



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

www.defra.gov.uk

Statistical Digest of Rural England 2013

January 2013



 Government
Statistical Service

© Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

This document/publication is also available on our website at:

www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/rural/publications

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at:

rural.statistics@defra.gsi.gov.uk

PB13821

Contents

Introduction	5
Official Statistics	5
Defining rural areas	6
Rural Context.....	8
Population	8
Population by Age	9
Population Change	10
Internal Migration	12
Education.....	14
Pupils Leaving School with 5+ A* - C at GCSE Level, based on residency of pupils	14
Pupils Leaving School with 5+ A* - C at GCSE Level, based on location of school	15
Full Time Entrants to Higher Education	17
Part Time Entrants to Higher Education.....	18
Health	20
Life Expectancy.....	20
Infant Mortality Rate	23
Potential Years of Life Lost from Cancer	25
Potential Years of Life Lost from Stroke and Related Diseases	26
Potential Years of Life Lost from Coronary Heart Disease	27
Potential Years of Life Lost from Suicide and Undetermined Injury	28
Housing.....	30
House Building.....	30
Homelessness and Temporary Accommodation	37
Housing Affordability	39
Private Rental Affordability.....	41
Fuel and Energy	45
Fuel Poverty	46
Household Energy Supply.....	49
Crime	54
Violence Against the Person Offences.....	54
Sexual Offences.....	55
Robbery Offences	56
Burglary Offences	57
Theft of Motor Vehicle Offences.....	58
Theft from Motor Vehicle Offences	59
Poverty.....	61
Households with income below the poverty threshold	62
Working age people in households with income below the poverty threshold	63
Children in households with income below the poverty threshold.....	64
Pensioners in households with income below the poverty threshold	65
Expenditure.....	66
Nominal Expenditure and Disposable Income	66
Expenditure on Commodity or Service Groups.....	67
Transport	69
Distance Travelled	71
Bus Availability	72
Accessibility	73
Measuring accessibility	73
Service Accessibility	74
Average Overall Accessibility.....	76
Broadband	80
Households with No or Slow Broadband.....	80
Broadband Speed	81

Productivity	83
Productivity by Industry	84
Gross Value Added (GVA) per Workforce Job.....	86
Economic Activity.....	90
Employment Rate	90
Full Time and Part Time Workers	91
Unemployment Rate	93
Economic Inactivity	94
Earnings.....	97
Workplace Based Earnings.....	97
Residence Based Earnings.....	99
Skills	101
Residence Based Skills	101
Proportion of Working Age Population with At Least One Qualification.....	102
Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 2 or Above.....	103
Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 4 or equivalent.....	104
Proportion of Employees Receiving On the Job Training	105
Workplace Based Skills	107
Proportion of Working Age Population with At Least One Qualification.....	107
Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 2 or Above.....	109
Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 4	110
Proportion of Employees Receiving On the Job Training	111
Enterprise	112
Businesses per 10,000 Population.....	112
Business Start-Ups per 10,000 Population	113
Enterprise Composition.....	114
Enterprise by Industry Type	117
Enterprise by Size Band.....	119
Innovation	121
Businesses Engaged in Innovation.....	121
Product and Process Innovation	122
Investment	125
Capital Investment per Employee	125

Introduction

The Statistical Digest of Rural Statistics is a collection of statistics on a range of social and economic subject areas. The statistics are split by rural and urban areas, allowing for comparisons between the different rural and urban area classifications. The Digest includes high level statistics which present an overall picture for England. However, there is likely to be considerable variation in individual towns, villages and hamlets.

The Digest starts with a section on the rural and urban populations in England. This is followed by a range of subjects, including social issues such as housing, broadband, crime and education. The economic section contains indicators on productivity, earnings and economic activity, as well as a selection of indicators relating to economic growth.

It should be noted that it is only practicable to update certain sections of the Digest in each update. Those sections updated in this edition are:

- Fuel and Energy
- Poverty
- Productivity
- Economic Activity
- Skills
- Enterprise
- Investment

Official Statistics

These statistics have been produced to the high professional standards set out in the Code of Practice for Official Statistics, which sets out eight principles including meeting user needs, impartiality and objectivity, integrity, sound methods and assured quality, frankness and accessibility.

More information on the Official Statistics Code of Practice can be found at <http://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/assessment/code-of-practice/index.html>.

This publication has been compiled by the Rural Statistics Team, within the Rural Communities Policy Unit in Defra:

Stephen Hall
Melanie Riley
Adele Storr
Monika Krzykawska

rural.statistics@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Defining rural areas

There are two ways of defining areas as rural or urban. Wherever possible, the Rural-Urban Definition is used. This is a National Statistic and applies to very small areas. The Definition defines areas as rural if they fall outside of settlements with more than 10,000 resident population. The Definition defines four settlement types:

- Urban (more than 10,000 population)
- Rural town and fringe
- Rural village
- Rural hamlet and isolated dwellings (also known as dispersed).

Each of these settlement types are given a 'context' of either 'sparse' or 'less sparse' depending on whether the wider area is defined as being remotely populated or not. When data are not available at a small enough geographical scale to apply the Definition, it may be possible to apply the Local Authority Rural-Urban Classification (known as the local authority classification). This classification categorises districts and unitary authorities on a six point scale from rural to urban. It is underpinned by rural and urban populations as defined by the Definition. However in the context of areas the size of local and unitary authorities, it also considers some urban areas as Large Market Towns. These Towns serve a wider rural hinterland and their populations are therefore classified as rural for the purposes of the Classification. The Market Towns have populations between 10,000 and 30,000 and meet various service criteria. The categories of the Classification are:

- Major urban (MU) – districts with either 100,000 people or 50 per cent of their population living in urban areas with a population of more than 750,000.
- Large urban (LU) – districts with either 50,000 people or 50 per cent of their population living in one of 17 urban areas with a population between 250,000 and 750,000.
- Other urban (OU) – districts with less than 26 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns.
- Significant rural (SR) – districts with between 26 and 50 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns.
- Rural-50 (R50) – districts with at least 50 per cent but less than 80 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns, and
- Rural-80 (R80) – districts with at least 80 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns.

When categories of the six-way classification are combined to produce overall rural and urban estimates, Rural-80 and Rural-50 areas are combined to produce "Predominantly Rural" areas. Major Urban, Large Urban and Other Urban areas are grouped together under "Predominantly Urban". Significant Rural areas remain the same, and separate from the other two categories. This is because the areas do not have a majority (predominantly) rural population, but they are seen as having a substantial enough proportion of their population in rural areas to be considered separately from the predominantly urban group.

- Predominantly rural: areas with more than 50% of their population living in rural areas or large market towns
- Significant rural: areas with between 26 and 50 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns.
- Predominantly urban: areas with less than 25% of their population living in rural areas or large market towns.

These groupings can be also used when data are available at a higher (larger) geographical level. This higher level classification uses the same methodology as the Local Authority Classification.

More information on how to define rural areas can be found at www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/rural/what-is-rural/.

Rural Context

- In 2010 the population of rural England was 9.8 million, or 19% of the total population.
- The rural population is predominantly aged between 45 and 64, and has more older people than the urban population.
- Between 2001 and 2010 the population of Less Sparse Villages, Hamlets and Isolated Dwellings increased by 7%, greater than any other rural or urban area type.
- In 2009/10 net internal migration to rural areas was 54,000, compared with -75,000 for urban areas.

Population

- 9.8 million people, or 18.9% of the population, live in rural areas. The majority of these (9.2 million people) live in Less Sparse Rural areas. The population of Sparse Rural areas accounts for 1.2% of the national population and 6.3% of the total rural population.

Mid-year Population Estimates, by settlement type in England, 2010


	Population	Proportion
Less Sparse Urban	42,280,263	80.9%
Sparse Urban	107,797	0.2%
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	4,693,875	9.0%
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	248,349	0.5%
Less Sparse Village and Dispersed	4,530,953	8.7%
Sparse Village and Dispersed	372,808	0.7%
Urban	42,388,060	81.2%
Rural	9,845,985	18.9%
England	52,234,045	100.0%

Notes: The estimated resident population of an area includes all people who usually live there, whatever their nationality. Members of UK and non-UK armed forces stationed in the UK are included and UK forces stationed outside the UK are excluded. Students are taken to be resident at their term time address.

Source: ONS, 2011. Mid-2010 Population Estimates for Lower Layer Super Output Areas

www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/product.asp?vlnk=15106

Population by Age



- With approximately 50% of those living in rural areas aged over 45 years, the rural population is on average older than in urban areas. The most marked difference between rural and urban populations is at the 16 to 29 age group. In urban areas this age group accounts for 20% of the population whereas in rural areas they make up just 14%.
- At a more detailed level, settlements in sparse areas tend to have the highest proportions of their populations amongst the older age groups. This reaches its peak in Rural Town and Fringe areas where on average 26% of the population are over 65 years old and 54% of the population are over 45.

Age Groups as a Percentage of Total Mid-Year Population, by settlement type in England, 2010


	0 - 15 years old	16 - 29 years old	30 - 44 years old	45 - 64 years old	65 + years old
Less Sparse Urban	18.9	20.1	21.3	24.2	15.5
Sparse Urban	16.1	15.0	16.2	28.1	24.5
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	18.1	14.2	18.7	28.6	20.5
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	16.2	13.8	16.4	27.9	25.7
Less Sparse Village and Dispersed	17.5	12.9	17.5	31.6	20.5
Sparse Village and Dispersed	15.4	11.6	15.3	33.4	24.3
Urban	18.9	20.1	21.3	24.2	15.5
Rural	17.7	13.5	17.9	30.1	20.8
England	18.7	18.9	20.6	25.3	16.5

Notes: The estimated resident population of an area includes all people who usually live there, whatever their nationality. Members of UK and non-UK armed forces stationed in the UK are included and UK forces stationed outside the UK are excluded. Students are taken to be resident at their term time address.

Source: ONS, 2010. Mid-2010 Population Estimates for Lower Layer Super Output Areas

www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/product.asp?vlnk=15106

Population Change



- The population of each area type in 2001 has been taken as the base year on which the population figures for each of the subsequent year are compared. This method allows the degree of change over a period of time to be shown as compared to annual changes between subsequent years. Between 2001 and 2010 the greatest rate of population change has been in Less Sparse Village and Dispersed areas where the population has grown by 6.7%.
- In contrast, over the same period the population of Sparse Urban areas has increased by an average of 3.3%. Between 2008 and 2009 rates of population growth slowed or reversed except in Less Sparse Urban areas which have experienced slightly accelerated population change. Between 2009 and 2010 the population in all area types except Sparse Village and Dispersed have increased.

Index of population change, by settlement type, in England, 2001 to 2010


	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Less Sparse Urban	100.0	100.3	100.6	101.0	101.8	102.4	103.0	103.7	104.7	105.6
Sparse Urban	100.0	100.7	101.4	102.3	102.3	102.5	103.0	103.1	102.7	103.3
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	100.0	100.7	101.4	102.0	102.8	103.4	104.1	104.7	104.6	105.1
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	100.0	100.8	101.5	102.5	103.2	103.7	104.7	105.3	105.0	105.4
Less Sparse Village and Dispersed	100.0	100.8	101.9	103.1	103.9	104.6	105.4	106.1	106.1	106.7
Sparse Village and Dispersed	100.0	100.5	101.3	102.5	103.0	103.4	103.7	103.9	103.4	103.2
Urban	100.0	100.3	100.6	101.0	101.8	102.4	103.0	103.7	104.7	105.6
Rural	100.0	100.7	101.7	102.5	103.3	103.9	104.7	105.3	105.2	105.8
England	100.0	100.4	100.8	101.3	102.1	102.7	103.3	104.0	104.8	105.6

Notes: The estimated resident population of an area includes all people who usually live there, whatever their nationality. Members of UK and non-UK armed forces stationed in the UK are included and UK forces stationed outside the UK are excluded. Students are taken to be resident at their term time address.

Source: ONS, 2011. Mid-2009 Population Estimates for Lower Layer Super Output Areas

www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/product.asp?vlnk=15106

Internal Migration



- Internal migration is the movement of people within England. Between 2000/01 and 2003/04 the general trend was of net migration to rural areas from urban areas. Whilst this overall trend has continued since 2003/04 the extent of net migration to rural areas has been decreasing. Both Rural-80 and Rural-50 areas saw net internal migration of 27,000 in 2009/10 compared with approximately 20,000 respectively in the previous year.
- In contrast, Major Urban areas lost more residents to internal migration, with a net decrease of 63,000 in 2009/10 compared with 48,000 the previous year. Figures for the majority of area types in 2009/10 are considerably less than the levels seen in 2000/01 except for Other Urban areas.

Internal Migration, by local authority classification, in England, 2000/01 to 2009/10, thousands

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
Major Urban	-101.7	-134.2	-144.8	-148.1	-111.1	-97.4	-103.6	-92.1	-48.3	-62.8
Large Urban	-7.5	-9.0	-11.0	-12.2	-9.1	-6.4	-15.2	-8.3	-6.7	-5.1
Other Urban	-3.0	-3.7	-2.1	-4.7	-2.6	-6.4	-9.7	-2.5	-3.7	-6.9
Significant Rural	20.8	31.1	31.8	30.2	24.2	22.0	22.2	19.3	13.6	15.9
Rural 50	38.5	47.2	50.5	52.6	38.4	35.8	44.6	32.8	20.0	26.9
Rural 80	41.6	52.5	53.4	53.3	38.0	35.9	44.3	32.8	19.9	26.9
Predominantly Urban	-112.2	-146.9	-157.9	-165.0	-122.8	-110.2	-128.5	-102.9	-58.7	-74.8
Predominantly Rural	80.1	99.7	103.9	105.9	76.4	71.7	88.9	65.6	39.9	53.8

The population of all areas have undergone considerable change during the period examined here. On average, rural areas have seen greater increases in their population than urban areas, historically driven in large part by internal migration from urban to rural areas. However, the latest internal migration figures show that fewer people are moving from urban to rural areas with figures for the majority of area types in 2009/10 being approximately two thirds of the levels seen in 2000/01.

Population change has many drivers and whilst the evidence presented here does not point directly to these causes, changes in the extent of internal migration over the last couple of years suggests a causal link with the economic downturn of the same period. It is likely that the ongoing economic recession and subsequent suppressed housing market have both acted to reduce the extent of movements between rural and urban areas.

The distribution of population by age group is not even across the country and we have shown that the population of rural areas tend to be older than urban populations and those settlements in sparse areas have the oldest populations on average. Differences between age bands in rural and urban areas have a variety of causes and may be explained by younger people moving to urban areas to study and work.

Demographic change will have a variety of impacts. Faster population growth in rural areas might impact on services and housing. The rural and urban populations differ in both size and density. Whilst the rural population is smaller than the urban population the dispersed pattern of rural settlements means the rural population is distributed across a much larger area.

Notes: Estimates for internal migration movements are based on the movement of NHS doctors' Patients between Health Authority areas. In 2010 ONS adopted a new approach for collecting data from the NHS GP lists that form the basis of these internal migration figures. This change has inconsequential impacts on the figures, but improves efficiency for ONS and NHS. From mid- 2010 figures onwards this newer approach will be used as standard


Source: ONS, 2011. Internal Migration within the United Kingdom during the year to June 2010.

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Migration+within+the+UK>

Education

- In the 2010/11 academic year almost 82% of pupils living in rural communities left school with 5 or more A* - C GCSEs, compared to almost 81% of pupils in England.
- In 2010/11 the proportion of pupils attending schools in rural areas who left school with at least 5 A* - C GCSEs was lower than the percentage of pupils achieving those grades who attended schools in urban areas.
- In 2010/11 there were 149 full time entrants to higher education institutions per 1,000 18-20 year olds in England and 8 part time entrants. The rate of 18 to 20 year-olds from rural areas entering higher education has increased from 121 per 1000 in 2004/05 to 154 per 1000 in 2010/11.
- In 2010/11 there were almost 10 part time entrants to higher education per 1,000 18 – 20 year olds in predominantly rural areas, compared to almost 8 in predominantly urban areas.

Pupils Leaving School with 5+ A*- C at GCSE Level, based on residency of pupils




Interpretation: The chart above shows that the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more A* - C grades in their GCSEs at the end of Key Stage 4 has been steadily increasing since 2005/06. A higher proportion of pupils in rural areas achieved 5 or more A* – C grades at GCSE than pupils in England. However, the difference in attainment has been narrowing.

Percent of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 leaving school with 5 A - C GCSEs, based on residency of pupils, 2005/06 to 2010/11*

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Urban Areas	53.2	55.0	63.4	69.1	75.8	80.5
Rural Areas	62.7	64.6	69.7	74.0	78.6	81.6
Rural Town and Fringe	59.5	61.7	67.1	72.0	77.4	80.7
Rural Village	64.9	66.8	71.6	75.4	79.3	82.1
Rural Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	68.1	68.8	74.2	77.2	81.0	83.2
England	54.9	56.8	63.5	69.7	76.3	80.7

Pupils Leaving School with 5+ A* - C at GCSE Level, based on location of school



Interpretation: The chart above shows that the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more A* - C grades in their GCSEs at the end of Key Stage 4 has been steadily increasing since 2005/06. Until 2008/09 a higher proportion of pupils at schools based in rural areas achieved 5 or more A* – C grades at GCSE than pupils in England. Since 2008/09 the proportion of pupils at rural schools achieving 5 or more A* - C grades has been lower compared with those attending schools in urban areas.

Percent of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 leaving school with 5 A - C GCSEs, based on location of school*

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Urban Areas	56.7	58.0	62.5	69.7	76.2	80.8
Rural Areas	62.3	65.5	69.2	71.7	76.7	79.9
Rural Town and Fringe	62.5	62.8	66.5	72.0	77.1	80.4
Rural Village	62.9	67.6	71.1	71.4	76.3	79.2
Rural Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	60.6	70.6	73.7	70.1	75.1	78.0
England	57.4	59.3	63.5	69.7	76.3	80.7


GCSEs are an important stepping stone in a young person's future. By gaining a strong set of GCSEs, young people will have more career opportunities to contemplate for their future, whether they choose to continue their studies, enter the workplace or training. Pupils are generally required to have 5 A* - C GCSEs to be eligible to attend university. Looking at the latest data based on pupil residency, the data shows that **a slightly higher proportion of pupils living in rural areas left compulsory education with at least 5 A* - C GCSEs than pupils living in urban areas.**

These statistics show that **pupils living in rural areas, on average, potentially have slightly better career options than those living in urban areas.** What this data does not tell us, however, is whether these options are available in their local area.

Based on the location of the school, results are slightly different, with pupils in rural schools slightly less likely than average to achieve 5 A* - C grades at GCSE. The reasons for this are not clear, but as pupils are given a choice of which school to attend within their local catchment area, they may not go to the secondary school nearest to their home. Pupils living in a rural area may travel to a school in an urban area, and likewise pupils living in an urban area may choose to travel to a school in a nearby rural area. Since 2008/09 a lower percentage of pupils at schools in rural areas achieved 5 A* to C grades than pupils at schools in urban areas. The reasons for this change over time are not known, and this is an area for further investigation.

