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# Worklessness Assessment SWOT

## Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A relatively resilient economy – See BUSINESS section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher value industry in all districts – See BUSINESS section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime levels are decreasing across the county</td>
<td>p38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low qualifications in Fenland; NEET hotspots in Fenland, Huntingdon and Cambridge City</td>
<td>p31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High numbers of long term Incapacity Benefit claimants, particularly in Fenland and northern wards of Cambridge City - variations in pattern and nature of ESA/IB</td>
<td>p22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA/IB claimant rate increasing in Fenland compared with a steady decrease nationally</td>
<td>p22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing employment inequalities: Fenland, Huntingdon North, Kings Hedges, St Neots and Littleport hit hardest by recession</td>
<td>p16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland wards among most deprived in the country, however there are also significant pockets of education deprivation in Huntingdonshire and income deprivation in Cambridge.</td>
<td>p26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing ethnic minority groups are over-represented in the unemployed population and Traveller communities face significant difficulties accessing mainstream education and employment opportunities.</td>
<td>p12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural communities have limited access to jobs, education, training and employability services</td>
<td>p35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longer term demand in health, creative industries, agriculture, manufacturing</td>
<td>p33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market links to the north and east of the county</td>
<td>p4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although seasonal migrant labour in Fenland and Cambridge creates increased competition for jobs, there are some signs that migrant workers are beginning to return home. Initially this may threaten the productivity of those businesses dependent on them but it does create potential employment opportunities for the workless population</td>
<td>p6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for the workless stemming from an ageing population in the north and associated decrease in levels of economic activity</td>
<td>p6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly entrepreneurial culture that currently is not reflected in VAT registration figures.</td>
<td>p32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over-representation of 18-24 among the unemployed, particularly in Fenland</td>
<td>p22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge is a regional centre of employment, particularly for public sector occupations. The impact of public sector redundancies is already being seen in the low levels of job vacancies advertised through Job Centre Plus.</td>
<td>p43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited availability of part-time work (plus possible competition from students in Cambridge) – an important route back into work for the unemployed</td>
<td>p32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The condition of housing stock is relatively poor in areas such as Littleport, St Ives, areas of Forest Heath and Wisbech. This reduces the attractiveness of these areas as somewhere to live and invest and can contribute to fuel poverty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cambridgeshire’s labour market is relatively self contained, with 80% of Cambridgeshire’s residents working in the county, and 81% of Cambridgeshire’s workers living in the county. These figures have not changed significantly since 2001; however there has been a slight increase in the number of residents commuting to London, mainly from South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire. Most other areas of the region have also experienced increased levels of commuting to London.

Cambridgeshire’s most significant out-commuter flows continue, however, to be to Peterborough and Forest Heath. Around 30% of out-commuters (6% of residents) commute to Peterborough, and around 15% to Forest Health (3% of residents). Strong two way commuting links exist between Peterborough, Fenland and Huntingdonshire (nearly a third of Fenland residents commute to Peterborough and Huntingdonshire to work), and between Forest Heath and East Cambridgeshire. In addition, Fenland draws a significant number of workers from Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire together have a relatively self contained labour market supply with 87% of Cambridge residents and 85% of South Cambridgeshire residents working in Cambridge or South Cambridgeshire. However, both districts also draw significant numbers of workers from Huntingdonshire, East Cambridgeshire and St Edmundsbury. Approximately 60% of Cambridge workers reside outside the district and nearly 20% reside outside the county, underlining Cambridge’s importance as a regional centre of employment.

The Population of Cambridgeshire

Cambridgeshire has an overall estimated population of 595,700, 63% of which are estimated to be of working age – slightly higher than the national and regional average of 62% and 61% respectively. Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire are the most populous districts in the county and East Cambridgeshire is the least populous. Within the county, the proportion of working age is lowest in Fenland and highest in Cambridge City, due to the student populations of both Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin universities.

In 2008, 17,600 students attended Cambridge University. Anglia Ruskin has a student population of 25,500, although this is split across two main campuses, one in Cambridge and one in Chelmsford.
Table 1: Mid-2008 population of Greater Cambridge and its constituent districts


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population Estimate</th>
<th>Working age population</th>
<th>% population of working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (16-64)</td>
<td>Female (16-59)</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City</td>
<td>117,700</td>
<td>44,700</td>
<td>39,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>79,400</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>92,900</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>163,100</td>
<td>53,800</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>40,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>595,700</td>
<td>198,100</td>
<td>175,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>64,700</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hertfordshire</td>
<td>123,800</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>36,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmundsbury</td>
<td>103,700</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>28,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttlesford</td>
<td>73,700</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Cambridge</td>
<td>961,600</td>
<td>316,200</td>
<td>279,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>5,728,700</td>
<td>1,835,500</td>
<td>1,650,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>51,446,200</td>
<td>16,751,000</td>
<td>15,186,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 1: Sources of population estimates

