering through distinct activities as well as distinct groups going through those activities. So a ‘wagon-train’ for example, would be a single distinct activity even if there were a number of such expeditions in the life of the programme. In this way, the supported activities are more likely to be represented; it is also important that the number of beneficiaries are recorded.

The specific visits to schools and youth work organisations do not seem to have happened, because the anti-bullying strategies have been delivered through the Youth Moves project and others under Measure 3.1, where blurred reporting lines have meant that this output is significantly under-reported. URBAN is committed to the belief that young people are part of the solution, so delivering specific visits is not appropriate when the issue is dealt with as intrinsic to the education process.

Changing the wording in this way enables (particularly) youth organisations to record progress against this output without setting up specific people to ‘come in from the outside’ and deliver a ‘message’. In other words, this output now supports young people doing this for themselves. The important change here is that young people are now seen as the proper change agents; emphasis is on how they can help themselves to be engaged in the community, and therefore not engaged in anti-social behaviour, rather than on ‘scare tactics’ or ‘lecturing’.

Drug use is more difficult to source local statistics for, though it is now clear that the Programme may have been both optimistic and outside national good practice guidelines in thinking that a rehabilitation centre should be established locally for class A drug users (including heroin and crack cocaine).

Statistics available through the Hartcliffe and Withywood Kick Start project, which have direct local reference, concluded that:

- Heroin use amongst young people is ‘not currently an issue’, though they go on to say that heroin addiction is a huge problem for people under 30, and that 201 of 319 people on the Hartcliffe Methadone replacement programme are under 30.
- Cannabis use is so common that it is ‘hardly worth mentioning as a risk to young people’
- There is a real and continuing problem with alcohol abuse
- Use of cocaine from 14 up is relatively common.

The idea of a residential de-tox centre may not, therefore, be the answer to local problems, though this may work in other areas. Although there are real and continuing issues for local people seeking this kind of treatment, and there is a shortage of placement beds nationally, the profile of drug users in South Bristol does not warrant the level of expenditure on treatment centres necessary to make an impact on young people.

Similarly, evidence from the QOL questionnaire suggests that amongst its respondent group, fear of crime is lessening, slowly but perceptibly, across the target area with the exception of Filwood. This suggests that the appropriate measures to tackle crime disorder and drugs in the URBAN areas are largely in place; URBAN targets, with the exception of victim support and visits to youth organisations are likely to be achieved and exceeded; the target for visits to schools and youth organisations are likely to be met, but only by including outputs from projects presented under Measure 3.1 such as Youth Moves, as these initiatives have significant ‘cross-Measure’ impact.

Proposals for Change

Additional Suggested Indicator:

Number of young people contributing to ‘social behaviour’ initiatives; 250

Suggested Change in Wording:

Number of visits to schools or youth organisations addressing bullying, drug use, anti-social or offending behaviour. **To:**

Number of teaching and/or youth work sessions promoting better citizenship by addressing bullying, drug use, disempowerment or offending behaviour.

Suggested Deleted Indicators

Number of Ex-Offenders gaining employment

This output would seem to sit better under Measure 1.1 (Employment Skills and Training); and should be a proportion of the employment output. As with the target for jobs created it should be split between ‘jobs created/safeguarded’ and ‘assisted into employment’.

The % of victims receiving support from one of the support agencies

This is not in the Action Plan or SPD, and is therefore of questionable eligibility.

Measure 3.1 Getting Together

This Measure is designed to integrate young people more fully with the decision-making structures in the target neighbourhoods, and to support their involvement in all phases leading up to decision-making.

The original justification for Measure 3.1 projects were, perhaps, largely ideological, in that the direct evidence for empowerment programmes in this way were largely articulated through evidence of local disaffection: voting records, particularly in local government elections, indicate that few young people vote across the target area. Community elections for the Knowle West Development Trust and the Hartcliffe and Withywood Community Partnership compare very favourably to local government elections, though their demographic still shows that older people are more likely to turn out than younger voters.

The social and economic drivers identified in the CIP included:

- Child poverty information derived from the 2000 Index of Local Deprivation,
- Changes in youth population (ditto), and
- Perceptions of local youth support mechanisms from Hoggett et. al.
- Access to financial services.

URBAN has been able to intervene to date in this measure to:

- Create new capital structures for young people (e.g. Hareclive Space for Sports and Arts)
- Create new delivery mechanisms for youth service provision (e.g. Youth Moves in Filwood)
- Support innovative projects to involve disaffected young people in community activities and in their own lives (e.g. The Children Helping Inclusion by Listening (CHIL) project)

The effect that this Measure has had on the neighbourhoods will be measured in successive QOL surveys; it is not possible to state at this present time what kind of impacts the Programme has been able to achieve; nonetheless, the available statistical evidence (from ILD 2004 and the 2001 census) indicates that broadly, there remains a significant series of issues to deal with: low educational achievement, higher than average levels of non-attendance at schools for pupils resident in the target area, and lower than average expectations conspire to sustain a 'culture of isolation' in the area.

Urban is supporting the 2005 QoL survey, which will include questions on how young people see their neighbourhood in terms of power to influence decisions.

The fact that, to date, over 1,000 young people have benefited from increased activity as a result of URBAN funding is significant, but the impacts of this activity will take some time to filter down to all levels of the community. Whilst it is possible, therefore, to point to the fact that over 50 young people have now been trained in committee skills (on the main programme alone 27 young people have received some training), and that the majority of our funded projects now include young people in their decision making procedures, the real impact of the Programme may not be felt to

its fullest extent until some of 'our' young people are in the position of community leaders in later life.

The holistic nature of URBAN funded projects is such that, for example, Youth Moves has as one of its objectives to reduce offending behaviour (recorded under Measure 2.1), whilst the recently approved SkillForce Employment Transition project (approved under Measure 1.1) aims to empower young people to access the world of employment more easily by providing tools to make decisions in their own lives and increasing self-esteem.

However far URBAN has come, the fact that 16 of 21 SOAs in the URBAN area are amongst the worst 10% nationally for education, training and skills deprivation indicates that there remains much to do to prepare local young people for a place in society in terms of the tools to make a contribution. The area continues to be characterised by poor access to services, and whilst it is not possible for URBAN to directly support impacts that would make a significant difference, for example banking services, it is possible to contribute to the regeneration of the wider area so that commercial services like banks, shops and small businesses are persuaded to set up in the area.

Proposals for Change

Suggested Added Indicators:

Young People Participating in making changes: (Of Which)	200
Number of young people involved in the design, implementation or management of the programme or its funded projects <i>in a decision making capacity</i> (as opposed to a consultation capacity)	
Number of young people given training in committee or other (community) capacity building skills:	80
Number of representative structures (youth parliament, youth forum, citizen's panel etc):	5