Notes: Includes pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 in each academic year, also includes international GCSEs (iGCSEs), England percentages for school-location and pupil-location are not the same, because pupils with a missing or incorrect residential postcode have been excluded. There is also a small number of pupils resident in Scotland or Wales who attend a school in England – these are included in the location of school analysis, but not in the location of the pupil analysis.
Source: <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s001057/sfr03-2012adv2.xls> , tables A2 and B1

Full Time Entrants to Higher Education




Interpretation: The rate of 18 – 20 year olds enrolling for full-time courses at higher education institutions has increased in England between 2004/05 and 2010/11. The rate was higher for 18 – 20 years olds who were living in Significant Rural areas prior to starting university than the England average. Predominantly Urban areas have consistently had a lower rate than other areas

Full time entrants to Higher Education per 1,000 population of 18-20 year olds, 2004/05 to 2010/11

	2004/05,	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Predominantly Urban	117	125	122	126	137	142	141
Significant Rural	144	156	146	153	164	164	165
Predominantly Rural	121	129	122	129	139	153	154
England	124	133	127	132	143	149	149

Part Time Entrants to Higher Education



Interpretation: The rate of 18 – 20 year olds enrolling for part –time courses at higher education institutions has been increasing in England between 2004/05 and 2010/11. The rate was higher for 18 – 20 years olds living in Significant Rural areas until 2009/10, when the rate has since been higher for 18 – 20 year olds in Predominantly Rural areas. Predominantly Urban areas have consistently had a lower rate than other areas.

Part time entrants to higher education per 1,000 population of 18-20 year olds, 2040/05 to 2010/11

	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Predominantly Urban	5.9	6.7	8.0	7.8	8.0	7.4	7.5
Significant Rural	7.1	7.7	9.8	8.8	10.1	9.4	9.6
Predominantly Rural	6.0	7.4	8.5	7.9	9.4	10.5	9.9
England	6.2	7.1	8.5	8.1	8.7	8.4	8.4

Higher education is key for the economic success and social wellbeing of the country. By attending higher education, people will have a wider range of opportunities available to them and may increase their earning potential. The charts above show that the rate of entrance to higher education has been increasing since the 2004/05 academic year, with both Predominantly Rural and Significant Rural areas seeing high rates than Predominantly Urban areas.

What this data cannot tell us is the location of the institutions attended by these students, and where people live after completing their higher education.

Notes: Data are shown at LEA level as Ward level data has been discontinued. Data backdated to 2004/05 and a classification for LEA has been produced for analysis purposes.


Data are presented as the rate per 1,000 18-20 year olds as at Census 2001.


Source: Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) Student Records.

Health

- Health outcomes are more favourable in rural areas than urban areas; the most recent statistics show that life expectancy is higher, infant mortality rate lower and potential years of life lost from common causes of premature death lower in rural areas than in urban areas.
- Life expectancy was highest in Rural-80 areas. Men born in Rural-80 areas in 2008-10 were expected to live just over two years longer than men born in Major Urban areas and women in Rural-80 areas were expected to live one and a half years longer than women born in Major Urban areas.
- In 2010, the infant mortality rate in rural areas was 3.3 deaths per 1,000 live births, which was lower than the England average, 4.3 per 1,000 live births.
- PYLL from cancer in Predominantly Rural areas in 2008-10 was 134.4 years per 10,000 people, over fifteen years lower than Predominantly Urban areas, 150.6 years.
- PYLL from stroke or related diseases is lower in rural areas than England. In 2008-10, PYLL from stroke in Predominantly Rural areas was 12.5 years per 10,000 population. In Predominantly Urban areas PYLL was 16.6 years.
- PYLL from Coronary Heart Disease has decreased by 20 years per 10,000 between 2001-03 in England and 2008-10 to 46.9 years per 10,000. PYLL from Coronary Heart Disease in Predominantly Rural areas was 10 years less than the England average, 36.0 years in 2008-10.

Life Expectancy





Interpretation: Life expectancy has been increasing in England since 1991. In 2008-10 life expectancy for men was 78.5 years and 82.6 years for women. However, life expectancy was higher for people born in rural areas. The area in which life expectancy was highest is Rural-80 where men born in these areas were expected to live until 79.9 years of age and women were expected to live until 83.6 years. Life expectancy was lowest in Major Urban areas for men and Large Urban areas for women. Men born in Rural-80 areas were expected to live just over two years longer than men in Major Urban areas. Women in Rural-80 areas were expected to live almost one and a half years longer than women born in Large Urban areas.

Male Life Expectancy at Birth in Years, 1997-99 to 2008-10

	1997-99	1998-00	1999-01	2000-02	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
Major Urban	74.2	74.4	74.7	75.0	75.2	75.6	76.0	76.4	76.8	77.1	77.5	77.8
Large Urban	74.7	75.0	75.3	75.6	75.7	76.0	76.3	76.8	77.0	77.3	77.6	77.9
Other Urban	74.8	75.1	75.4	75.6	75.9	76.1	76.5	76.8	77.1	77.4	77.7	78.0
Significant Rural	75.9	76.1	76.5	76.8	77.1	77.2	77.5	78.0	78.4	78.6	78.9	79.2
Rural-50	76.0	76.2	76.6	76.9	77.1	77.4	77.8	78.2	78.6	78.9	79.2	79.4
Rural-80	76.6	76.8	77.2	77.4	77.7	77.9	78.3	78.7	79.0	79.2	79.5	79.9
Predominantly Urban	74.4	74.7	75.0	75.3	75.5	75.8	76.2	76.6	76.9	77.2	77.5	77.9
Predominantly Rural	76.2	76.5	76.9	77.1	77.4	77.7	78.0	78.4	78.7	79.0	79.3	79.6
England	75.1	75.3	75.7	75.9	76.2	76.5	76.8	77.2	77.6	77.8	78.2	78.5

Female Life Expectancy at Birth in Years, 1997-99 to 2008-10

	1997-99	1998-00	1999-01	2000-02	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
Major Urban	79.4	79.6	79.8	80.1	80.2	80.4	80.6	81.0	81.4	81.6	81.9	82.2
Large Urban	79.8	80.0	80.2	80.4	80.4	80.6	80.8	81.2	81.4	81.6	81.8	82.1
Other Urban	79.8	80.0	80.2	80.3	80.4	80.6	80.8	81.2	81.4	81.6	81.9	82.2
Significant Rural	80.4	80.6	80.8	81.2	81.3	81.4	81.6	82.0	82.3	82.5	82.7	83.0
Rural-50	80.5	80.7	81.0	81.2	81.3	81.5	81.7	82.0	82.3	82.6	82.8	83.1
Rural-80	80.9	81.2	81.5	81.8	81.8	81.9	82.2	82.6	82.9	83.0	83.3	83.6
Predominantly Urban	79.6	79.8	80.0	80.2	80.3	80.5	80.7	81.1	81.4	81.6	81.9	82.2
Predominantly Rural	80.7	80.9	81.2	81.4	81.5	81.7	81.9	82.3	82.5	82.8	83.0	83.3
England	80.0	80.2	80.4	80.6	80.7	80.9	81.1	81.5	81.8	82.0	82.3	82.6

Life expectancy is the number of years of life a person is expected to live. The data shows that a newborn baby boy born in England can expect to live to 78.5 years of age, if mortality rates stay the same throughout his lifetime. The life expectancy calculation is based on the mortality rate, so if a life expectancy is high, the mortality rate is low for younger age groups. People born in rural areas have a higher life expectancy than people born in urban areas. This means that if mortality rates do not change, **people born in rural areas can expect to live longer than people born in urban areas.**

There are many factors that influence life expectancy, including diet, economic circumstances and access to health care.


Notes: non resident deaths included, Weighted average calculated using Census 2001 population by Local Authority

Source: ONS, Life expectancy at birth and at age 65 by local areas in the United Kingdom, 2008 –10, for more information

see <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/all-releases.html?definition=tcm%3A77-22483> or contact

healthgeog@ons.gsi.gov.uk

Infant Mortality Rate



Interpretation: Infant deaths were at a lower rate in rural areas than the England average. In 2010, the Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) in rural areas was 3.3 deaths per 1,000 live births, compared to 4.3 in England. In 2010 the IMR was lowest in Rural villages, 3.1 per 1,000 live births. This means that there were 3.1 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in Rural villages. The IMR has been decreasing in England since 2003. The IMR for rural areas fluctuates more than urban areas and there is no clear trend in the data shown, which potentially could be due to data issues. To get a better idea of the trend in IMR, it should be monitored over a longer time period.

Infant deaths at aged under 1 year per 1,000 live births, 2003 to 2010

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Urban	5.6	5.2	5.2	5.2	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.5
Rural	3.8	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.3
Rural Town and Fringe	4.1	3.7	4.4	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.3
Village	3.2	4.2	3.5	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.1
Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.1	4.3	3.4
England	5.3	5.1	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.3


The Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) is the number of infant deaths (where infants are under one year old) per 1,000 live births. IMR is lower in rural areas than in urban areas. This means that there is a higher proportion of infant deaths in urban areas than in rural areas. The IMR in England has been decreasing since 2003. There was a slight increase in the IMR in rural areas between 2003 and 2005, but it has been decreasing since then, with a marked decrease in 2010 especially in Rural villages and Rural hamlets. The **IMR in rural areas has consistently been lower than urban areas in this time period.**

There are many factors that are shown to influence the IMR, including birth weight, mothers' age, and father's socio-economic status.

Notes: Infants are defined as less than one year old

Source: ONS, for more information contact vsob@ons.gov.uk

Potential Years of Life Lost from Cancer




Interpretation: Potential Years of Life Lost (PYLL) measures number of years of life lost from cancer per 10,000 people. In 2008-10, PYLL in the most rural areas (Rural-80) was 131.8 years. This means that 131.8 years of life was lost from people prematurely dying from cancer for every 10,000 people living in Rural-80 areas.

PYLL was lower in rural areas than in urban areas between 2001-03 and 2008-10. PYLL was lowest in Rural-80 areas and highest in Large Urban areas. PYLL from cancer was decreasing in all rural and urban areas between 2001-03 and 2008-10 and the PYLL from cancer in England decreased by just under 18 years in this period.

Potential Years of Life Lost from Cancer per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
Major Urban	174.0	169.4	164.6	162.2	159.5	156.6	152.2	149.0
Large Urban	173.1	168.9	165.1	163.2	161.9	155.1	152.5	153.0
Other Urban	168.7	164.1	160.7	157.2	155.9	155.3	153.4	152.0
Significant Rural	155.4	151.7	148.1	147.0	146.0	143.5	140.5	138.1
Rural-50	155.3	152.3	150.0	147.1	145.8	142.7	140.9	136.8
Rural-80	151.0	149.9	145.0	142.2	137.8	136.6	129.3	131.8
Predominantly Urban	172.5	168.0	163.8	161.2	159.1	156.1	153.2	150.6
Predominantly Rural	153.5	151.3	147.9	145.1	142.4	141.6	134.3	134.7
England	164.1	160.3	156.3	153.8	151.7	150.9	146.9	146.2

Potential Years of Life Lost from Stroke and Related Diseases




Interpretation: PYLL from stroke and related diseases measures the number of years of life lost from dying prematurely from a Stroke per 10,000 people. The PYLL was lowest for Rural-80 areas and highest in Major Urban areas. In 2008-10 PYLL from Stroke in Rural-80 areas was 12.2 years, 5.2 years lower than PYLL in Major Urban areas. The PYLL in rural areas was lower than the England.

PYLL decreased between 2001-03 and 2008-10 in England and in both rural and urban areas. In 2001-03, PYLL from stroke in England was 22.5 years per 10,000 population, which decreased to 15.5 years in 2008-10

Potential Years of Life Lost from Stroke and Related Diseases per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
Major Urban	26.2	25.4	24.1	22.2	20.6	19.4	18.3	17.4
Large Urban	24.9	23.6	22.1	19.9	18.4	17.2	16.2	15.4
Other Urban	23.1	22.1	21.0	19.3	18.4	17.4	16.6	16.1
Significant Rural	19.8	19.3	18.1	17.4	15.8	15.1	14.0	13.4
Rural-50	19.3	18.7	17.5	16.1	14.9	14.5	13.4	12.6
Rural-80	17.5	16.7	15.4	14.3	13.4	13.2	12.6	12.2
Predominantly Urban	25.2	24.2	22.9	21.0	19.6	18.4	17.5	16.6
Predominantly Rural	18.5	17.9	16.6	15.3	14.3	13.9	12.9	12.5
England	22.5	21.6	20.4	18.8	17.5	16.9	15.9	15.5

Potential Years of Life Lost from Coronary Heart Disease




Interpretation: PYLL from Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) in England was 46.9 years per 10,000 people in 2008-10. PYLL in Predominantly Rural areas was approximately 10 years less, and PYLL was lowest in the most rural areas (Rural-80). In Major Urban areas, PYLL was considerably more, 52.3 years per 10,000 people, which is just under 20 years higher than PYLL in Rural-80 areas.

PYLL from CHD in England has decreased by over 20 years per 10,000 people between 2001-03 and 2008-10. PYLL for all rural and urban classification groups also decreased. The rate of decrease has been slower in rural areas than urban areas, narrowing the rural/ urban gap.

Potential Years of Life Lost from Coronary Heart Disease per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
Major Urban	80.3	75.0	70.4	65.3	62.0	58.9	55.6	52.3
Large Urban	74.6	69.6	64.3	59.6	57.1	54.2	51.7	49.6
Other Urban	72.1	68.3	63.5	59.9	56.0	53.2	51.0	50.2
Significant Rural	58.3	55.4	52.1	48.2	45.1	43.1	40.8	39.2
Rural-50	57.4	53.7	50.1	47.1	44.6	42.4	39.8	37.5
Rural-80	52.4	50.3	46.8	44.3	40.4	41.7	36.4	34.1
Predominantly Urban	77.1	72.2	67.4	62.7	59.5	56.5	53.8	51.2
Predominantly Rural	55.3	52.3	48.7	45.9	42.8	42.1	37.9	36.0
England	68.0	63.9	59.6	55.5	52.3	51.2	48.2	46.9

Potential Years of Life Lost from Suicide and Undetermined Injury



Interpretation: PYLL due to suicide or undetermined injuries in England is 26.3 years per 10,000 population, which was only slightly lower than predominantly rural areas. There does not appear to be a clear relationship between PYLL and the different settlement types. Between 2001-03 and 2008-10, PYLL has decreased in England and all rural and urban classifications.

Potential Years of Life Lost from Suicide and Undetermined Injuries per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10
Major Urban	28.6	27.9	27.6	26.7	25.3	24.7	24.5	24.7
Large Urban	32.4	31.1	30.2	28.9	27.8	27.9	27.8	27.2
Other Urban	31.6	31.0	29.9	29.2	28.1	27.1	27.7	28.6
Significant Rural	27.8	28.2	28.1	25.5	24.0	23.8	25.4	25.1
Rural-50	26.7	27.0	27.8	27.0	25.5	24.3	25.1	25.9
Rural-80	27.6	28.4	27.1	27.6	26.5	26.0	27.1	27.3
Predominantly Urban	30.2	29.4	28.7	27.8	26.5	25.7	26.1	26.2
Predominantly Rural	27.1	27.6	27.5	27.3	25.9	26.0	25.7	26.5
England	28.7	28.3	27.8	26.7	25.5	25.5	25.9	26.3

Potential Years of Life Lost (PYLL) is the difference between the actual age of death due to a particular condition or disease and the expected age of death if that person had not suffered from that disease. If the PYLL is low, it means that there is a low degree of premature death due to that particular condition. This could be due to a number of reasons, including fewer people suffering from that condition or sufferers making a full recovery.

Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) is the most common cause of premature death in England; Cancer is the second and Stroke the third. Even though CHD is the most common, PYLL from cancer is substantially higher than PYLL in CHD. This is because more people suffer from cancer at a younger age than people who get CHD. Stroke is another condition which people typically suffer later in life.

The data shows that PYLL from all three diseases is substantially lower in Predominantly Rural areas than Predominantly Urban areas, particularly for cancer. **This means that people living in rural areas are dying less prematurely than those living in urban areas.** Two possible reasons for this result are that the proportion of people living in rural areas suffering from these illnesses may be lower than urban areas, or the proportion of people recovering from these illnesses could be higher in rural areas than urban areas.

The reason why there could be proportionally fewer instances of these illnesses in rural areas than urban areas is that people in rural areas lead healthier lifestyles than those in urban areas. The common risk factors associated with suffering these diseases are smoking, a bad diet, and lack of exercise. So it may be the case that people living in rural areas are less at risk of suffering from these illnesses.

For people to recover from these conditions it is also important to have access to medical facilities and in the case of having a stroke or heart attack, it is essential to receive treatment quickly. Early detection of these diseases will mean that people can get the necessary treatment before the disease progresses. So, it can be inferred that people living in rural areas are generally able to access sufficient healthcare, though there may be local variations that the average figures conceal.

Potential Years of Life Lost (PYLL) due to suicide or undetermined injury is the difference between the actual age of death due to suicide and the expected age of death if this incident had not occurred. The PYLL for rural areas is only slightly different to PYLL in urban areas and so **there does not appear to be any clear relationship between deaths due to suicide and settlement types.** PYLL from suicides is used as a measure of mental health.


Notes: The average number of years a person would have lived had he or she not died prematurely (under age 75), per 10,000 European standard population. Uses Standardised years life lost rate (SYLL) as this is age standardised. Weighted by Census 2001 population at Local Authority level.

Source: National Centre for Health Outcomes Development, <http://www.nchod.nhs.uk/>

Housing

- There is a higher rate of house-builds started and completed in Predominantly Rural areas than in Predominantly Urban areas and the national average.
- The rate of house-builds being started increased in all types of area between 2009/10 and 2010/11, albeit a small increase for Significant Rural areas, with the rate of completions continuing to decline except for Predominantly Rural completions which saw an increase.
- There are proportionally fewer homeless people and people in temporary accommodation in rural areas than in urban areas.
- Housing affordability is lower in Predominantly Rural areas than Predominantly Urban areas. In 2011, the average lower quartile house price was 7.8 times the average lower quartile earnings. This compares to 7.1 in Predominantly Urban areas and 7.3 in England as a whole.
- Average Private Registered Provider rents per week in all categories of rural areas are similar to the national average.

House Building



Interpretation: This chart shows the rate of house-builds started and completed by the rural-urban classification, grouped for clarity into Predominantly Urban (Major, Large and Other Urban districts), Significant Rural, and Predominantly Rural (Rural-50 and Rural-80 districts). The solid lines show buildings started and the dashed lines show completions. In 2010-11 the rate of starts and completions per head of population was highest in Predominantly Rural areas, whereas in previous years this applied to all rural areas as compared with urban areas. In 2010-11 the rate of starts per head of population for Significant Rural fell below the national average. The long term pattern, however, has been reasonably similar across the different area types.