The official source of population data for local authorities in England is the Office for National Statistics, which publishes annual estimates. In addition, some local authorities, such as Cambridgeshire County Council, produce their own estimates, which are able to take account of local knowledge and local data. Differences between the ONS and Research Group estimates for Cambridgeshire in the past have mainly been attributed to long-running problems with ONS’ method for estimating international out-migration. ONS recently revised their methodology, releasing revised population estimates for 2002-2008 in May 2010. The revisions bring the ONS estimates closer to the Research Group’s figures for most districts, substantially reducing the previous discrepancies in Cambridge City, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>ONS original</th>
<th>ONS revised</th>
<th>Research Group</th>
<th>Previous difference</th>
<th>Current difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City</td>
<td>122,800</td>
<td>118,700</td>
<td>117,700</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>82,300</td>
<td>82,600</td>
<td>79,400</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>91,800</td>
<td>91,600</td>
<td>92,900</td>
<td>-1,100</td>
<td>-1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>168,900</td>
<td>165,200</td>
<td>163,100</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>139,300</td>
<td>142,400</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>-3,200</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>605,100</td>
<td>600,600</td>
<td>595,600</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, Cambridgeshire has a similar age structure to the region and country as a whole. Most districts within the county follow the same pattern, with two main exceptions. Cambridge City has a much higher proportion of the population aged 15 to 24 than elsewhere, and the proportion aged 25 to 44 is also slightly higher. This is mainly due to the City’s student population. Fenland has a slightly higher proportion of residents aged 65 plus.
Forecast Population Change

Opportunities for the workless stemming from an ageing population in the north and associated decrease in levels of economic activity.

The population aged over 45 is forecast to increase in absolute terms in all districts. Cambridge City is the only district forecast to see a marked increase in the population aged 25 to 44. This potentially means less competition for jobs in the north of the county and an opportunity to get more workless people into jobs.

Figure 1 compares future population change by age across the Cambridgeshire districts. This shows that Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire will experience an absolute increase in the population of all age groups. Additionally, all districts will see an increase in the number of people in their population aged over 45. The increase will be most marked in the population aged over 65. In East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and Huntingdonshire, these increases will be offset by decreases in the number of people aged under 44, most notably among those aged 25-44. Cambridge City is the only district forecast to see a marked rise in the population aged 25-44. Across Cambridgeshire the 65+ age group formed 16% of the population in 2008 but by 2021 is forecast to form 21%. The impact of this ageing will be felt in all districts except Cambridge City.

Migration

Competition from seasonal migrant labour in the north and east

International migration and migration within the UK are and will continue to be important drivers of population and economic growth in Cambridgeshire; the high tech sector is highly dependent on a supply of skilled labour which cannot be met within the region or country. In the north of the county migrant workers appear to stay temporarily, working in seasonal employment such as farming. This has meant increased competition in traditional areas of work for lower skilled workers, particularly Cambridgeshire’s Gypsy/Traveller population. Although WRS registrations have fallen during the recession a decrease in vacancies and increase in NINo registrations will mean the impact on labour supply competition is probably unchanged but if the trend continues, the level of competition may reduce over the longer term.

Cambridgeshire County Council Research Group estimates that net migration (both internal and international) accounted for 70% of the county’s population change between 2001 and 2008. Indicative figures from ONS suggest that around half of net migration was internal (from within the rest of the UK) and half was international. Migration is expected to remain an important driver for population growth in Cambridgeshire. The Research Group’s 2008-based forecasts indicate that migration will account for 56% of
population growth between 2008 and 2021. International migration would be expected to remain a significant element of this.

Between 2002/3 and 2008/9, 49,200 overseas people registered for a National Insurance Number (NiNo) in Cambridgeshire. Of these, 48% registered in Cambridge City, 14% in Fenland and approximately 12% each in Huntingdonshire, South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire. A rise in local NiNo registrations between 2007/8 to 2008/9 (see Figure 2) runs counter to regional and national trends where migration declined following the recession.

Worker Registration Scheme (WRS) figures for Cambridgeshire show the highest numbers of WRS registrations were in Fenland, East Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City. In all districts, the highest number of registrations was from Polish migrants. The main sectors of employment were administration, business and managerial industries and agriculture in the north of the county and the hospitality sector in Cambridge City.