Permanent Dwellings Started, by Tenure and Rural-Urban Classification, 2004-05 to 2010-11

		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
		Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n
Private Enterprise	Major Urban	32,090	19.0	38,860	22.9	32,560	19.1	33,740	19.6	13,840	8.0	13,910	8.0	17,620	10.0
	Large Urban	13,520	20.0	16,810	24.7	17,340	25.3	15,000	21.8	7,170	10.3	6,410	9.2	7,790	11.1
	Other Urban	24,330	32.2	25,790	33.9	24,660	32.2	20,430	26.5	7,910	10.2	10,320	13.1	10,860	13.7
	Significant Rural	20,380	30.1	19,780	29.0	19,400	28.3	15,800	22.9	7,240	10.4	8,780	12.6	8,990	12.8
	Rural-50	20,990	29.9	21,680	30.7	20,720	29.2	19,940	27.9	8,420	11.7	8,600	11.9	11,110	15.3
	Rural-80	17,210	33.4	17,700	34.1	17,620	33.7	17,220	32.6	8,320	15.7	9,220	17.3	11,520	21.5
England		128,520	25.6	140,620	27.9	132,300	26.1	122,130	23.9	52,900	10.3	57,240	11.0	67,890	13.0
Local Authority / Registered Social Landlord	Major Urban	6,450	3.8	8,100	4.8	6,110	3.6	6,470	3.8	5,210	3.0	5,920	3.4	9,030	5.1
	Large Urban	1,470	2.2	1,410	2.1	1,670	2.4	1,760	2.6	1,350	1.9	1,160	1.7	1,370	1.9
	Other Urban	3,310	4.4	4,170	5.5	3,990	5.2	3,600	4.7	3,480	4.5	2,910	3.7	2,770	3.5
	Significant Rural	1,770	2.6	2,610	3.8	2,680	3.9	2,980	4.3	2,800	4.0	2,530	3.6	2,440	3.5
	Rural-50	1,680	2.4	2,130	3.0	1,770	2.5	2,960	4.1	2,360	3.3	1,730	2.4	3,130	4.3
	Rural-80	1,590	3.1	1,870	3.6	1,770	3.4	2,630	5.0	2,230	4.2	2,210	4.1	2,830	5.3
England		16,270	3.2	20,290	4.0	17,990	3.5	20,400	4.0	17,430	3.4	16,460	3.2	21,570	4.1
All	Major Urban	38,240	22.7	44,100	26.0	38,510	22.5	39,350	22.9	19,270	11.1	19,960	11.4	26,760	15.2
	Large Urban	13,340	19.8	17,070	25.1	16,090	23.5	15,860	23.0	8,600	12.4	7,960	11.4	9,020	12.8
	Other Urban	26,160	34.6	29,970	39.4	28,600	37.3	23,970	31.0	11,320	14.5	13,220	16.8	14,480	18.3
	Significant Rural	22,190	32.7	22,320	32.7	21,530	31.4	20,330	29.5	10,940	15.7	11,240	16.1	11,430	16.3
	Rural-50	22,240	31.7	23,770	33.7	21,470	30.3	22,840	32.0	10,820	15.1	9,500	13.2	14,240	19.7
	Rural-80	18,460	35.8	19,400	37.3	19,020	36.4	19,770	37.5	10,530	19.8	11,400	21.4	14,360	26.8
England		140,630	28.1	156,630	31.0	145,220	28.6	142,120	27.8	71,480	13.9	73,280	14.1	90,290	17.3


Permanent Dwellings Completed, by Tenure and Rural-Urban Classification, 2004-05 to 2010-11

		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
		Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number	Rate per 10,000 pop'n
Private enterprise	Major Urban	31,420	18.6	34,850	20.5	31,150	18.2	36,360	21.2	28,810	16.7	20,730	11.9	19,950	11.3
	Large Urban	13,400	19.8	13,220	19.4	15,680	22.9	15,550	22.6	11,930	17.2	9,550	13.7	8,540	12.1
	Other Urban	20,180	26.7	23,300	30.6	23,070	30.1	22,460	29.1	16,000	20.5	12,910	16.4	10,980	13.8
	Significant Rural	18,890	27.9	18,500	27.1	17,220	25.1	16,960	24.6	12,100	17.4	10,340	14.8	9,850	14.0
	Rural-50	18,030	25.7	21,880	31.0	21,220	29.9	20,480	28.7	14,250	19.8	10,390	14.4	11,780	16.3
	Rural-80	15,720	30.5	16,650	32.0	17,590	33.6	16,880	32.0	14,130	26.6	11,230	21.1	10,660	19.9
England		117,640	23.5	128,400	25.4	125,930	24.8	128,690	25.2	97,220	18.9	75,150	14.5	71,760	13.7
Local Authority/ Registered Social Landlord	Major Urban	6,330	3.8	6,240	3.7	7,360	4.3	6,990	4.1	7,270	4.2	7,040	4.0	8,610	4.9
	Large Urban	990	1.5	1,370	2.0	1,360	2.0	2,120	3.1	2,040	2.9	1,690	2.4	1,660	2.4
	Other Urban	2,350	3.1	3,380	4.4	3,640	4.8	3,980	5.2	4,250	5.5	4,130	5.3	2,900	3.7
	Significant Rural	1,640	2.4	1,860	2.7	2,620	3.8	2,350	3.4	3,270	4.7	3,370	4.8	2,730	3.9
	Rural-50	1,350	1.9	1,990	2.8	1,830	2.6	2,040	2.9	2,540	3.5	1,970	2.7	2,860	3.9
	Rural-80	1,460	2.8	1,770	3.4	1,580	3.0	1,830	3.5	3,620	6.8	2,480	4.7	2,190	4.1
England		14,120	2.8	16,610	3.3	18,390	3.6	19,310	3.8	22,990	4.5	20,680	4.0	20,950	4.0
All	Major Urban	36,160	21.5	38,730	22.8	38,840	22.7	43,050	25.1	36,650	21.2	27,730	15.9	29,100	16.5
	Large Urban	11,550	17.1	13,450	19.8	14,600	21.3	16,740	24.3	13,920	20.1	11,640	16.7	10,220	14.5
	Other Urban	21,690	28.7	26,620	35.0	26,720	34.9	26,410	34.2	19,770	25.4	17,050	21.7	14,590	18.4
	Significant Rural	20,620	30.4	20,310	29.8	19,270	28.1	20,500	29.7	16,280	23.4	13,720	19.6	12,550	17.8
	Rural-50	19,020	27.1	23,870	33.9	22,110	31.2	22,420	31.4	16,770	23.4	11,550	16.0	14,630	20.2
	Rural-80	16,940	32.8	18,160	34.9	19,030	36.4	18,730	35.5	17,710	33.3	13,710	25.7	12,840	24.0
England		125,980	25.1	141,140	28.0	140,570	27.7	147,850	28.9	121,100	23.5	95,400	18.4	93,930	18.0

House-Building: Permanent Private Dwellings Started per 10,000 Population, 2004-05 to 2010-11




House-Building: Permanent Local Authority/Registered Social Landlord Dwellings Started per 10,000 Population, 2004-05 to 2010-11




Interpretation: These charts present the number of house-builds started each year as a rate to take into account differences in populations in different types of area. For example in 2010-11, over 20 house-builds were started by private enterprise per 10,000 households in the most rural areas (dark green line). **The scale on each chart is different** – the rate of Local Authority/RSL builds was much lower than private house building. In 2010-11, Other Urban and Significant Rural areas continued to show a decline in house builds started per 10,000 households, whereas all other areas showed an increase.

House-Building: Permanent Private Dwellings Completed per 10,000 Population, 2004-05 to 2010-11



House-Building: Permanent Local Authority/Registered Social Landlord Dwellings Completed per 10,000 Population, 2004-05 to 2010-11



Interpretation: These charts present the number of house-builds completed as a rate, to take into account differences in populations in different types of area. The first chart shows those houses completed by private enterprise, while the second chart shows those completions by either local authorities or registered social landlords, such as housing associations. Again, **the scale on these two charts is different.**

Statistics on house building are used by housing market analysts, forecasters and decision makers, for example at the Bank of England and in the construction and banking industries. House-builds started give an indication of the likely stock of available housing in the future, whereas house-builds completed indicate the availability of additional housing now.



The statistics on house-building show that there was sustained growth in starts until 2007-08, when the data show a sharp downturn. This is likely to reflect the economic downturn and later recession. After the trough in 2008-09, the rate of starts began to recover, but completions responded more gradually and still mainly show a downwards trend for Private Dwellings completions. However, for Local Authority and Registered Social Landlord Dwellings completions, Major Urban and Rural-50 have seen an increase in the rate of completions, though the overall national rate has remained steady between 2009-10 and 2010-11. The rate of new houses being built is highest in the more rural areas than the national average. This may be the result of specific targets for new homes to be built in smaller rural settlements. Alternatively, the availability of space to build new homes – perhaps more limited in major urban areas- may also have an impact.

There are differences in the rate of Local Authority/Registered Social Landlord (RSL) house building and private enterprise. The private sector was affected more immediately by the economic downturn of 2008, with a sharp downturn in house-builds started and, latterly, completed. The local authority/RSL series does not show as strong a trend, and the initial downward trend in the rate of starts has now been reversed, and completions have been steady between 2009-10 and 2010-11.

Notes: Includes new house builds only. Conversions and changes of use of existing buildings are excluded from the series. Figures on housing starts and completions are from records kept for building control purposes. It is sometimes difficult for data providers to identify whether a dwelling is being built for a housing association or for a private developer. This may lead to an understatement of housing association starts and completions recorded in these tables, and a corresponding overstatement of private enterprise figures. This problem is more likely to occur with starts than completions.

Source: Communities and Local Government, Table 253 Housebuilding: permanent dwellings started and completed, by tenure and district, 2010/11, <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/xls/1474276.xls>

Homelessness and Temporary Accommodation



Interpretation: These charts show the proportion of people who are homeless and in priority need of assistance in securing permanent settled accommodation, and those in temporary accommodation, as a rate per 1,000 households. The highest rate of both is in Major Urban areas, and the lowest rates are in Significant Rural, Rural-50 and Rural-80 districts. The rate of homeless and in priority need of assistance increased for all categories between 2009-10 and 2010-11.

People Who Are Homeless and In Priority Need per 1,000 Households, 2002-03 to 2010-11

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Major Urban	8.5	8.9	7.7	4.9	4.6	4.0	3.7	2.8	3.0
Large Urban	5.7	6.6	6.1	4.2	3.5	2.7	2.7	1.9	2.1
Other Urban	5.7	5.8	5.3	4.1	3.2	2.8	2.2	1.8	2.0
Significant Rural	4.1	4.4	3.9	2.9	2.2	2.0	1.6	1.2	1.3
Rural-50	4.1	4.5	4.4	3.3	2.5	2.1	1.7	1.3	1.5
Rural-80	3.8	3.7	3.4	2.7	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.6
Predominantly Rural	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.0	2.3	2.0	1.6	1.3	1.5
Predominantly Urban	7.2	7.6	6.8	4.6	4.0	3.4	3.1	2.4	2.6
England	6.3	6.7	5.9	4.6	3.6	3.1	2.6	2.0	2.2

People in Temporary Accommodation per 1,000 Households, 2002-03 to 2010-11

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Major Urban	7.0	8.7	8.9	9.7	9.2	8.2	7.3	6.0	5.5
Large Urban	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.6	1.3	1.0	0.8	0.8
Other Urban	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.6	2.1	1.7	1.2	1.1
Significant Rural	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.4	1.1	0.8	0.6	0.6
Rural-50	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.5	1.3	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.5
Rural-80	1.8	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.5	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.7
Predominantly Rural	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.6
Predominantly Urban	5.2	6.1	6.2	6.4	5.9	5.2	4.6	3.7	3.4
England	4.4	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.3	3.8	3.1	2.5	2.4


Homelessness and being in temporary, rather than settled, accommodation is a social problem associated both with individual wellbeing and the wellbeing of the country more generally. There is a lower rate of homelessness and people in temporary accommodation in rural areas than urban areas and the English average. Both indicators have been gradually declining over a number of years, however, the number of homeless rose between 2009/10 and 2010/11. CLG comment that historically, changes in homelessness levels coincide with changes in numbers of people in temporary accommodation a few years later. For example, homelessness rates started to decrease from 2003/04, followed by temporary accommodation rates two year later in 2005/06. The decline in the rate of people in temporary accommodation slowed down between 2009/10 and 2010/11.

Notes: Temporary accommodation includes Bed and Breakfast, hostels, women's refuges, local authority and housing association stock, and private sector leased properties.

Source: Communities and Local Government, housing statistics table 784, 2010-11 (Revised).

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/xls/19187241.xls>

Housing Affordability



Interpretation: This series looks at the ratio between the lowest quartile (25%) house prices and the lowest quartile earnings. It gives an indication of whether someone in the lower earnings band could afford to buy a house. In 2011, in Rural-80 areas the average lower quartile house price was 8.3 times the average lower quartile earnings. This will underestimate affordability in instances where a household has more than one income from earnings – for example when a couple combine their earnings to buy a house.

Ratio of Lower Quartile House Prices to Lower Quartile Workplace-Based Earnings, 1997 to 2011

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	3.8	4.0	4.3	4.8	5.2	5.9	6.3	7.2	7.5	7.9	8.4	8.4	7.2	7.7	7.7
Large Urban	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.9	4.3	4.9	5.4	6.3	6.8	7.0	7.4	7.2	6.2	6.6	6.3
Other Urban	3.4	3.5	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.9	5.4	6.3	6.9	7.1	7.4	7.2	6.1	6.5	6.3
Significant Rural	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.9	5.2	5.9	6.6	7.5	8.1	8.2	8.5	8.3	7.3	7.8	7.6
Rural-50	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.8	5.1	5.8	6.5	7.5	7.9	8.1	8.4	8.3	7.2	7.8	7.5
Rural-80	4.4	4.5	4.8	5.2	5.6	6.5	7.2	8.5	9.0	9.0	9.5	9.3	8.0	8.6	8.3
Predominantly Urban	3.6	3.8	4.0	4.4	4.8	5.4	5.9	6.8	7.2	7.5	7.9	7.8	6.7	7.2	7.1
Predominantly Rural	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.9	5.3	6.1	6.8	7.9	8.4	8.5	8.9	8.7	7.6	8.1	7.8
England	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.6	5.0	5.7	6.2	7.1	7.6	7.8	8.2	8.1	7.0	7.5	7.3

The ratio of lower quartile house prices to earnings is a useful indication of housing affordability. Workplace based earnings data are used because residence based earnings data are not available at district level before 2002. As a result this doesn't take into account non-earned income and the assumption that earners would want to buy a house where they work which isn't necessarily the case.

The data shows that the most rural areas have, on average, lower affordability than other types of area. The ratio between house prices and earnings decreased between 2007 and 2009. This was almost certainly due to the recession negatively impacting on house prices. Because earnings did not decrease at the same rate the ratio is seen to drop. Although there was an increase in 2010, there has been a slight decrease in 2011.

The pattern of change over the past 13 years has been broadly similar across all area types. The gap between the ratio in predominantly rural areas and the ratio in predominantly urban areas was greatest in 2005, but since then has reduced. Although the gap has reduced in recent years, housing affordability is on average, lower in rural areas than other areas and compared with the England average.


Notes: The housing affordability ratio is calculated by dividing the average lower quartile house price by the average lower quartile earnings.


The 'lower quartile' property price/earnings is determined by ranking all property prices/incomes in ascending order. The lowest 25 per cent of prices/earnings are below the lower quartile; the highest 75 per cent are above the lower quartile. Workplace earnings is the earnings measure used by Communities and Local Government in their calculations of the ratio between earnings and house price. It is used because residence based earnings estimates are only available back to 2002. The figures for England have been calculated by weighting district level ratios by the number of households (as at Census 2001).

Source: Communities and Local Government, housing statistics table 576, 2011,

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/xls/152924.xls>

Private Rental Affordability





Interpretation: These charts show the average private registered provider rents per week. The highest rental costs are in London, and the cheapest rental costs are in Major Urban (excluding London). Other areas have similar costs to the national average. Costs have steadily increased between 1997 and 2010, with the national average rental cost at £77.91 per week in 2010.

Average Private Registered Providers (PRP) Rents (£)s per week, 1997 to 2010

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Major Urban (excl. London)	42.08	44.72	46.77	48.72	49.85	51.64	52.66	54.34	57.38	60.25	62.51	65.04	68.31	71.97
London	54.36	58.32	60.68	62.42	63.73	66.42	68.44	71.04	75.95	79.52	82.99	87.09	91.84	97.50
Large Urban	47.46	49.96	52.18	53.52	54.05	56.08	57.53	58.92	62.40	64.52	66.46	69.04	72.10	76.14
Other Urban	47.28	49.57	51.64	52.98	54.14	55.91	57.31	58.79	62.18	64.90	67.08	70.22	73.72	77.71
Significant Rural	48.42	50.80	52.89	54.54	55.13	57.27	58.50	59.59	63.09	66.11	68.85	71.97	75.70	80.13
Rural-50	47.04	49.75	51.48	53.13	54.07	56.13	57.09	58.64	62.40	65.09	66.86	69.59	73.04	77.06
Rural-80	47.54	49.99	51.61	52.97	53.72	55.47	56.92	58.23	61.75	64.29	66.96	70.01	73.51	77.83
Predominantly Urban	47.34	50.19	52.38	54.02	55.09	57.15	58.59	60.38	64.06	66.91	69.37	72.45	76.09	80.40
Predominantly Rural	47.25	49.85	51.53	53.06	53.92	55.85	57.01	58.46	62.13	64.75	66.90	69.77	73.24	77.39
England	46.81	49.82	51.92	53.11	53.90	55.81	56.52	58.23	61.49	64.32	66.67	69.96	73.51	77.91

The data show that rural areas pay similar private registered provider (PRP) rents compared with the national average. Affordability, however, will be affected by average incomes in those areas, and lower earners may choose to rent where they cannot afford to purchase a property. Average earnings for individuals who work or live in urban areas are generally slightly higher than for individuals who work or live in rural areas, which may result in lower affordability in rural areas. PRP rents have steadily risen between 1997 to 2010.

Notes: The average private registered provider rents have been calculated by weighting district level average figures from the ONS mid-year population estimates.

Source: Communities and Local Government, Table 704: RSL rents, by district, from 1997 <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/xls/2039641.xls>

Fuel and Energy


Households in fuel poverty are those that are at risk of being unable to afford to heat their homes to an adequate standard. They may also be less able to spend money on other necessities.

A household is said to be in fuel poverty if it needs to spend more than 10% of its income on fuel to maintain an adequate level of warmth (usually 21 degrees for the main living area, and 18 degrees for other occupied rooms). It is not based on what is actually spent. Fuel poverty rates are influenced by household incomes, fuel usage and fuel prices. In addition it may be affected by ability to take up energy saving initiatives.

- Proportionally more households in rural areas are in fuel poverty than the national average.
- In 2010, around 18% of households in rural areas were in fuel poverty compared with 16% of those in urban areas.
- There was proportionally more fuel poverty in Sparse Villages and Hamlets than in Rural Towns and Urban areas, where rates of fuel poverty are very similar.
- Households in sparse areas are more likely to be in fuel poverty, but the greatest decreases in the proportions of households in fuel poverty between 2009 and 2010 were in sparse areas.
- Households in rural areas are more likely to be off the gas grid (i.e. not connected to mains gas), and hence reliant on potentially more expensive fuels (such as heating oils and solid fuels), than those in urban areas (36% compared with 8% of households).

Fuel Poverty

Percentage of households in fuel poverty, by settlement type in England , 2006 to 2010



Percentage of households in fuel poverty, by settlement type in England, 2006 to 2010

	2006	2008	2009	2010
Less Sparse Urban	10.6	14.5	17.4	15.9
Sparse Urban	16.4	29.8	34.0	21.1
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	10.6	13.4	16.6	15.7
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	16.7	27.3	31.7	21.0
Less Sparse Village	15.7	23.7	25.3	18.7
Sparse Village	25.3	35.6	39.1	28.0
Less Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings	22.9	27.4	29.1	22.8
Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings	38.9	42.9	46.8	34.1
Urban	10.7	14.5	17.5	15.9
Rural	15.3	20.5	23.0	18.4
England	11.6	15.7	18.6	16.4

- There were higher rates of fuel poverty in rural areas than urban areas, and as rurality increases, so does fuel poverty.
- There were also higher rates of fuel poverty in sparse areas than in less sparse areas.
- The percentage of households in fuel poverty fell between 2009 and 2010 in England by 2.2 percentage points. The largest contribution to this change came from rising incomes.
- The greatest reductions were seen in rural areas such that in 2010 the gap in the percentage of households in fuel poverty between urban and rural areas was 2.6 percentage points compared with 5.5 percentage points in 2009.
- The maps on the following page show that there appears to be a relationship between sparse areas (dark green on the left-hand map) and higher rates of fuel poverty (dark blue, right-hand map).
- The proportion of people with income below the poverty threshold is lower in rural areas than in urban areas, but the proportion of people in rural areas in fuel poverty is higher than in urban areas. It may be that the costs of heating a home to an adequate standard of warmth are higher in rural areas than in urban areas, not least because a higher proportion of rural households are off the gas grid and hence may be dependent on more costly fuels.

Notes: A household is said to be in fuel poverty if it needs to spend more than 10% of its income on fuel to maintain an adequate level of warmth (usually 21 degrees for the main living area, and 18 degrees for other occupied rooms). It is not based on what is actually spent.

Because these statistics are based on modelled estimates, they may differ slightly from DECC's headline published figures. Around 3.5 million households in England were in fuel poverty in 2010.


Source: DECC modelled fuel poverty estimates at census output area level, 2010

http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/fuelpov_stats/regional/regional.aspx

In March 2012, Professor John Hills presented his final report to Government on his independent review of Fuel Poverty. In that report he proposed a new way to define fuel poverty. The report can be viewed at:

http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/funding/Fuel_poverty/Hills_Review/Hills_Review.aspx. DECC are in the process of studying the Final Report ahead of consulting on an alternative definition for fuel poverty.

Rural-urban definition: England




(c) Crown Copyright
All rights reserved
Defra 100018880 2010

Rural Statistics Unit
Room 311, Foss House, York
Tel: 01904 455251
rural.statistics@defra.gsi.gov.uk

0 20 40 80 Miles

Source: rural-urban area classification
2004, based on census 2001
population estimates

Fuel poverty in England, 2010



(c) Crown Copyright
All rights reserved
Defra 100018880 2012

Rural Statistics Unit
Room 311, Foss House, York
Tel: 01904 455251
rural.statistics@defra.gsi.gov.uk


0 20 40 80 Miles

Source: modelled fuel poverty estimates
at census super output area level,
DECC.

Notes: a household is currently defined
as being in fuel poverty if it would need
to spend more than 10% of its income on
maintaining an adequate standard of
warmth.


Household Energy Supply

Percentage of households off the gas grid, by settlement type in England, 2009



Note: AEA Technology modelled data based on DECC LSOA estimates

Percentage of households off the gas grid, by sparsity in England, 2009




Note: AEA Technology modelled data based on DECC LSOA estimates

Percentage of households off the gas grid by house type, 2009

	All House Types	Detached	Semi Detached	Terrace	Flat	Other
Urban	9	9	8	9	13	19
Rural	38	46	35	29	27	52
Rural Town and Fringe	16	17	15	16	17	29
Village	57	60	55	50	50	63
Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	64	68	62	49	52	55
England	15	23	13	12	14	36

Percentage of households off the gas grid, for urban and rural areas in England, 2010



Note: Sourced from English House Survey (household sample) - data are not directly comparable with 2009 modelling from AEA Technology.

- A higher proportion of households in rural areas, and in particular Rural Villages and Hamlets, are not connected to the mains gas grid, and hence are dependent on other fuels, which are potentially more costly.
- In Rural Sparse areas, 60% of households were off the gas grid in 2009.
- In 2010, 36% of households in rural areas overall were off the gas grid compared with 8% in urban areas and 13% across England.

Notes: 2009 AEA Off gas-grid statistics are modelled based on DECC's LSOA level statistics estimates and they therefore may not be consistent with DECC's published estimates of the number of households off the gas grid. Other off-gas grid statistics are derived from [DCLG's English Housing Survey \(household sample\)](http://www.dclg.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6757/2173775.xls#DA2202!A1). The % totals for urban and rural may differ slightly because data are being compared at different spatial levels and groupings may be different.


http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/fuelpov_stats/regional/regional.aspx

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6757/2173775.xls#DA2202!A1

'Other' house types include caravans and other mobile or temporary structures.

Source: Off gas grid data: 2009 AEA Technology modelled data based on DECC LSOA estimates, and English Housing Survey 2010 (household sample).

Percentage of households by main fuel type used, by settlement type in England, 2010



- The majority of urban homes use gas as their main fuel type. However in rural areas, particularly Villages and Hamlets, a large proportion of households use oil fired heating systems.
- The overall distribution of household fuel type has not changed substantially in rural and urban areas between 2007 and 2010.

Notes: Main heating fuel types have been grouped together. For example, 'Gas fired systems' is made up from 'Gas – Mains', 'Gas – Bulk/LPG' and 'Gas – Bottled'. Figures may therefore differ from DCLG published data.

Source: DECC, English Housing Condition survey, 2007, energy.stats@decc.gsi.gov.uk, DCLG, English Housing Survey 2009 and 2010

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6757/2173775.xls#'DA2202'!A1)

For more discussion of fuel poverty statistics see <http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/stats/fuel-poverty/5270-annual-report-fuel-poverty-stats-2012.pdf> though note this does not contain any rural-urban analysis. For statistics on energy costs from the Expenditure and Food Survey see <http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/statistics/source/prices/qep262.xls>.


Percentage of households by main fuel type, by settlement type, 2007, 2009 and 2010

Main fuel type						
	Gas fired system	Oil fired system	Solid fuel fired system	Electrical system	Not identified/ communal systems	Total
2007						
Urban	89.3	0.4	0.7	7.8	1.7	100
Rural	64.9	19.6	4.3	10.6	0.6	100
Rural Town and Fringe	84.6	4.4	2.0	8.1	0.8	100
Village	48.6	30.9	6.9	13.3	0.3	100
Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings	39.1	42.9	5.5	11.9	0.6	100
England	84.4	4.3	1.4	8.4	1.5	100
2009						
Urban	89.4	0.2	0.3	7.9	2.3	100
Rural	65.2	20.0	3.4	10.3	1.1	100
Rural Town and Fringe	84.1	4.6	1.6	8.1	1.6	100
Village	47.9	33.9	4.7	12.8	0.6	100
Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings	44.4	37.5	6.5	11.3	0.3	100
England	84.6	4.1	0.9	8.3	2.1	100
2010						
Urban	89.0	0.2	0.3	7.6	2.9	100
Rural	66.0	20.4	3.4	9.2	1.0	100
Rural Town and Fringe	85.4	4.8	2.1	6.6	1.0	100
Village	49.9	33.2	3.9	11.7	1.2	100
Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings	42.4	39.4	6.3	11.1	0.8	100
England	84.5	4.1	0.9	7.9	2.6	100

Crime

- Average crime rates are lower in rural areas than urban areas.
- In 2011/12, there were 14.1 violent offences against a person per 1,000 population in England. This is the highest rate out of all the selected crimes. The rate of violent crime was considerably lower in rural areas; in Rural 80 areas the rate was 9.4 per 1,000 people, compared to 16.2 per 1,000 people in Major Urban areas.
- Sexual offences are more common in urban areas; the rate of sexual offences in Predominantly Urban areas was 1.1 per 1,000 in 2011/12, compared to 0.8 per 1,000 in Predominantly Rural areas.
- The rate of crime was higher in urban areas than rural areas for all the selected types of crime (sexual offences, burglary, robbery, violence against the person, thefts of a motor vehicle and theft from a motor vehicle). For example, there were 6.7 thefts from a motor vehicle offence per 1,000 people in urban areas and 3.6 per 1,000 in rural areas in 2010/11.
- The rate of crime has been decreasing between 2005/06 and 2010/11 for all types of crime. For example, there were 4.0 thefts of motor vehicle offences per 1,000 population in 2005/06, which fell to 1.7 per 1,000 in 2011/12.

Violence Against the Person Offences




Interpretation: the chart above shows the proportion of violent offences that happen per 1,000 people living in that type of settlement. The rate of crime was much higher in urban areas than rural areas. For all rural classifications, the rate of violent offences was lower than the average England rate. The rate of violence against a person was lowest in Rural-80 areas, where there were 8.6 acts of violent crime per 1,000 people, considerably lower than the rate in Major and Large Urban areas where the rate was 15.8 acts of crime per 1,000 people.

Violence against the person offences per 1,000 population, 2005/06 to 2010/12

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Major Urban	23.5	22.3	20.3	19.4	18.6	17.3	15.8
Large Urban	24.5	24.4	22.3	20.2	19.1	17.4	15.8
Other Urban	22.7	22.3	20.3	17.9	17.6	17.6	15.4
Significant Rural	16.4	16.2	15.0	13.5	13.1	12.7	11.6
Rural-50	13.1	13.6	12.1	11.3	10.6	9.5	9.4
Rural-80	11.0	10.8	10.1	9.2	9.0	8.8	8.6
Predominantly Urban	23.5	22.7	20.7	19.5	18.6	17.4	15.7
Predominantly Rural	12.2	12.4	11.3	10.4	9.9	9.2	9.1
England	19.8	19.3	17.6	16.4	15.7	14.8	13.6

Sexual Offences




Interpretation: The rate of sexual offences did not differ greatly between the different types of areas. In 2011/12, the rate of sexual offences in Predominantly Rural areas was 0.7 per 1,000 population, 0.4 lower than the rate in Predominantly Urban areas. From 2005/06 to 2009/10 the rate of sexual offences was higher in Large Urban areas than in Major Urban areas, whereas in 2010/11 the rate was the same.

Sexual offences per 1,000 population, 2005/06 to 2011/12

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Major Urban	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
Large Urban	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1
Other Urban	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1
Significant Rural	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8
Rural-50	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Rural-80	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7
Predominantly Urban	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1
Predominantly Rural	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
England	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0

Robbery Offences




Interpretation: The chart above shows that robbery offences occurred at a substantially higher rate in Major Urban areas than any other type of settlement in England. The rate of robbery offences in 2011/12 in Major Urban areas was 3.1 per 1,000 population, which was the same as 2010/11. The rate in Predominantly Rural areas was 11 times higher than the rate in Predominantly Urban areas.

Robbery offences per 1,000 population, 2005/06 to 2011/12

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Major Urban	4.0	4.1	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.1
Large Urban	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.0
Other Urban	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.8
Significant Rural	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4
Rural-50	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3
Rural-80	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1
Predominantly Urban	2.8	2.9	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1
Predominantly Rural	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
England	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4

Burglary Offences

Burglary Offences per 1,000 Households, 2005/06 to 2011/12




Interpretation: The rate of burglary offences was higher in urban areas than rural areas; in 2011/12 the rate of burglary was almost three times higher in Predominantly Urban areas than Predominantly Rural areas. The rate of burglary offences has seen a gradual decrease in all areas since 2005/06.

Burglary offences per 1,000 households, 2005/06 to 2011/12

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Major Urban	19.2	18.8	18.3	17.9	17.5	17.3	16.6
Large Urban	16.4	15.4	14.8	14.3	12.9	11.9	11.0
Other Urban	14.1	14.2	13.0	13.0	11.4	11.2	10.2
Significant Rural	9.4	9.2	8.7	8.5	8.2	7.7	7.2
Rural-50	7.7	7.6	7.1	7.0	6.3	5.6	5.4
Rural-80	5.8	5.3	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.3
Predominantly Urban	17.4	16.9	16.3	15.9	15.0	14.6	13.8
Predominantly Rural	6.9	6.6	6.2	6.0	5.6	5.1	4.9
England	13.8	13.4	12.8	12.5	11.8	11.3	10.8

Theft of Motor Vehicle Offences




Interpretation: In 2011/12 the rate of theft of motor vehicle offences in England fell to 1.7 per 1,000 population, less than half the rate in 2005/06. The rate was higher in urban areas than rural areas. The rate was highest in Major Urban areas, where there were 2.5 thefts of motor vehicle offences per 1,000 people in 2011/12, more than three times higher than the rate in Rural-80 areas (0.8).

Theft of motor vehicle offences per 1,000 population, 2005/06 to 2011/12

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Major Urban	5.7	4.8	4.2	3.6	3.0	2.8	2.5
Large Urban	4.5	4.2	3.5	2.9	2.3	1.9	1.6
Other Urban	4.2	3.9	3.4	2.9	2.2	2.0	1.6
Significant Rural	2.8	2.6	2.3	2.1	1.6	1.4	1.2
Rural-50	2.3	2.2	2.0	1.7	1.3	1.1	1.0
Rural-80	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.0	0.8
Predominantly Urban	5.1	4.5	3.9	3.3	2.6	2.4	2.1
Predominantly Rural	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.2	1.0	0.9
England	4.0	3.6	3.1	2.7	2.2	1.9	1.7

Theft from Motor Vehicle Offences



Interpretation: The rate of theft from motor vehicle offences was highest in the most urban areas and lowest in the most rural areas. In 2011/12 the rate of theft from motor vehicle offences was 7.5 per 1,000 population in Major Urban areas and 3.0 in Rural-80 settlements. The rate of theft from motor vehicle offences has fallen since 2005/06 in all areas

Theft from a motor vehicle offences per 1,000 population, 2005/06 to 2011/12

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Major Urban	12.0	11.9	10.4	9.5	8.2	7.9	7.5
Large Urban	12.1	11.7	9.3	8.2	6.5	5.7	5.4
Other Urban	10.4	10.2	8.8	8.0	6.5	6.0	5.3
Significant Rural	7.1	7.2	6.1	5.5	4.8	4.4	4.2
Rural-50	6.0	5.9	5.2	4.8	4.0	3.4	3.6
Rural-80	4.8	4.7	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.1	3.0
Predominantly Urban	11.6	11.4	9.7	8.8	7.6	7.0	6.5
Predominantly Rural	5.5	5.4	4.7	4.4	3.8	3.3	3.3
England	9.5	9.4	8.0	7.3	6.2	5.7	5.5

Crime rates measure the amount of criminal activity as a proportion of the population in that area. The rate of crime is used rather than the number of offences as it takes into account the difference in population sizes for all different type of areas. The data shows that crime rates were much higher in urban areas than rural areas. This means that **people living in urban areas were more likely to experience crime than people from rural areas.**

As crime rates have been decreasing since 2005/06, people in England were less likely to be victim of the types of crimes discussed here in 2011/12 than in 2005/06.

For all crimes, crime rates in Predominantly Urban areas have been decreasing faster than rural areas. However, as crime rates are higher in Predominantly Urban areas, there is more scope to decrease crime rates than in Predominantly Rural areas.

Source: Home Office, British Crime Survey, <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/period-ending-march-2012/rft-recorded-crime-tables-2011-12.xls>

Contact crimestats@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk for more information

The British Crime Survey collects information on crime that is both reported to the police and crime that has not been reported. See http://www.statistics.gov.uk/ssd/surveys/british_crime_survey.asp for more information

In 2010/11, two police forces amalgamated their separate units and now report for the whole Force rather than separate areas of their Forces. These changes have been backdated across the whole time series.


There has been a methodology change since the last publication of these figures; crime rates are now compared to the mid-year population for the year immediately prior to the crime reporting period, rather than a population set in time. This methodology accounts for the changes in population size from one year to the next.

Poverty

- It is important to ensure that everyone maintains a good standard of living, and those below the poverty threshold are considered to have a low standard of living.
- The threshold used here is below 60% of the median income (the income earned by the household in the middle of the income distribution).
- The proportion of people with income below the poverty threshold is lower in rural areas than in urban areas.
- **Household poverty:** In 2010/11, **16% of households in rural areas were below the poverty threshold after housing costs** (also 16% before housing costs). In urban areas the proportion was 23% (18% before housing costs).
- **Working age poverty:** In 2010/11, **16% of working age people (aged 16 to 64) living in rural areas were living in households below the poverty threshold after housing costs** (12% before housing costs). In urban areas the proportion was 23% (16% before housing costs).
- **Child poverty:** In 2010/11, **20% of children in rural areas lived in households below the poverty threshold after housing costs** (14% before housing costs).
- **Pensioner poverty:** In 2010/11, **13% of pensioners lived in households below the poverty threshold after housing costs** (16% before housing costs).

Households with income below the poverty threshold

Proportion of households with income below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11




- In 2010/11, 16% of households in rural areas were below the poverty threshold after housing costs, compared with 23% for households in urban areas.

Proportion of households with income below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11

	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Urban before housing costs	18	19	19	19	19	18	18
Urban after housing costs	22	22	23	23	23	23	23
Rural before housing costs	16	16	18	18	17	16	16
Rural after housing costs	16	17	19	19	18	17	16
England before housing costs	18	18	19	19	19	18	17
England after housing costs	21	21	22	22	22	22	21

Working age people in households with income below the poverty threshold

Proportion of working age people in households with income below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11




- In 2010/11, 16% of working age people (people aged between 16 and 64) in rural areas were living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold after housing costs, whereas in urban areas the proportion was higher at 23%.

Proportion of working age people in households with income below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11

	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Urban before housing costs	14	15	15	16	17	16	16
Urban after housing costs	20	21	22	22	23	24	23
Rural before housing costs	11	12	13	13	13	12	12
Rural after housing costs	14	16	16	17	17	15	16
England before housing costs	14	15	15	15	16	15	15
England after housing costs	19	20	21	21	22	22	22

Children in households with income below the poverty threshold

Proportion of children in households with income below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11




- In 2010/11, 20% of children in rural areas were living in households that were below the poverty threshold after housing costs, whereas in urban areas the proportion was higher at 29%.
- Children are the group that are most likely to live in a household with an income below the poverty threshold after housing costs in both urban and rural areas. These types of households include both couples and lone parent families. Lone parents have a high risk of having a low income because of low employment rates. They may also be living off a single income. Lone parent families are therefore more likely to be living below the poverty threshold. Households with children will also have higher housing costs as they require a larger house to accommodate the larger household size.