**Figure 2: Number of National Insurance Number and Workers Registrations Scheme Registrations in Cambridgeshire**

Source: DWP and Home Office (via Local Government Analysis and Research)

Although there are no sources showing the number of migrant workers leaving the county, and therefore no accurate way of establishing how many migrant workers reside in the county, the Annual Population Survey estimates that the proportion of residents born abroad has risen by 4 percentage points since the 2001 census, compared to 3 percentage points nationally. This would imply there are now an additional 25-30,000 migrants living in Cambridgeshire compared to 2001. The highest percentage point increase in the county has been in Cambridge City and the lowest in Fenland. The low increase in Fenland is interesting as there have been a relatively high number of NiNo and WRS registrations in the district. This implies that many migrants do not remain in the area very long, reflecting the fact that many work in agriculture which experiences a high demand for seasonal employment. The high increase in Cambridge City may reflect the settling of highly skilled migrants who were originally recruited into the high tech and health industries, which are highly dependent on a supply of skilled labour that cannot be met within the region or country.

The 2001 Census recorded 91% of Cambridgeshire residents as White British, 5% White Irish or White other and 4% from ethnic groups other than White. The highest proportion of ethnic minority groups was found in Cambridge City, most likely reflecting the high number of international students, and the lowest was in Fenland. Cambridgeshire’s largest ethnic minority group was Asian/Asian British.
Gypsies and Travellers

The 2001 Census did not allow Gypsies or Travellers to identify themselves as belonging to distinct ethnic groups. This means that the Census cannot provide a count of the size of Cambridgeshire’s Traveller population. The best source of local information is the County Council’s 2006 Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment.

The following information is taken from paragraphs 2.2.4 and 2.3.1 of the Need Assessment:

The Need Assessment estimated the Gypsy/Traveller population in Cambridgeshire together with Peterborough, Forest Heath, St Edmundsbury and Kings Lynn and West Norfolk at around 6,800. This made them potentially the second largest ethnic minority in the study area, similar in size to the Indian population.

Most Gypsies/Travellers prefer self-employment, in such occupations as farm and land work, tree-lopping, vehicle trading, tarmacking, carpet-dealing and external building work.

The survey found evidence that:

a) Types of work had changed over the years, with a decline in traditional farm work, and increased competition from cheaper immigrant labour.

b) Gypsies/Travellers find it increasingly difficult to make a living from traditional occupations, contributing to severe economic disadvantage and social exclusion.

c) Difficulties in travelling, and being moved frequently, made it harder to get work. Some Gypsies now travel more to continental Europe, and Irish Travellers have entered the sub-region in search of work.

d) Family networks and informal reciprocal arrangements are important for encouraging and sustaining economic activity.

e) Seasonal social security benefits are important income sources, especially for those on council sites.

f) Difficulties with the theory part of the driving test (because of low literacy levels) is affecting younger Gypsies/Travellers.

Traveller skills

Future economic opportunities for Traveller communities are strongly linked to access to flexible training and education

Traveller communities have a strong preference for self employment however a recent reduction in some employment opportunities has caused high levels of unemployment. Focus group work suggests that future economic opportunities were strongly linked to access to training and education that takes account of the difficulties of travellers in accessing mainstream service provision.

A piece of research recently undertaken by the Ormiston Trust looked at skills and employment among Traveller communities.

For many Gypsies and Travellers school is only one aspect within a broader concept of education. Some Travellers note that time spent in school is at the expense of “learning to be a successful Traveller”. Teachers also need to recognise the ‘adult’ status of young people from Gypsy and Traveller communities and the importance to some pupils of learning the family business. Boys in particular are often encouraged to work with their fathers and learn life skills rather than stay in school.

Evidence from France, where distance learning materials have been more fully developed, has reported high levels of success in delivering education to Travelling families.
Very little research or consultation relating to Gypsies and Travellers and skills and employment exists. What research does exist suggests that there is a strong preference for self employment among communities and there is a broad skill base that goes unrecognised. There has been a reduction in some employment opportunities (such as agriculture) traditionally filled by Gypsies and Travellers. There is evidence of high levels of unemployment among those living on local authority sites. Opportunities to develop social enterprise, recycling initiatives and support for small businesses with Gypsy and Traveller groups should be explored further.

Focus group work with travellers identified that future economic opportunities were strongly linked to access to training and education. Among the focus group members there was unanimous support for greater access to adult learning opportunities, particularly in relation to basic skills and IT.