Proportion of children in households below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11

	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Urban before housing costs	23	23	23	24	23	20	18
Urban after housing costs	31	32	33	33	33	31	29
Rural before housing costs	14	15	17	16	15	15	14
Rural after housing costs	19	21	22	25	21	22	20
England before housing costs	21	22	22	22	22	19	17
England after housing costs	29	30	31	32	31	29	28

Pensioners in households with income below the poverty threshold

Proportion of pensioners in households below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11



- In 2010/11, 13% of pensioners in rural areas were living in households with income below the poverty threshold after housing costs, whereas in urban areas the proportion was higher at 15%.

Proportion of pensioners in households below the poverty threshold, by urban and rural areas in England, 2004/05 to 2010/11

	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Urban before housing costs	22	21	23	23	20	18	18
Urban after housing costs	18	17	19	19	17	15	15
Rural before housing costs	19	18	23	21	19	18	16
Rural after housing costs	16	15	19	17	15	16	13
England before housing costs	21	20	23	23	20	18	18
England after housing costs	18	17	19	18	16	15	15

Notes: Incomes are presented net of income tax payments, National Income contributions and Council tax. Small changes should be treated with caution as these will be affected by sampling error and variability in non-response.

The measures have been determined by disposable income, both before and after housing costs. If housing costs are not taken into account, improvements in living standards could be overstated for individuals whose housing costs are high relative to the quality of accommodation or those who receive Housing Benefit. If housing costs are included then a shift from renting to owning a house will reduce the income of low-income individuals who used to receive Housing Benefit.


There was a lower proportion of pensioners below the poverty threshold after housing costs than before housing costs as many pensioners have paid their mortgages and so will have low housing costs.

Source: DWP, bespoke data request.

Expenditure

- Both average weekly expenditure and disposable income are highest in Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings and lowest in Rural Town and Fringe.
- The breakdown of expenditure by commodity or service category shows very little variation across the rural-urban spectrum.

Nominal Expenditure and Disposable Income




Interpretation: This chart shows that expenditure and disposable income are highest in Rural Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings areas and lowest in Rural Town and Fringe areas. The average disposable income is greater than the average expenditure in all areas. Total expenditure represents a similar proportion of disposable income in all areas, the highest being 73% in Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings and the lowest being 66% in Villages.

Weekly household expenditure, (£) 2009

Commodity or Service	Urban	Rural Town and Fringe	Village	Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings	England
Food & non-alcoholic beverage	51.60	52.50	56.30	61.70	52.30
Alcoholic Beverages, Tobacco	10.30	12.70	12.90	12.40	10.80
Clothing and Footwear	20.60	18.90	20.00	26.30	20.50
Housing, Water, Electricity	60.10	49.70	54.30	60.90	58.60
Furnishings, HH Equipment, Carpets	28.30	29.10	36.40	36.40	29.10
Health expenditure	5.60	£3.90	7.50	8.50	5.60
Transport costs	55.70	62.50	78.20	90.70	58.80
Communication	11.80	11.10	12.30	14.00	11.80
Recreation	57.50	55.90	62.90	77.60	58.20
Education	8.10	£3.60	3.80	12.60	7.50
Restaurants and Hotels	38.70	£34.90	36.80	61.70	38.70
Miscellaneous Goods and Services	35.00	£34.50	43.00	48.90	35.80
Total Expenditure	383.30	369.30	424.40	511.70	387.70
Disposable Income	555.60	543.60	642.20	700.70	563.90
Total Expenditure as a % of Disposable Income	69%	68%	66%	73%	69%

Expenditure on Commodity or Service Groups



Interpretation: This chart and the table below show that the proportions of expenditure spent on the major components are similar across rural and urban areas. 'Other Expenditure' (in orange on the chart) is a combination of areas of expenditure smaller than those shown individually. The highest proportion of income spent on an individual commodity or service goes on 'Transport costs' in all rural areas and 'Housing, Water, Electricity' in urban areas. No one category of expenditure accounts for more than 18% of total expenditure in any area.

Commodity or Service Expenditure as a percentage of Total Expenditure, 2009

Commodity or Service	Urban	Rural Town and Fringe	Village	Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings	England
Food & non-alcoholic beverage	13.5	14.2	13.3	12.1	13.5
Alcoholic Beverages, Tobacco	2.7	3.4	3.0	2.4	2.8
Clothing and Footwear	5.4	5.1	4.7	5.1	5.3
Housing, Water, Electricity	15.7	13.5	12.8	11.9	15.1
Furnishings, HH Equipment, Carpets	7.4	7.9	8.6	7.1	7.5
Health expenditure	1.5	1.1	1.8	1.7	1.4
Transport costs	14.5	16.9	18.4	17.7	15.2
Communication	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	3.0
Recreation	15.0	15.1	14.8	15.2	15.0
Education	2.1	1.0	0.9	2.5	1.9
Restaurants and Hotels	10.1	9.5	8.7	12.1	10.0
Miscellaneous Goods and Services	9.1	9.3	10.1	9.6	9.2
Total Expenditure	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Expenditure data can help us to see whether households in different area types have different spending patterns. It gives an indication of areas where there may be disproportionately high or low spend and therefore where there may be the need for policy intervention. It also shows which areas are will be affected most by changes in price, either by changes in value of expenditure or quantity consumed.

Higher expenditure in the most rural areas might mean that the 'cost of living' is higher in these areas. Alternatively, because this data does not give any indication of the quantity or quality of the goods and services purchased, it might be the case that higher expenditure is due to greater quantities or higher quality goods being purchased than in urban areas.


Notes: The measure of income used here does not include withdrawal of savings, loans and money received in payment of loans, receipts from maturing insurance policies and proceeds from the sale of assets.

Source: Office for National Statistics, Living Costs and Food Survey (<http://www.ons.gov.uk/about/surveys/a-z-of-surveys/living-costs-and-food-survey/index.html>)

Transport

- On average people living in the most rural areas travelled 45% further per year than those in England as a whole and 53% further than those living in urban areas.
- A greater percentage of total annual mileage was made using a car in the most rural areas (58%) than in urban areas (49%).
- In 2009 42% of households in the most rural areas had a regular bus service close by compared to 96% of urban households.

Travel Behaviour



Interpretation: The above chart shows the number of trips, travelling time, miles travelled and trip distance as an index where the England average is set at 100. Results above 100 are therefore above the national average. The first two measurements, average number of trips and travelling time per person, are similar to the national average. This is despite much higher average trip distances for people living in Villages and Dispersed areas and in Rural Town and Fringe areas. These results combine to give a picture of travel behaviour in which those living in rural areas travel much further than those living in urban areas, but that these trips take a similar amount of time to complete.

Index of trips, distance and travelling time per person, 2006/09

	Trips per person	Travelling time per person	Miles per person	Average trip distance
Urban	99	99	92	92
Rural Town and Fringe	103	102	128	124
Village and Dispersed	103	106	145	140
England	100	100	100	100


Trips, distance and travelling time per person, 2006/09

	Trips per person	Travelling time per person	Miles per person	Average trip distance
Urban	990	376	6,381	6
Rural Town and Fringe	1,025	389	8,902	9
Village and Dispersed	1,027	403	10,067	10
England	997	380	6,957	7

Notes: A trip is defined as a one-way course of travel with a single main purpose. Trips include those made on foot, by private car or van as both a driver and passenger, by other private transport, by local bus, by rail and London Underground, and by other public transport. Travelling time is shown in hours. Average trip distance is shown in miles. The sample size for one year is too small to produce robust results so this analysis combines data from four years.

Source: DfT, 2010 National Travel Survey, 2006-2009, www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/nts/

Distance Travelled




Interpretation: People living in Villages and Dispersed areas travel 10,000 miles per year on average, compared to 6,400 miles per year in urban areas. In all areas driving a car makes up the bulk of annual mileage but represents a greater percentage in the most rural areas (58%) than in urban areas (49%). When travel as both a car driver and passenger are taken together 87% of travel in villages and dispersed areas is made by car compared to 77% in urban areas and 79% in England as a whole.

Distance per person per year by main mode, 2006/09

	Walk	Car/Van Driver	Car/Van Passenger	Other Private	Local Bus	Rail/LU	Other Public
Urban	208	3,105	1,796	182	311	599	180
Rural Town and Fringe	166	4,906	2,640	256	238	549	146
Village and Dispersed	128	5,804	2,972	284	179	544	155
England	197	3,522	1,983	198	292	590	174

Notes: Trips may include more than one mode of transport, and each mode is recorded as a stage within that trip. 'Main mode' refers to the sole mode of transport or the mode used for the greatest distance during the trip. Distance is shown in miles. The sample size for one year is too small to produce robust results so this analysis combines data from four years. Source: DfT, 2010 National Travel Survey, 2006-2009, www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/nts/

Bus Availability



Interpretation: Bus availability is expressed as the percentage of households whose nearest bus stop is within 13 minutes walk and has a service at least once an hour. Between 2002 and 2008 bus availability in Villages and Dispersed areas increased from 39% to 50%, falling to 47% in 2009. In contrast figures for urban areas have risen from 93% in 2002 to 96% in 2006 to 2009.

Bus availability, 2002 to 2009

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Urban	93%	95%	95%	95%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Rural Town and Fringe	76%	80%	84%	80%	80%	81%	83%	82%
Village and Dispersed	39%	41%	47%	49%	46%	50%	50%	47%
England	87%	90%	89%	89%	90%	90%	90%	91%

Whilst the number of trips and travelling time per person differ little between area types, those in the more rural settlements travel much further distances on average than those in urban areas and in England as a whole. Travel by car as a driver is the predominant means of transport in all areas, but it is highest in the most rural areas. Furthermore, proportionally fewer households in rural villages and hamlets have access to a regular bus service than in larger towns and urban areas. This pattern of travel behaviour will have implications for issues such as greenhouse gas emissions and environmental sustainability. Public transport usage and availability may have particular implications for access to services, employment or education and training.

Notes: The sample sizes for rural area types are small so year on year changes should be interpreted with caution.

Source: DfT, 2010 National Travel Survey, 2002-2009, <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/nts/>

Accessibility

- Generally, access to services is lower in rural areas than it is elsewhere. For example, 52% of users in rural areas live within a short enough travel time of a GP's surgery by foot or public transport that they are likely to make the journey, compared to 62% in urban areas.
- Unsurprisingly users in small, sparse rural areas generally have the lowest service accessibility; for example, 30% of users in sparse villages live within a short enough travel time to a supermarket that they are likely to make the journey, compared with 52% of users in less sparse rural towns.


Measuring accessibility

'Accessibility' has been calculated from DfT's accessibility indicators for eight services: employment centres, primary and secondary schools, further education colleges, GPs, hospitals, town centres and supermarkets. For each service DfT calculate the percentage of target users (for example for primary schools, children aged 5 to 10) who are likely to travel to the given service by walking or using public transport, given the time it will take and the user's willingness to undertake the journey. This gives an estimate of the accessibility of services from any given type of area. The willingness of a user to travel to a service is derived from analysis of the National Travel Survey, identifying the sensitivity of trip making to travel time.


The composite measure of 'overall accessibility' has been calculated by taking an arithmetic average of the percentages for each service. This gives a broad indication of the overall accessibility of a place.

Service Accessibility


Proportion of target population likely to travel to education services: 2011



Proportion of target population likely to travel to health services: 2011



Proportion of target population likely to travel to employment centres, towns and supermarkets: 2011



Interpretation: The charts show that in general, people in rural areas have lower accessibility to services than those in urban areas, but that the level of accessibility varies from service to service. In rural areas overall, 39.2% of the population lives within a short enough travel time of primary schools by foot or public transport to make them likely to make the journey, compared to 44.3% in urban areas. In contrast, 16.7% of users in rural areas live within a short enough travel time of hospitals to make them likely to make the journey, compared with 31.6% elsewhere.

Proportion of the target population likely to access education and health services by public transport or walking, 2011


	Primary school	Secondary school	Further education	GP	Hospital
Less sparse urban	44.3	52.0	64.7	61.5	31.6
Sparse urban	39.2	52.0	62.8	52.5	27.9
Less sparse rural town and fringe	41.7	42.3	52.0	58.7	17.8
Sparse rural town and fringe	39.0	46.9	52.4	59.2	19.6
Less sparse village and dispersed	37.1	31.2	43.9	46.3	15.8
Sparse village and dispersed	32.2	24.5	32.7	40.9	11.5
Rural	39.2	36.7	47.7	52.4	16.7
Urban	44.3	52.0	64.7	61.5	31.6
England	43.4	49.1	61.5	59.8	28.8

Proportion of the target population likely to access employment, town centres and supermarkets by public transport or walking, 2011

	Employment	Supermarket	Town centre
Less sparse urban	82.5	56.3	35.9
Sparse urban	80.8	50.8	38.2
Less sparse rural town and fringe	77.7	51.6	22.1
Sparse rural town and fringe	78.8	53.9	31.1
Less sparse village and dispersed	70.7	37.4	17.7
Sparse village and dispersed	59.6	30.3	13.1
Rural	73.9	44.5	20.0
Urban	82.5	56.3	35.9
England	80.9	54.1	33.0

Average Overall Accessibility

Proportion of target population likely to travel to all services: composite measure, 2011



Interpretation: This indicator gives a statistical estimate of the general accessibility of different types of places rather than being a measure of actual accessibility to any one particular service. Nationally, average accessibility in England is 51.3%, with accessibility in urban areas at 53.6% and in rural areas 41.4%. Accessibility is lowest in sparse rural villages and dispersed settlements at 30.6%. This is almost seven percentage points lower than less sparse rural villages.

Percentage of the target population likely to access a range of services by public transport or walking: composite measure of accessibility, 2011


	Average accessibility (%)
Less sparse urban	53.6
Sparse urban	50.5
Less sparse rural town and fringe	45.5
Sparse rural town and fringe	47.6
Less sparse village and dispersed	37.5
Sparse village and dispersed	30.6
Rural	41.4
Urban	53.6
England	51.3

Legend

- England
- Scotland and Wales

Accessibility (%)

- 1.1 - 34.2
- 34.3 - 44.3
- 44.4 - 51.4
- 51.5 - 57.8
- 57.9 - 72.1



(c) Crown Copyright
All rights reserved
Defra 100018880 2011

Rural Statistics Unit
Room 311, Foss House, York
Tel: 01904 455251
rural.statistics@defra.gsi.gov.uk

0 20 40 80 Miles

Source: based on DfT's core accessibility indicators, 2010

Definitions: composite measure of accessibility is calculated as the average proportion of target users within a reasonable travel time of services by foot or public transport, for all eight services combined.

Being able to access key services by public transport is important not only in terms of benefiting from that service when it is needed, but also perhaps in terms of social inclusion. The key services used in this analysis represent a broad range of 'vital' services, from education and health services to employment centres which offer job opportunities and choice. Town centres and food stores are important in terms of accessing basic retail services. The calculations used in this section are based on the actual travel time multiplied by a factor which indicates how likely someone is to make the journey. A long travel time (e.g. 40 minutes) to a service that people very much need access to (e.g. work) will result in a greater proportion of users being expected to undertake the journey. However, a service that people are not prepared to spend lots of time travelling to (for example primary schools, which are more numerous than employment centres) then fewer people would be prepared to travel the same 40 minutes to the location.

On average **rural areas have lower overall accessibility than urban areas**. Unsurprisingly, sparse rural areas have lower accessibility than less sparse rural and urban areas. Because rural areas, and in particular sparse rural areas, are less densely populated than urban areas, services are likely to serve a larger geographical area than those in urban areas, and this in turn is likely to impact on travel time and the likelihood that people are to make journeys to the services.


There are some issues in using the statistics in this way to analyse rural-urban differences. First, not all public transport is considered when DfT calculate the travel times to services; flexibly routed services and school transport, for example, are not included and this may lead to an underestimate of accessibility especially in rural areas. Furthermore the DfT guidance is clear in stating that the indicators do not necessarily take account of local circumstances, such as residents of rural communities being more willing to travel further for services than in urban areas. They should therefore be used with other evidence, particularly when making comparisons between dissimilar geographical areas.

Source: DfT core accessibility indicators at LSOA level (tables ACS0501-0508) at <http://www.dft.gov.uk/statistics/releases/accessibility-statistics-2011>. For further methodological information and guidance see <http://www.dft.gov.uk/statistics/series/accessibility>.

Broadband

- Average broadband speeds were slower in rural areas than in urban areas and a higher proportion of rural households have slow or no broadband.
- 8% of households in England have access to no or slow broadband. Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwellings had the highest proportion of households with no or slow broadband in 2010, 47%.
- Almost a quarter of households in rural areas only have access to no or slow broadband.
- The average broadband speeds in rural areas are considerably slower than speeds in urban area. The average broadband speed in Less Sparse Urban areas was 12 Mbit/s and in Less Sparse Villages 4 Mbit/s.

Households with No or Slow Broadband




Interpretation: The chart and data shows that the area with the highest percentage of households with no or slow broadband were sparse hamlets and isolated dwellings. In 2010, 47% of households in this settlement type only had access to no or slow broadband. Considerably fewer households in urban areas had access to no or slow broadband, 5%

Percentage of households with no or slow broadband, 2010

	No Broadband	Slow Broadband	No and Slow Broadband
Less Sparse Urban	2	3	5
Sparse Urban	1	0	1
Less Sparse Town and Fringe	5	7	12
Sparse Town and Fringe	1	2	3
Less Sparse Village	16	16	32
Sparse Village	18	15	33
Less Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	18	16	35
Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	31	16	47
Urban	2	3	5
Rural	11	12	23
England	4	5	8

Broadband Speed

Average Broadband Speed, 2010



Interpretation: The chart above show the average broadband speed for each settlement type. In 2010, the average broadband speed was fastest in Less Sparse Urban areas, 12 Mbit/s. However, this was almost double the average broadband speed in Sparse Rural Town and Fringe areas, which has the fastest average speed in rural areas.

Average broadband speed, 2010

Average ADSL Speed (Mbit/s)	
Less Sparse Urban	12.5
Sparse Urban	7.0
Less Sparse Town and Fringe	6.2
Sparse Town and Fringe	7.0
Less Sparse Village	4.1
Sparse Village	4.2
Less Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	3.9
Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	3.2
England	6.0

Broadband is very important for the economic and social sustainability of rural communities. The government aims to ensure fast and reliable access is available in all rural communities as part of its commitment to have the best broadband network in Europe by 2015. To achieve this, all households will need to have access to broadband networks with a speed of 2 Mbit/s. In 2010, 23% of households in rural areas and only 5% in urban areas had broadband speeds less than 2 Mbit/s. This suggests that achieving this aim will mean a greater change in rural areas.

There was a large difference in average broadband speeds between urban and rural areas, and rural areas have a slower average broadband speed. One reason why there is such a difference in broadband speeds between rural and urban areas is that it is harder for network operators to recoup the fixed costs necessary for upgrading exchanges and cabinets in rural areas, where there are lower population densities, and therefore fewer end customers.

Notes: Data is from a model based on potential downstream speeds that are derived from the distance that households are from a telephone exchange

Asymmetric Digital Subscriber Line (ADSL) is a type of broadband, where an analogue phone line is converted to a digital line, which can then be used to transmit data at a high speed.

Source: Broadband Delivery UK, a delivery vehicle for the Government's policies on broadband. For more information visit

<http://interactive.bis.gov.uk/comment/bduk/>

Productivity


Productivity measures are often used to indicate how well a country can use its human and physical resources to generate economic growth. Strong economic growth will generally mean an improvement in living standards. However, productivity alone does not tell us everything about the economic wellbeing of different areas. The potential of any given place depends on the mix of industries, the infrastructure and the size of settlements there. Based on these circumstances, even an area with low productivity might be performing as well as it can.

Gross Value Added (GVA) measures the contribution to the economy of each individual producer, industry or sector. Simplistically it is the value of the amount of goods and services that have been produced, less the cost of all inputs and raw materials that are directly attributable to that production.

- In 2010, Gross Value Added (GVA) from Predominantly Rural areas contributed to 19% of England's GVA, and was worth £211bn. This compares with 68% from Predominantly Urban areas (£751bn) and 12% from Significant Rural areas (£137bn).
- 'Distribution; transport; accommodation and food' and 'Public administration; education; health' each contributed roughly one fifth of GVA in both Predominantly Rural and Predominantly Urban areas. Around 2% of rural GVA came from 'Agriculture, forestry and fishing'.
- In 2010, productivity per job was far higher in London than in other areas (around 39% above the average for England). The differences between other types of area were less pronounced.
- Average productivity levels were lowest in Rural-50 areas, followed by Rural-80 areas.
- A lower proportion of rural districts fell into the top performing 25% of districts and a higher proportion into the lowest performing 25% than for England as a whole.

Productivity by Industry

Percentage breakdown of GVA by industry, and by local authority classification in England, 2010



- The industrial breakdown is broadly similar across rural-urban classifications with 'Distribution; transport; accommodation and food' and 'Public administration; education; health' each contributing about a fifth of GVA in each area type.
- The main differences are the contributions by 'Financial and insurance activities' (13% in Predominantly Urban, 4% in Predominantly Rural), 'Information and Communication' (7% in Predominantly Urban, 4% in Predominantly Rural), and 'Production' (11% in Predominantly Urban, 18% in Predominantly Rural).

Gross Value Added (GVA) by industry: percentage breakdown within local authority classification, 2010

	Predominantly Rural		Significant Rural		Predominantly Urban		England	
	GVA (£m)	%	GVA (£m)	%	GVA (£m)	%	GVA (£m)	%
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	3,994	2	2,312	1	817	0	7,123	1
Business service activities	16,476	10	27,232	11	92,558	14	136,266	12
Construction	12,198	7	20,240	8	37,981	6	70,419	6
Distribution; transport; accommodation and food	33,604	20	54,920	22	125,029	18	213,553	19
Financial and insurance activities	6,869	4	14,217	6	89,564	13	110,650	10
Information and communication	6,089	4	12,059	5	50,464	7	68,612	6
Other services and household activities	6,039	4	8,801	3	23,810	3	38,650	4
Production	29,519	18	46,027	18	73,675	11	149,221	14
Public administration; education; health	35,499	22	48,215	19	130,767	19	214,481	20
Real estate activities	13,858	8	20,902	8	55,992	8	90,752	8
Total GVA	164,145	100%	254,925	100%	680,657	100%	1,099,727	100%

- GVA in Predominantly Rural areas comes from a range of industries. A noticeably smaller proportion of Predominantly Rural GVA is contributed by the combination of 'Business service activities', 'Financial and insurance activities' and 'Information and communication' (18%) compared with Predominantly Urban areas (34%).
- Whilst these types of highly specialised businesses do exist in Predominantly Rural areas, they are more prevalent in cities.
- Even in Predominantly Rural areas, 'Agriculture, forestry and fishing' contributes the smallest share of GVA of any category (2%) (though this likely to under-estimate the value of agriculture owing to data collection issues).


Notes: Gross Value Added measures the contribution to the economy of each individual producer, industry or sector in the country. However there are some gaps in the coverage of the Annual Business Survey; agriculture for example is only partially covered and self employment is not included in the data. This may lead to underestimations of economic value. Gross Value Added data by industry is only available at NUTS3 (broadly county) level, and so a three-way rural-urban classification is applied. Predominantly Rural areas are those with at least half of their population living in rural settlement or large market towns.

Source: Office for National Statistics, Gross Value Added data at NUTS3, table 3:4.

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/regional-accounts/regional-gross-value-added--income-approach-/december-2012/index.html>

Gross Value Added (GVA) per Workforce Job

Gross Value Added (GVA) per workforce job, by local authority classification in England, 2010




- Productivity levels are, on average, much higher in London than in any other category of the rural-urban classification. After London, Significant Rural areas have the highest productivity per job (96.2) relative to the English average, and Rural-50 areas have the lowest (85.7).

Gross value added (GVA) per workforce job indexed to England=100, by local authority classification, 2001 to 2010


	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
London	127.2	130.5	130.9	131.0	133.8	136.1	136.6	138.0	141.0	138.9
Major Urban excl. London	97.5	95.1	94.6	92.8	92.2	91.2	91.1	90.6	91.3	91.1
Large Urban	92.5	93.7	94.5	93.3	91.9	91.3	91.2	93.7	92.6	92.9
Other Urban	94.5	94.7	94.4	94.9	94.3	93.0	93.5	92.9	91.9	92.5
Significant Rural	98.4	97.7	95.9	95.5	95.3	96.9	97.7	96.8	95.6	96.2
Rural-50	90.4	91.8	91.2	93.7	93.2	91.7	89.9	87.5	85.7	85.7
Rural-80	87.3	84.6	87.1	88.1	87.6	89.3	88.4	87.1	87.2	88.9
England	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Output per job, by local authority classification in England, 2001 to 2010 (England=100)



- The relative performance of London has increased by around twelve percentage points between 2001 and 2010, while there has been little discernable change in other types of areas.

Contribution to England's Gross Value Added (GVA), 2010




Contribution to England's Gross Value Added (GVA), by local authority classification in England, 2010

Full Split	GVA (£m)	% Split	Basic Split	GVA (£m)	% Split
London	277,180	25	London	277,180	25
Major Urban	178,925	16	Predominantly Urban excl. London	474,173	43
Large Urban	135,015	12			
Other Urban	160,233	15			
Significant Rural	137,408	12	Significant Rural	137,408	12
Rural-50	118,280	11	Predominantly Rural	210,950	19
Rural-80	92,670	8			
England	1,099,711	100%	England	1,099,711	100%

- Predominantly Urban areas make the largest contribution (£474bn, 43%) to England's GVA and more than twice the contribution of Predominantly Rural areas (£211bn, 19%). London (£277m, 25%) also has a higher contribution to GVA than Predominantly Rural areas.

Proportion of districts in each productivity quartile by local authority classification in England, 2010



- Quartile analysis examines data by grouping it into bands of 25%, with the lowest quartile being the 25% of districts with the lowest productivity scores. If the productivity of districts was randomly distributed, we would expect to see 25% in the bottom quartile.
- However, there are proportionately more Rural-50 and Rural-80 districts in the lowest performing quartile and proportionately fewer Rural-50 and Rural-80 districts in the highest performing quartile than would be expected.
- Over half (55%) of London districts have productivity in the top 25% for England.

Proportion (%) of districts in each productivity quartile, by local authority classification in England, 2010

	1 (lower quartile)	2 (lower middle)	3 (upper middle)	4 (upper quartile)
Major Urban excl. London	8	37	42	13
London	9	9	27	55
Large Urban	18	28	31	23
Other Urban	29	26	22	22
Significant Rural	25	19	19	37
Rural-50	33	29	22	16
Rural-80	37	23	20	20
	25	25	25	25
England	8	37	42	13

Notes: This analysis takes the number of workforce jobs as an input measure and gross value added (GVA) as an output measure, and indexes productivity scores such that England=100.

It is important to note that there is currently no official way of deflating these nominal GVA figures to reflect underlying differences in price levels between places. This means that these figures may exaggerate the variation in real GVA per job between different areas because we would expect prices (property and other living expenses) to be highest in areas of high productivity such as London.


Source: Office for National Statistics, Annual Business Inquiry via abi2@ons.gov.uk, 2010 (GVA) and workforce jobs series via Nomis (<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/Default.asp>).

Economic Activity

- **Employment:** The percentage of working age people in employment (*employment rate*) in 2011 was **69.2% in urban areas** and **74.6% in rural areas**.
- **Full time employment:** The percentage of working age people in employment who were working full time (as opposed to part time) in 2011 was **74.7%** for those living **in urban areas** and **72.6%** for those living **in rural areas**.
- **Unemployment:** The percentage of working age people who were unemployed (*unemployment rate*) in 2011 was **8.8% in urban areas** and **5.2% in rural areas**.
- **Economic inactivity:** The percentage of working age people who are not available for work or not seeking work (*economic inactivity rate*) in 2011 was **24.1% in urban areas** and **21.3% in rural areas**.

Employment Rate

Employment as a percentage of working age population, by settlement type in England, 2011




- The employment rate in 2011 was higher in rural areas (74.6%) than in urban areas (69.2%), but has fallen for both in recent years. It was highest in Less Sparse Village and Dispersed areas (75.0%) and lowest in Less Sparse Urban areas (69.2%).
- Employment rates have been consistently higher in Less Sparse Rural areas than in Sparse Rural areas.
- Employment is crucial for economic growth and social wellbeing and the steady decrease in the employment rate from 2007 can be attributed to the economic downturn.
- The latest England employment rate for September to November 2012 was 71.8% up 0.3 percentage point on June to August 2012 and up 1.3 percentage point on a year earlier. It is not yet possible to analyse these later figures in terms of settlement type.

Percentage of working age population who are employed, by settlement type in England, 2006 to 2011

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Less Sparse Urban	71.8	71.8	71.4	69.8	69.4	69.2
Sparse Urban	71.7	69.2	71.9	68.2	72.9	74.1
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	76.5	76.3	76.0	75.2	74.2	74.5
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	74.0	75.5	75.2	73.9	70.9	72.6
Less Sparse Rural Village and Dispersed	76.4	76.0	76.5	75.2	75.6	75.0
Sparse Rural Village and Dispersed	71.1	72.4	76.5	74.6	75.0	72.8
Urban	71.8	71.8	71.4	69.8	69.4	69.2
Rural	76.2	76.0	76.3	75.2	74.8	74.6
England	72.6	72.6	72.3	70.8	70.4	70.2

Full Time and Part Time Workers

Full and part time workers as percentage of all employed people of working age, by settlement type in England, 2011




- There is little difference between rural and urban areas in terms of the split of full time and part time employment, with roughly 75% of employed people in full time jobs and 25% in part time jobs.
- Workers living in urban areas had a slightly higher level of full time employment at 75% compared with 73% for those living in rural areas in 2011.
- Higher proportions of full time workers would be desirable if people would prefer to work full-time. We might have expected to see a greater increase in the proportion of part time work as observed from 2009 to 2011, as employers seek to avoid redundancies during the recession; this was around a 0.3% increase in part time work.

Full time and part time workers as a percentage of all employed people of working age, by settlement type in England, 2006 to 2011

	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Less Sparse Urban	76.3	23.7	76.2	23.8	76.0	24.0	75.1	24.9	74.7	25.3	74.7	25.3
Sparse Urban	72.9	27.1	73.7	26.3	67.1	32.9	69.6	30.4	72.7	27.3	73.7	26.3
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	72.8	27.2	73.4	26.6	74.3	25.7	73.6	26.4	73.7	26.3	73.3	26.7
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	75.1	24.9	70.4	29.6	66.2	33.8	73.3	26.7	70.8	29.2	72.0	28.0
Less Sparse Village and Dispersed	71.9	28.1	72.1	27.9	72.2	27.8	72.0	28.0	71.8	28.2	72.1	27.9
Sparse Village and Dispersed	69.2	30.8	70.9	29.1	72.7	27.3	72.6	27.4	73.1	26.9	72.5	27.5
Less Sparse	75.5	24.5	75.5	24.5	75.5	24.5	74.6	25.4	74.3	25.7	74.3	25.7
Sparse	71.7	28.3	71.1	28.9	70.2	29.8	72.4	27.6	72.4	27.6	72.6	27.4
Urban	76.3	23.7	76.1	23.9	76.0	24.0	75.1	24.9	74.7	25.3	74.7	25.3
Rural	72.3	27.7	72.6	27.4	73.0	27.0	72.8	27.2	72.6	27.4	72.6	27.4
England	75.5	24.5	75.5	24.5	75.4	24.6	74.6	25.4	74.3	25.7	74.3	25.7

FT= Full Time, PT = Part Time


Full time workers as a percentage of all employed people of working age, by settlement type in England, 2006 to 2011



- The split of full time and part time workers remained almost static from 2006 to 2011 in both urban and rural areas.
- The highest proportion of part time workers in 2011 were those living in Sparse Rural Town and Fringe areas (28%) and the lowest were those living in Less Sparse Urban areas (25.3%).

Unemployment Rate

Unemployment as percentage of economically active working age population, by settlement type in England, 2006 to 2011




- The unemployment rate in rural areas in 2011 was 5.2%. The unemployment rate has followed a similar pattern in rural and urban areas.
- Unemployment is costly to the individual (financially and socially), and also to the public purse (as many benefits payments are linked directly to unemployment or to low income, and there may also be indirect impacts on crime rates). There was a sharp increase in unemployment at the start of the recession between 2007 and 2009, and has since stabilised at around 8% nationally.
- The unemployment rate has tended to be highest in urban areas and lowest in Less Sparse Rural Village and Dispersed areas. (The trends for sparse areas have fluctuated and this may be owing to the small sample populations rather than genuine changes).
- The latest England unemployment rate for September to November 2012 was 7.7% of the economically active population, down 0.1 percentage points on June to August 2012 and down 0.7 percentage points on a year earlier. It is not yet possible to analyse these later figures in terms of settlement type.

Percentage of economically active working age population who are unemployed, by settlement type in England, 2006 to 2011

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Less Sparse Urban	6.0	5.7	6.4	8.5	8.3	8.8
Sparse Urban	7.0	5.8	3.8	6.5	4.1	7.9
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	4.0	4.0	4.2	5.9	6.2	5.8
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	3.9	4.6	4.4	6.1	8.9	4.8
Less Sparse Rural Village and Dispersed	2.8	2.9	3.2	4.5	4.5	4.6
Sparse Rural Village and Dispersed	2.5	3.7	2.7	4.7	3.7	6.6
Urban	6.0	5.7	6.4	8.5	8.3	8.8
Rural	3.4	3.5	3.6	5.2	5.3	5.2
England	5.5	5.3	5.9	7.8	7.8	8.1

Economic Inactivity

Percentage of working age population who are economically inactive, by settlement type in England, 2011




- In 2011, the highest percentage of economic inactivity in rural areas was in Sparse Rural Town and Fringe areas (23.7%), though it was higher in Less Sparse Urban areas (24.1%).
- People who are economically inactive are not available for work or not seeking work. Included are students, retirees and those unable to work due to sickness or disability. People who are officially unemployed are considered to be economically active. In general, lower rates of economic inactivity are desirable, although this may not be the case if increases are driven by reductions in those in full time education. The recession could have caused people struggling to find a job to remove themselves from the job market by retiring or returning to study. Conversely, some people who were previously economically inactive may have decided to go back to work to cover for lost income elsewhere in their household.

Percentage of working age population who are economically inactive, by settlement type in England, 2006 to 2011

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Less Sparse Urban	23.7	23.8	23.7	23.7	24.3	24.1
Sparse Urban	22.9	26.5	25.3	27.1	23.9	19.5
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	20.3	20.5	20.6	20.0	21.0	21.0
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	23.0	20.8	21.3	21.3	22.2	23.7
Less Sparse Rural Village and Dispersed	21.4	21.7	21.0	21.3	20.8	21.4
Sparse Rural Village and Dispersed	27.1	24.8	21.4	21.7	22.1%	22.0
Urban	23.7	23.9	23.7	23.7	24.3	24.1
Rural	21.1	21.2	20.8	20.7	21.0	21.3
England	23.2	23.4	23.2	23.2	23.6	23.6

Economic inactivity as a percentage of working age population in rural areas in England, 2006 to 2011



- Economic inactivity as a percentage of working age population was stable over the period 2006 to 2011. Overall, the gap between urban and rural areas increased slightly between 2006 and 2010, owing to a slight increase in urban areas and a slight decrease in rural areas, but the gap narrowed to 2.8 percentage points in 2011.
- The latest England inactivity rate for September to November 2012 was 22.1%, down 0.2 percentage points on June to August 2012 and down 0.9 percentage points on a year earlier. It is not yet possible to analyse these later figures in terms of settlement type.

Notes: In 2009 and before, working age was defined as 16-64 for males and 16-59 for females. In September 2010 the definition for working age was altered to be 16-64 for both males and females. The statistics shown here have been adjusted to this new definition for all years shown.


Unemployment rate is expressed as a percentage of the economically active working age population, whereas the employment rate is expressed as a percentage of the entire working age population. Therefore the unemployment rate and employment rate should not be expected to sum to 100%.

Source: Office for National Statistics, Annual Business Inquiry via abi2@ons.gov.uk

Earnings

- Average earnings for individuals who work or live in urban areas were higher than individuals who work or live in rural areas.
- Workplace and residence based annual earnings were highest in Major Urban areas. In 2011, average workplace based earnings were £26,410 and residence based earnings were £24,010.
- Workplace based median earnings in Predominantly Rural areas were below the England median. In 2011, median earnings in Rural-80 areas were £19,370.
- In 2011, residence based median earnings in Predominantly Rural areas were £21,430, slightly less than the England median.
- Workplace based earnings in Predominantly Rural areas increased by almost 25% between 2002 and 2011, which was slightly slower than the change in England overall.
- Residence based earnings increased by almost 26% in Predominantly Rural areas between 2002 and 2011, which was slightly higher than the change in median earnings in England.

Workplace Based Earnings




Interpretation: Workplace based earnings measure the average annual earnings of people who work in that particular type of area but may live elsewhere. Workplace based earnings were highest in Major Urban areas at £26,416 in 2011. In England the median earnings was £21,650, which is higher than all other areas. Median earnings were lowest in Rural-80 areas, where the median earnings were £19,370.

Median earnings have been increasing for workplace employees in all types of areas in this period, except between 2009 and 2010, where there was a small dip in earnings for all areas except Rural-80. However, between 2010 and 2011 the earnings have increased slightly. The rate of change was fastest in Major Urban areas where median earnings increased by around over 29% between 2002 and 2011, closely followed by Rural-80 areas which saw an increase of around 28%. The rate of change was slowest in Rural-50 areas where median earnings increased by just over 22% in the same period.

Median Earnings of Workplace Based Employees, (£), 2002 to 2011

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	20,510	20,360	22,470	22,820	23,390	24,390	25,260	25,990	25,820	26,416
Large Urban	16,440	17,030	17,390	18,150	18,770	19,430	20,100	20,610	20,440	20,610
Other Urban	16,970	17,760	18,110	18,860	19,360	19,870	20,900	21,280	21,030	21,190
Significant Rural	16,970	17,520	18,230	18,810	19,100	19,640	20,460	21,040	20,850	20,870
Rural-50	16,010	16,380	16,870	17,680	18,180	18,440	18,980	19,420	19,380	19,590
Rural-80	15,090	16,110	16,520	17,170	17,710	18,220	18,890	19,290	19,320	19,370
Predominantly Urban	18,750	18,990	20,300	20,800	21,360	22,190	23,050	23,650	23,470	23,810
Predominantly Rural	15,620	16,260	16,720	17,460	17,980	18,350	18,940	19,370	19,350	19,490
England	17,270	17,850	18,520	19,290	19,810	20,350	21,170	21,670	21,560	21,650

Residence Based Earnings



Interpretation: Residence based earnings measure the earnings of individuals based on where they live, which may be different to where they work. In England, median residence based earnings in 2011 was £21,692. In Predominantly Rural areas, the median earnings were less than this. However, median earnings were not lowest in rural settlements; residence based employees in Large Urban areas had the lowest earnings, £20,380.

Median earnings in England increased by approximately 25% between 2002 and 2011, and there was very little variation in the rate of change for each settlement type. The rate of change was highest in Rural-80 areas where there was around a 29% increase in median earnings and slowest in Rural-50 settlements where there was just under 24% increase in earnings.

Since 2009, median earnings in Predominantly Urban areas have been decreasing, whereas in Predominantly Rural areas decreased in 2009 but then increased.

Median Earnings of Residence Based Employees, (£), 2002 to 2011

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	19,020	19,720	20,360	21,360	21,780	22,730	23,610	24,310	24,020	24,010
Large Urban	16,440	16,870	17,530	18,350	18,810	19,310	20,000	20,520	20,460	20,380
Other Urban	16,850	17,580	18,080	18,730	19,330	19,780	20,800	21,140	21,090	21,250
Significant Rural	17,990	18,580	19,460	20,380	20,260	20,790	21,740	22,450	22,300	22,530
Rural-50	17,470	17,910	18,500	19,470	20,010	20,610	21,070	21,640	21,390	21,590
Rural-80	16,420	17,220	17,710	18,640	18,990	19,440	20,210	20,570	20,710	21,210
Predominantly Urban	17,920	18,560	19,170	20,050	20,520	21,250	22,130	22,700	22,520	22,490
Predominantly Rural	17,030	17,620	18,170	19,120	19,580	20,110	20,710	21,180	21,100	21,430
England	17,300	17,900	18,520	19,380	19,850	20,350	21,170	21,690	21,691	21,692

Employee earnings give an indication of living standards people are able to enjoy. If people have high earnings, then they are likely to have a higher disposable income and will, therefore, have a higher standard of living. These indicators show the median earnings, which is the earnings in the middle of the earnings distribution.

Workplace based earnings are based on where employees' workplaces are located, whereas residence based earnings are measured by where employees live. The data shows that **people working in Major Urban areas earn a lot more than those working in other types of areas**. Median earnings in Predominantly Rural areas are lowest. This shows that **people working in urban areas are more likely to earn more than people working in rural areas**.

Residence based earnings are lower than workplace based earnings in Major Urban areas. This shows that those working in Major Urban areas do not necessarily live in Major Urban areas. Although median residence based earnings are still lower than in urban areas, **residence based earnings in rural areas are higher than workplace earnings**. This indicates that there are people who live in rural areas but work in urban areas.

Between 2002 and 2011 earnings have been increasing. However, earnings in urban areas have been increasing faster than earnings in rural areas, for workplace based earnings, and the reverse is true for residence based earnings.

Source: Office for National Statistics, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, which is based on a one per cent sample of employee jobs taken from HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC) PAYE records. For more information see <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcn%3A77-235202> or contact earnings@ons.gov.uk

Skills

Having qualifications is good for the economy as it gives people a wider range of opportunities available to them and potentially increases their earning potential and a strong skills base is also key to the economic success and social wellbeing of the country.

The skills looked at are National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) Level 2 and above – which is equivalent to 5 General Certificates of Secondary Education (GCSE) at Grade A-C, NVQ4 and above –which measures qualifications at Higher National Certificate (HNC), Higher National Diploma (HND) or degree level and people with at least one qualification- including GCSEs at Grade D or E.


Residence Based Skills

The first section looks at skills based on where individuals live, but this will not accurately reflect the true differences in the knowledge base between different settlement types. Many people who live in rural areas will travel to urban areas for work and so the skills that these people have will not be used in rural areas.

- The proportion of working age population with at least one qualification was consistently highest for people living in rural areas. In 2011, 91.3% of working age people living in predominantly rural areas had at least one qualification.
- The proportion of working age population with NVQ2 or above was consistently higher for people living in rural households than for those living in urban households. However for those with NVQ4 and above the proportions was similar regardless of where people lived.

Proportion of Working Age Population with At Least One Qualification

Proportion of working age population with at least one qualification (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011



- The proportion of working age population that have at least one qualification was higher in Predominantly Rural areas than in Predominantly Urban areas, 91.3% and 88.8% respectively.
- For all rural classifications, the proportion was higher than the average England proportion of 89.7%.
- The proportion of working age population with at least one qualification has risen in all areas since 2004.

Proportion of working age population with at least one qualification (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011


	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	83.5	83.8	84.1	84.9	85.0	86.3	87.8	88.7
Large Urban	84.6	85.2	86.2	86.5	86.2	87.5	88.2	88.9
Other Urban	85.0	85.5	86.4	86.8	86.5	87.7	88.8	88.8
Significant Rural	86.3	87.4	88.2	88.7	87.9	89.0	90.0	91.4
Rural-50	86.8	88.3	88.1	89.0	88.8	90.1	90.7	91.4
Rural-80	87.4	88.7	88.8	89.4	89.0	90.0	89.9	91.3
Predominantly Urban	84.1	84.5	85.1	85.7	85.6	86.9	88.2	88.8
Predominantly Rural	87.1	88.5	88.4	89.2	88.9	90.0	90.4	91.3
England	85.6	86.4	86.3	86.9	86.7	87.9	88.9	89.7

Notes: In 2010 the classification of working age population changed to include females aged 60- 64, who had previously been excluded; this change was incorporated in this data and backdated to 2004.

Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey, NOMIS

Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 2 or Above

Proportion of working age population with NVQ2 (or equivalent) and above (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011



- The proportion of working age population with qualifications at NVQ Level 2 (or equivalent) and above was consistently highest for people living in Predominantly Rural areas and above the England average.
- In 2011, the proportion of working age people with qualifications at NVQ Level 2 or above was 71.6% for people living in Rural-50 areas and 67.7% for people living in Major Urban areas.

Proportion of working age population, with NVQ level 2 (or equivalent) and above (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	58.4	59.3	60.0	60.9	60.9	62.4	63.5	67.7
Large Urban	63.2	62.6	63.9	65.1	65.1	66.6	67.9	68.2
Other Urban	60.0	60.8	61.8	61.6	61.5	63.5	66.1	66.4
Significant Rural	63.9	64.9	65.2	66.0	64.7	65.9	69.1	70.8
Rural-50	65.0	65.9	66.6	66.9	66.3	67.6	70.2	71.6
Rural-80	66.7	67.7	68.4	69.1	67.7	69.2	71.4	70.5
Predominantly Urban	59.8	60.4	61.3	62.0	62.0	63.6	65.1	67.5
Predominantly Rural	65.7	66.7	67.4	67.8	66.9	68.3	70.7	71.1
England	61.7	62.5	63.2	63.9	63.5	65.0	66.9	68.8


Notes: In 2010 the classification of working age population changed to include females aged 60 – 64, who had previously been excluded; this change was incorporated in this data and backdated to 2004.

This indicator has been amended from previously, and is now recorded for Working Age Population for consistency with other indicators.

Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey, NOMIS.

Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 4 or equivalent

Proportion of working age population with NVQ4 (or equivalent) and above (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011



- The proportion of working age population with qualifications at NVQ Level 4 (or equivalent) and above is broadly similar in all areas and has increased since 2004 to 2011. However, the proportion in Major Urban areas increased above other areas in 2011 to 35.5%.
- In 2011, 31.8% of working age people living in Rural-80 areas had NVQ4 equivalent or above.

Proportion of working age population with NVQ level 4 (or equivalent) and above (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	26.0	27.1	28.1	29.5	29.8	31.5	32.5	35.5
Large Urban	25.5	25.3	26.5	27.9	27.8	28.5	29.9	30.5
Other Urban	23.0	23.3	23.8	24.2	25.2	26.5	27.8	28.3
Significant Rural	26.6	27.0	27.9	28.8	27.5	29.1	31.0	31.5
Rural-50	26.5	26.6	27.2	28.3	28.3	29.5	31.5	32.0
Rural-80	27.9	27.5	28.8	30.3	29.2	29.9	32.5	31.8
Predominantly Urban	25.2	25.8	26.7	27.8	28.3	29.7	30.8	32.6
Predominantly Rural	27.1	27.0	27.9	29.2	28.7	29.7	32.0	31.9
England	25.8	26.3	27.1	28.3	28.3	29.6	31.1	32.3


Notes: In 2010 the classification of working age population changed to include females aged 60 – 64, who had previously been excluded; this change was incorporated in this data and backdated to 2004.

This indicator has been amended from previously, and is now recorded for Working Age Population for consistency with other indicators

Source data: ONS, Annual Population Survey, NOMIS

Proportion of Employees Receiving On the Job Training

Proportion of employees and self-employed of working age receiving on the job training in last 4 weeks (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011



- On the job training is when employees receive training at their workplace and is typically used for vocational work.
- The proportion of people receiving job-related training was lower for people living in Predominantly Rural areas than those living in Predominantly Urban areas.
- In 2011 there was an increase in the proportion of people who were living in either Predominantly Rural or Significant Rural areas who had received on the job training in the previous 4 weeks. The proportion for people living in Predominantly Urban areas had decreased.
- A refocusing of Government resources supporting apprenticeships and training in 2010 may have contributed to the increase in uptake of on the job training in all but Major Urban areas in 2011.

Proportion of employees and self employed that received on the job training in last 4 week, (residence based), by local authority classification in England, 2004 to 2011

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	15.3	14.4	13.7	13.3	13.3	13.0	13.2	12.5
Large Urban	16.3	15.7	14.4	14.5	14.8	13.7	13.3	13.8
Other Urban	15.2	15.6	14.5	13.5	14.1	13.6	13.7	13.8
Significant Rural	14.8	14.2	13.3	13.0	13.0	12.6	12.0	13.2
Rural-50	15.0	14.1	13.6	13.1	12.8	12.7	12.3	12.9
Rural-80	14.1	13.5	12.5	12.2	13.3	12.0	11.4	11.5
Predominantly Urban	15.5	15.0	14.0	13.6	13.9	13.3	13.4	13.1
Predominantly Rural	14.6	13.8	13.1	12.7	13.0	12.4	11.9	12.3
England	15.2	14.6	13.7	13.3	13.6	13.4	12.8	12.9

Notes: This indicator was previously reported for Working Age Population so included people who were economically active but not in employment so who were not able to have On the Job Training, so has been revised to just include people who are in employment, so proportions here are higher than those previously reported.


Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey, Nomis

Workplace Based Skills

- When these skill levels are looked at from a workplace based perspective, a higher proportion of people working in Predominantly Urban have qualifications at NVQ4 or above than those working in Predominantly Rural areas. One reason for this is that businesses that can utilise these skills are based in urban areas where they can benefit from better infrastructure and a larger potential workforce.
- The proportion of working age population with at least one qualification was generally higher for those working in Predominantly Rural areas than those working in Predominantly Urban areas, 94.6% and 93.8% respectively.
- In 2011, the proportion of working age population with NVQ Level 2 or above working in Predominantly Rural areas was 76.2% and 75.0% respectively, which was lower than Predominantly Urban areas.
- In 2011, the proportion of working age population with NVQ Level 4 or above working in Predominantly Rural areas was 35.8%, which was lower than the 39.8% of people working in Predominantly Urban areas
- In 2011, the proportion of employees, self-employed people and trainees who had received on the job training in the previous 4 weeks working in Predominantly Rural areas was 12.8%.

Proportion of Working Age Population with At Least One Qualification

Proportion of working age population with at least one qualification (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011



- The proportion of people with at least one qualification has increased in all areas since 2006
- The gap between people working in Predominantly Rural areas and Predominantly Urban areas has increased in 2011.


Proportion of working age population with at least one qualification (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	90.3	90.8	91.1	92.1	93.4	93.9
Large Urban	90.3	90.5	91.7	92.7	93.2	93.6
Other Urban	90.9	91.1	91.3	92.6	93.5	93.7
Significant Rural	91.6	92.0	91.8	93.3	93.9	94.3
Rural-50	91.4	92.2	92.6	93.6	94.2	94.8
Rural-80	91.5	92.3	92.0	93.3	93.4	94.3
Predominantly Urban	90.5	90.8	91.3	92.4	93.4	93.8
Predominantly Rural	91.5	92.2	92.3	93.5	93.9	94.6
England	90.9	91.3	91.6	92.8	93.6	94.0

Notes: In 2010 the classification of working age population changed to include females aged 60- 64, who had previously been excluded; this change was incorporated in this data and backdated to 2006.
Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey/Labour Force Survey

Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 2 or Above

Proportion of working age population with NVQ2 (or equivalent) and above (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011



- A higher proportion of people working in Predominantly Rural areas have NVQ Level 2 or above, than people working in Predominantly Urban areas.
- In 2011 in Predominantly Rural areas the proportion was 76.2% in 2010, compared with 75.0% in Predominantly Urban areas.

Proportion of working age population with NVQ level 2 (or equivalent) and above (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011


	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	68.1	68.6	71.2	70.9	72.9	76.0
Large Urban	67.0	67.9	71.3	71.2	72.5	74.6
Other Urban	67.1	66.7	68.9	69.5	72.0	73.4
Significant Rural	69.4	70.3	71.1	71.3	74.1	76.2
Rural-50	70.2	70.8	72.4	73.0	75.3	77.1
Rural-80	69.4	70.3	71.1	71.4	73.1	75.1
Predominantly Urban	67.6	68.0	70.7	70.6	72.6	75.0
Predominantly Rural	69.9	70.6	71.9	72.3	74.4	76.2
England	68.4	68.9	71.0	71.1	73.2	75.5

Notes: In 2010 the classification of working age population changed to include females aged 60 – 64, who had previously been excluded; this change was incorporated in this data and backdated to 2006.

Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey/Labour Force Survey.

Proportion of Working Age Population with NVQ Level 4

Proportion of working age population with NVQ4 (or equivalent) and above (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011



- The proportion of working age population with NVQ Level 4 or equivalent is much higher for people working in Predominantly Urban areas, than those working in Rural areas.
- In Predominantly Urban areas the proportion with NVQ Level 4 or equivalent was 39.8% compared with 34.8% in Predominantly Rural areas.

Proportion of working age population with at least NVQ level 4 (or equivalent) (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011


	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	35.5	36.9	38.8	40.0	41.7	44.3
Large Urban	28.9	30.8	32.0	32.4	34.2	35.5
Other Urban	27.8	28.2	30.3	31.5	33.1	33.8
Significant Rural	31.5	32.4	31.6	33.1	35.5	35.8
Rural-50	30.3	31.8	32.5	33.5	36.2	36.5
Rural-80	29.8	31.5	31.1	31.4	34.2	34.8
Predominantly Urban	32.1	33.4	35.2	36.2	38.0	39.8
Predominantly Rural	30.1	31.7	31.9	32.6	35.4	35.8
England	31.5	32.9	33.9	34.9	37.0	38.3

Notes: In 2010 the classification of working age population changed to include females aged 60 – 64, who had previously been excluded; this change was incorporated in this data and backdated to 2006.

Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey/Labour Force Survey.

Proportion of Employees Receiving On the Job Training

Proportion of employees and self-employed of working age receiving on the job training in last 4 weeks (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011



- A higher percentage of people working in urban areas received on the job training than people working in rural areas
- There was an increase in the proportion of people receiving on the job training for those working in Predominantly Rural or Significant Rural areas in 2011.
- For every £1 spent on apprenticeships, there is an £18 return¹. This may be an incentive for employers to provide apprenticeships, which has seen an increase of on-the-job training in 2011 in some areas.

¹Source: National Audit Office

Proportion of employees, self-employed and trainees receiving on the job training in last 4 weeks (workplace based), by local authority classification in England, 2006 to 2011

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	14.2	13.8	13.5	13.4	13.6	12.9
Large Urban	14.8	14.6	14.6	14.0	13.5	14.0
Other Urban	15.1	14.0	14.2	14.0	14.2	14.1
Significant Rural	13.7	13.6	13.1	13.0	12.4	13.6
Rural-50	14.3	13.7	13.0	13.2	12.8	13.4
Rural-80	13.1	13.1	13.4	12.7	12.0	12.0
Predominantly Urban	14.6	14.0	13.9	13.7	13.7	13.4
Predominantly Rural	13.8	13.4	13.2	12.8	12.5	12.8
England	14.3	13.8	13.6	13.4	13.3	13.3


Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey/Labour Force Survey.

Enterprise

- Businesses, and the employment opportunities they provide, are a very important aspect of the rural and urban economy. Changes in the numbers of businesses in different areas can give an indication of economic growth or decline.
- There are more businesses per 10,000 population in the most rural areas than in the most urban areas.
- Since 2007, business start-ups per 10,000 population were higher in Major Urban areas than in the most rural areas.
- There are more businesses per head in rural areas, but turnover per employee is higher in urban areas than in other settlement types.

Businesses per 10,000 Population

Businesses per 10,000 population, by type of local authority classification in England, 1999 to 2011



- The number of businesses per 10,000 population is higher in rural areas than in urban areas.
- Between 2009 and 2011 there has been a decrease in the number of businesses per 10,000 population across all area types.

Businesses per 10,000 population, by type of local authority classification in England, 1999 to 2011

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	300	300	300	300	300	370	370	380	390	400	410	410	400
Large Urban	230	240	240	240	240	320	320	330	330	330	330	320	320
Other Urban	240	240	240	240	250	310	320	320	330	330	330	320	320
Significant Rural	330	330	330	340	340	410	410	410	420	430	430	410	410
Rural-50	340	350	350	350	360	400	410	410	420	420	420	410	410
Rural-80	410	410	410	420	420	470	470	470	470	460	460	440	440
Predominantly Urban	270	270	270	270	270	350	350	350	360	370	370	370	360
Predominantly Rural	370	370	380	380	380	430	430	430	440	440	440	430	420
England	300	300	300	310	310	380	380	380	390	390	390	390	380


Notes: The 1999 – 2003 data comes from VAT Registrations and De-Registrations. The 2004 – 2011 data comes from Business Demography, which includes businesses that are PAYE registered but not VAT registered. This means that there are higher numbers of businesses showing from 2004 onwards. This change in collection methods was a result of a new European Commission Regulation.

Source: ONS - VAT Registrations and De-Registrations, ONS- Business Demography

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcn%3A77-283124>

Business Start-Ups per 10,000 Population

Business Start-Ups per 10,000 population, by broad local authority classification, in England, 1999 to 2011



- Since 2008 there have been more business start-ups per 10,000 population in urban areas than in rural areas.
- There was a decrease in the rate of business start-ups in most area types after 2007, which was most likely to have been related to the economic downturn.
- There has been an increase in business start-ups in 2011 in all areas.

Business Start-Ups per 10,000 population, by broad local authority classification in England, 1999 to 2011

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Major Urban	36	37	34	34	37	53	51	48	53	56	48	48	54
Large Urban	26	27	25	26	28	43	42	39	42	38	32	32	36
Other Urban	26	26	25	26	28	42	41	37	41	40	35	33	36
Significant Rural	32	33	31	33	35	51	49	46	50	46	40	39	42
Rural-50	31	32	30	32	34	50	48	44	47	43	37	37	39
Rural-80	34	34	33	35	37	57	53	49	52	43	39	36	40
Predominantly Urban	32	32	30	30	33	48	47	43	48	48	41	41	46
Predominantly Rural	32	33	31	33	36	53	50	46	49	43	38	36	40
England	32	32	30	31	34	50	48	44	48	46	40	40	44



Note: The 1999 – 2003 data comes from VAT Registrations and De-Registrations. The 2004 – 2011 data comes from Business Demography, which includes businesses that are PAYE registered but not VAT registered. This means that there are higher numbers of businesses showing from 2004 onwards. This change in collection methods was a result of a new European Commission Regulation

Source: ONS - VAT Registrations and De-Registrations, ONS- Business Demography

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcn%3A77-283124>

Enterprise Composition

Important note: The following statistics are based on Enterprises, which is the level at which businesses are registered for Value Added Tax. In the case of a business operating at only one address, it will be registered at that address, but for businesses operating in several locations, it will be the location of the head quarters that is registered. If a business has outlets in rural areas, but the headquarters is registered within an urban area, then the statistics for all the outlets will be registered at the head quarters, and not counted as “rural”.



- There are more enterprises per 10,000 population in rural areas than in urban areas and the number of businesses per head of population increases as areas become “more rural”.
- However the average turnover per employee is greatest in Less Sparse Urban areas and lowest in Sparse Rural Town & Fringe areas.


Enterprise Composition, by settlement type in England, 2010/11

	Count of Enterprises	Number of Employees 000s	Total Turnover £m	Count of Enterprises per 10,000 population	Average Turnover per enterprise £000s	Average Turnover per employee £000s
Less Sparse Urban	1,270,540	19,937	3,551,355	321	2,795	178
Sparse Urban	3,530	25	1,985	342	562	79
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	147,785	923	110,065	349	745	119
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	9,370	62	4,605	430	492	75
Less Sparse Rural Village	193,350	1,027	152,380	588	788	148
Sparse Rural Village	14,760	49	4,810	599	326	98
Less Sparse Rural Hamlet	126,525	808	117,690	916	930	146
Sparse Rural Hamlet	14,960	44	4,765	1,027	318	108
Less Sparse	1,738,205	22,695	3,931,490	359	2,262	173
Sparse	42,620	180	16,165	598	379	90
Urban	1,274,070	19,962	3,553,340	321	2,789	178
Rural	506,750	2,912	394,315	533	778	135
England	1,780,820	22,875	3,947,655	362	2,217	173

Note: On the IDBR, the enterprise is the statistical unit that most closely equates to a business. It holds aggregated information gathered from administrative and statistical sources within that enterprise to give an overall picture of what is going on in the business. An enterprise carries out one or more activities at one or more locations. An enterprise may be a sole legal unit.

Source: ONS, Inter Departmental Business Register (IDBR), 2010/11

Enterprise by Industry Type



- Agriculture, forestry & fishing accounts for 5% of businesses in England, but In Sparse Hamlets, more than half the enterprises are in these industries, and they are also dominant in Less Sparse Hamlets and Sparse Villages.
- Wholesale & retail trade, repair of motor vehicles is the most dominant sector in England and accounts for 17% of businesses, in Sparse Urban and Sparse Rural Town and Fringe areas the sector accounts for around 25% of businesses.
- Although the number of enterprises has fallen slightly since 2009/10, there has been an increase in the number of businesses in some industries (data not shown). Agriculture, forestry and fishing businesses have increased in almost all areas, along with mining and quarrying businesses, while other industries such as transport and storage and arts, entertainment and recreation have increased numbers in just one area type. These increases in business numbers have been more than matched by decreases in construction, manufacturing and administrative & support services.


Numbers of Enterprises by Industry, and settlement type in England, 2010/11

	Less Sparse Urban	Sparse Urban	Less Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Less Sparse Village	Sparse Village	Less Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	England
Administrative and support services	89,430	190	9,950	460	13,720	805	8,780	795	124,130
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9,660	160	6,175	605	31,815	4,985	30,865	7,715	91,975
Arts, entertainment and recreation	35,130	115	3,400	260	5,545	425	3,830	315	49,025
Construction	156,255	450	21,670	1,195	25,590	1,745	15,275	1,170	223,355
Education, health and social work	77,635	220	8,195	540	7,580	475	3,960	305	98,910
Finance	31,850	40	2,500	135	2,430	65	1,675	70	38,765
Hotels & Catering	77,385	535	9,820	1,230	8,800	1,235	4,585	760	104,355
Information and communication	108,690	80	9,390	290	11,145	320	5,680	325	135,915
Manufacturing	77,615	195	9,205	520	11,240	650	7,810	585	107,820
Mining/quarrying and utilities	2,940	10	410	15	665	30	540	50	4,660
Professional, scientific & technical services	222,045	255	23,665	83	29,760	1,145	15,600	895	294,200
Property and business services	60,820	180	7,370	455	6,255	320	3,730	210	79,345
Public admin and defence; other services	50,145	120	4,325	295	6,105	270	4,260	265	65,775
Transport and storage	39,635	120	5,455	320	6,090	455	3,565	320	55,965
Wholesale, retail & repair of motor vehicles	231,305	860	26,255	2,220	26,600	1,830	16,375	1,175	306,625
Total	1,270,540	3,530	147,785	9,370	193,350	14,760	126,525	14,960	1,780,825

Percentage of Enterprises by Industry, and settlement type in England, 2010/11

	Less Sparse Urban	Sparse Urban	Less Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Less Sparse Village	Sparse Village	Less Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	England
Administrative and support services	7.0%	5.4%	6.7%	4.9%	7.1%	5.5%	6.9%	5.3%	7.0%
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.8%	4.5%	4.2%	6.5%	16.5%	33.8%	24.4%	51.6%	5.2%
Arts, entertainment and recreation	2.8%	3.3%	2.3%	2.8%	2.9%	2.9%	3.0%	2.1%	2.8%
Construction	12.3%	12.7%	14.7%	12.8%	13.2%	11.8%	12.1%	7.8%	12.5%
Education, health and social work	6.1%	6.2%	5.5%	5.8%	3.9%	3.2%	3.1%	2.0%	5.6%
Finance	2.5%	1.1%	1.7%	1.4%	1.3%	0.4%	1.3%	0.5%	2.2%
Hotels & Catering	6.1%	15.2%	6.6%	13.1%	4.6%	8.4%	3.6%	5.1%	5.9%
Information and communication	8.6%	2.3%	6.4%	3.1%	5.8%	2.2%	4.5%	2.2%	7.6%
Manufacturing	6.1%	5.5%	6.2%	5.5%	5.8%	4.4%	6.2%	3.9%	6.1%
Mining/quarrying and utilities	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
Professional, scientific & technical services	17.5%	7.2%	16.0%	8.9%	15.4%	7.8%	12.3%	6.0%	16.5%
Property and business services	4.8%	5.1%	5.0%	4.9%	3.2%	2.2%	2.9%	1.4%	4.5%
Public admin and defence; other services	3.9%	3.4%	2.9%	3.1%	3.2%	1.8%	3.4%	1.8%	3.7%
Transport and storage	3.1%	3.4%	3.7%	3.4%	3.1%	3.1%	2.8%	2.1%	3.1%
Wholesale, retail & repair of motor vehicles	18.2%	24.4%	17.8%	23.7%	13.8%	12.4%	12.9%	7.9%	17.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Enterprise by Size Band



- In Urban areas around 60% of employees in businesses are employed in large businesses (those with over 250 employees), while only around 12% of employees are employed in micro businesses. In Sparse Rural areas, more people are employed in micro businesses than in large businesses. In the Less Sparse areas, the proportions employed in businesses of varying sizes are similar.

Note: Micro businesses are businesses with 1 – 9 employees, small businesses are businesses with 10 – 49 employees, medium businesses are businesses with 50 – 249 employees. These along with sole traders and partnerships, which have working proprietors but no employees, are referred to as Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs). Large businesses are businesses with 250 or more employees.

The statistics are based on the location of the headquarters of the enterprise, rather than of individual business units. Using this methodology, a supermarket with a number of branches across the country would be counted once based on where the headquarters were located. There may be many local business units in rural areas whose headquarters are elsewhere, and vice versa. This may go some way to explaining the high proportion of enterprises in the agricultural industry in Villages and Hamlets. Agricultural businesses are perhaps more likely than any other types of business to have their headquarters in the same location as the holding itself.

Source: ONS, IDBR 2010/11.

Enterprise Count and Percentage by Size, by settlement type in England, 2010/11

Detailed Breakdown	Micro (1 – 9 employees)		Small (10 – 49 employees)		Medium (50 – 249 employees)		Large (250 or more employees)		Sole Trader		Other Enterprises and Partnerships		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Urban	943,265	74.0%	119,910	9.4%	23,270	1.8%	6,560	0.5%	126,570	9.9%	54,500	4.3%	1,274,070	100.0%
Rural	341,920	67.5%	34,885	6.9%	5,200	1.0%	940	0.2%	74,355	14.7%	49,450	9.8%	506,750	100.0%
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	107,060	72.4%	11,245	7.6%	1,570	1.1%	290	0.2%	18,675	12.6%	8,945	6.1%	147,785	100.0%
Less Sparse Village	130,880	67.7%	12,375	6.4%	1,840	1.0%	340	0.2%	29,045	15.0%	18,870	9.8%	193,350	100.0%
Less Sparse Dispersed	81,190	64.2%	8,805	7.0%	1,505	1.2%	275	0.2%	19,720	15.6%	15,030	11.9%	126,525	100.0%
Sparse Rural	22,790	58.3%	2,460	6.3%	285	0.7%	40	0.1%	6,915	17.7%	6,605	16.9%	39,090	100.0%
England	1,285,185	72.2%	154,795	8.7%	28,470	1.6%	7,500	0.4%	200,925	11.3%	103,950	5.8%	1,780,825	100.0%

*Employee Count and Percentage by Size Band *, by settlement type in England, 2010/11*


Detailed Breakdown	Micro (1 – 9 employees)		Small (10 – 49 employees)		Medium (50 – 249 employees)		Large (250 or more employees)		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Urban	2,342,730	11.7%	2,343,015	11.7%	2,327,860	11.7%	12,948,685	64.9%	19,962,290	100.0%
Rural	840,965	28.9%	659,485	22.6%	503,450	17.3%	908,510	31.2%	2,912,410	100.0%
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	266,450	28.9%	213,540	23.1%	149,955	16.3%	292,705	31.7%	922,650	100.0%
Less Sparse Village	313,860	30.5%	233,150	22.7%	180,165	17.5%	300,235	29.2%	1,027,410	100.0%
Less Sparse Dispersed	201,910	25.0%	167,580	20.7%	147,350	18.2%	290,915	36.0%	807,750	100.0%
Sparse Rural	58,745	38.0%	45,220	29.2%	25,980	16.8%	24,660	16.0%	154,600	100.0%
England	3,183,695	13.9%	3,002,500	13.1%	2,831,310	12.4%	13,857,195	60.6%	22,874,700	100.0%

*Sole Traders, other enterprises and partnerships are not included in the above table as they have no employ

Innovation

- In 2009, 55.8% of urban businesses were involved in innovation compared to 53.0% of rural businesses.
- In 2009, 24.3% of urban businesses were product innovators compared to 25.2% of rural businesses.
- In 2009, 12.7% of urban businesses were process innovators compared to 12.6% of rural businesses.

Businesses Engaged in Innovation



Interpretation: This chart and the following table show the proportion of businesses engaged in innovation related activities between 1st January 2006 and 31st December 2008, split by the rural/urban definition of the head office location. Sparse areas show higher levels of innovation than less sparse areas in each of the rural/urban categories, with Sparse Urban areas having the highest proportion at 73%. However the results for sparse areas are based on a small number of observations and should therefore be treated with caution. Overall, urban areas have slightly higher levels of businesses engaged in innovation than rural areas.


Businesses Engaged in Innovation Related Activities Split by Rural/Urban Definition of Head Office, 2006-08

	Engaged in Innovation		Not Engaged in Innovation		All Businesses	
	Number	% of All Businesses	Number	% of All Businesses	Number	% of All Businesses
Less Sparse Urban	66,304	55.7%	52,724	44.3%	119,028	100.0%
Sparse Urban	334	72.6%	126	27.4%	460	100.0%
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	5,292	49.6%	5,368	50.4%	10,660	100.0%
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	684	59.6%	463	40.4%	1,147	100.0%
Less Sparse Village and Dispersed	9,906	53.9%	8,487	46.1%	18,393	100.0%
Sparse Village and Dispersed	791	64.4%	438	35.6%	1,229	100.0%
Less Sparse	81,502	55.0%	66,579	45.0%	148,081	100.0%
Sparse	1,809	63.8%	1,027	36.2%	2,836	100.0%
Urban	66,638	55.8%	52,850	44.2%	119,488	100.0%
Rural	16,673	53.0%	14,756	47.0%	31,429	100.0%
England	83,311	55.2%	67,606	44.8%	150,917	100.0%

Product and Process Innovation

Proportion of businesses that were innovators, 2006-08

Left hand columns = product innovators
Right hand columns = process innovators



Interpretation: The chart above and the following two tables show the proportion of businesses that are product innovators and process innovators, split by the rural/urban definition of the head office location. Product innovators have introduced new or significantly improved goods or services. Process innovators have introduced new or significantly improved processes for producing or supplying goods or services. Levels of both types of innovation are very similar across the urban/rural spectrum with roughly one quarter of businesses being product innovators and one eighth being process innovators.

Businesses that are 'Product Innovators' split by Rural/Urban Definition of Head Office, 2006-08

	Product Innovator		Not a Product Innovator		All Businesses	
	Number	% of All Businesses	Number	% of All Businesses	Number	% of All Businesses
Urban	29,017	24.3%	90,471	75.7%	119,488	100.0%
Rural Town and Fringe	2,927	24.8%	8,880	75.2%	11,807	100.0%
Village and Dispersed	4,997	25.5%	14,625	74.5%	19,622	100.0%
Less Sparse	36,288	24.5%	111,793	75.5%	148,081	100.0%
Sparse	653	23.0%	2,183	77.0%	2,836	100.0%
Urban	29,017	24.3%	90,471	75.7%	119,488	100.0%
Rural	7,924	25.2%	23,505	74.8%	31,429	100.0%
England	36,941	24.5%	113,976	75.5%	150,917	100.0%

Businesses that are 'Process Innovators' split by Rural/Urban Definition of Head Office, 2006-08

	Process Innovator		Not a Process Innovator		All Businesses	
	Number	% of All Businesses	Number	% of All Businesses	Number	% of All Businesses
Urban	15,208	12.7%	104,280	87.3%	119,488	100.0%
Rural Town and Fringe	1,501	12.7%	10,306	87.3%	11,807	100.0%
Village and Dispersed	2,452	12.5%	17,170	87.5%	19,622	100.0%
Less Sparse	18,813	12.7%	129,268	87.3%	148,081	100.0%
Sparse	348	12.3%	2,488	87.7%	2,836	100.0%
Urban	15,208	12.7%	104,280	87.3%	119,488	100.0%
Rural	3,953	12.6%	27,476	87.4%	31,429	100.0%
England	19,161	12.7%	131,756	87.3%	150,917	100.0%

Innovation is described by The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) as *the process by which new ideas are successfully exploited to create economic, social and environmental value*. Innovation is a key driver of economic growth, which is seen as critical to the reduction of the national debt.

Innovation related activities (first indicator) encompass marketing, design, research and development and the purchase of technical goods and services such as external knowledge, computer equipment and machinery. Product innovators have introduced new or significantly improved goods or services whilst Process innovators have introduced new or significantly improved processes for producing or supplying goods or services. By comparing both indicators it can be seen that a significant proportion of businesses engaged in innovation related activities are Product innovators and are not Process innovators.

Notes: England totals may be lower than those published by BIS due to discrepancies with post code data.

Source: BIS UK Innovation Survey 2009

<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/science/docs/u/10-p107a-uk-innovation-survey-2009-science-and-innovation-analysis.pdf>

Businesses classed as having engaged in innovation responded that they had engaged in at least one of the following between 1st January 2006 and 31st December 2008:


- Internal research and development
- Acquisition of external research and development
- Acquisition of advanced machinery
- Acquisition of computer hardware
- Acquisition of computer software
- Acquisition of external knowledge
- Training for innovative activities
- All forms of design
- Changes to product or service design
- Market research
- Changes to marketing methods
- Launch advertising

Investment

- Capital investment is where companies spend money on fixed assets (typically land, buildings or machinery) with the expectation that productivity will increase as a result of the investment.
- In 2010, **capital investment per employee** was highest in London, followed by Other Urban areas and lowest in Rural-80 areas
- In 2010 capital investment per employee decreased in all areas except London, where capital investment had increased by 1%. Elsewhere, the greatest decrease was in Rural-80 areas (by 17%).

Capital Investment per Employee

Capital investment per employee (at current prices) (£000), by local authority classification, in England, 1999 to 2010



- For Rural-50 and Rural-80 areas, investment per head was consistently lower than the England average. In 2010 investment was £4.6k per head in London compared with £2.4k in Rural-80 areas.
- Outside of London, Capital investment per employee was generally highest in Other Urban areas, and was £3.1k per head in 2010, whilst rural areas and Major Urban areas outside of London saw the lowest investment per employee.
- All types of area saw a decrease from 2008 which is likely to reflect the wider economic situation, with less investment during the recession.

Capital Investment per employee (£000), by local authority classification, 1999 to 2010

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
London	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.0	3.8	3.2	3.8	4.2	4.3	5.2	4.5	4.6
Major Urban (excl London)	3.1	2.9	3.4	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.7	2.6
Large Urban	3.3	3.4	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.5	2.9	2.7
Other Urban	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.5	3.3	3.1
Significant Rural	3.1	3.4	3.1	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.0	2.7
Rural-50	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.8	3.1	3.2	2.8	2.4
Rural-80	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.4
Predominantly Urban (excl London)	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.5	2.9	2.8
Predominantly Rural	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.2	2.9	2.4
England	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.0

Notes: Total net capital investment is calculated as total proceeds from disposals subtracted from the total cost of acquisitions. The data is at current prices so it has already taken account of inflation.

Caution should be taken when interpreting this measure as capital investment is difficult to attribute at Local Authority District level. The estimates are produced by taking data at a higher geographical level and apportioning it at local authority level based on employment levels. As ONS are not wholly confident that there is a sufficient correlation between investment and employment, they do not release the data as a National Statistic below National level.

London has been separated out to allow a fair comparison of Major Urban against all other area classifications.

Source data: Bespoke data request from Annual Business Inquiry, ONS.