Current uptake by Gypsies and Travellers of existing training provision and further education appears to be extremely low. However this does not appear to reflect a lack of interest but rather a difficulty in accessing existing service provision. Studies examining post-16 learning opportunities within Hertfordshire highlighted a range of barriers. Of these, respondents identified childcare and family commitments as the major barrier (this could be reflective of a respondent group in which 80% were female). Other reasons given included a lack of access to transport, a lack of confidence, a lack of support, financial reasons, and a lack of time. In identifying strategies to help participation in formal learning opportunities, respondents identified the key factors as flexible times, childcare provision, transport, one to one lessons and personal support.

First hand work experience was recognised to be the preferred method of training for employment among many young Travellers and felt by many to be the most beneficial preparation for adult roles.
The Workless Population

**Definition box**

The Workless Population is defined by the Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government as all those people who are out of work but would like a job. This can include those labelled as ‘economically inactive’ in addition to the unemployed, labelled as ‘economically active’.

A person is economically inactive if they are out of work and not seeking or available for work. This may be because, for example, they are a student; they are looking after their home or family or unable to work through sickness or disability. To be unemployed, a person must be out of work but available to start work in the next two weeks. They may be waiting to start a job or they may have been actively seeking work in the last four weeks.

Traditionally, the economically active population was thought to form the potential labour supply in an area, however more recently it has been acknowledged that a proportion of the economically inactive may wish/be able to work if they were given the right opportunity.

Unemployment and Economic Inactivity

**Box 2: Sources of Unemployment Estimates**

A number of different data sources can be used to measure or track unemployment. The Jobseekers’ Allowance claimant count has traditionally been the official measure of unemployment. This is, however, a ‘narrow’ measure of unemployment, as it only includes those people who are actually entitled to claim, and do claim, Jobseekers’ Allowance. This measure does not include those people who do not claim or are not entitled to claim, but who are actively seeking work. The Jobseekers’ Allowance claimant count remains a useful indicator as counts are released monthly and for small areas; this data source will therefore be considered later in this section.

Unemployment in labour market terms has an internationally agreed definition as recommended by the International Labour Organisation (ILO). Unemployment in this context refers to people without a job, who want a job, who have actively sought work within the last four weeks and are available to start work in the next two weeks; it also refers to people who have found a job and are waiting to start in the next two weeks. The percentage of economically active people who are unemployed by this definition is now considered to provide a more realistic indication and measure of ‘true’ unemployment.

The ONS Annual Population Survey provides estimates of unemployment along with data on economic activity and inactivity as presented elsewhere in this report. As the APS has a relatively small sample size, however, and as the unemployed form only a small proportion of the population, measures from the APS can be prone to fluctuation and unreliability. To overcome this, the Office for National Statistics has developed a statistical model that provides more robust estimates of unemployment for local authorities by ‘borrowing strength’ from claimant count data. The model-based unemployment estimates cannot be broken down by population characteristics; however, therefore although the model-based estimates are the most reliable, data from the APS are also presented in this section.

**36,000 workless individuals**

The unemployment rate in Fenland is close to the national average of around 7%. Unemployment across the rest of the county is low and relatively low economic inactivity rates across all districts means that there should be more opportunity to get the 36,000 residents that are workless into jobs when the economy recovers, providing they have the right skills.

In 2009, unemployment across most Cambridgeshire districts was well below the national average of 6.9%. The closest to the national average is found in Fenland, where 6.7% of the economically active population is unemployed. Within the county, unemployment is lowest in South Cambridgeshire at 3.9%.
APS figures suggest that men are slightly more likely to be unemployed than women in Cambridgeshire.

A lower proportion (16.7%) of Cambridgeshire’s working age residents claimed to be economically inactive in 2009 than was the case regionally (18.2%). Cambridge City had much higher levels of economic inactivity, accounted for mainly by the large student population. Undergraduate students at Cambridge University are generally not permitted to work during term time.

Economic inactivity is defined as being out of work and not seeking work or being unavailable to start work, however the Annual Population Survey does ask those identified as economically inactive whether they want a job. For Cambridgeshire, the APS estimates that of the 63,000 economically inactive, 14,300 wanted a job.

Combining the economically inactive wanting a job with the total number of unemployed gives an indicative figure of just under 36,000 working age residents who are currently without work but who may be able to work, given the right opportunity.
For ethnic minorities, language barriers and cultural issues can make it difficult for individuals to engage in economic activity. Also inflexible and below standard support provision allied with cultural misconceptions can limit the opportunities available. (East of England Economic Participation study, completed by TERU, Glasgow University for EEDA, October 2009).\(^1\)

Figure 4 compares levels of economic inactivity by ethnic group in the East of England and England. Cambridgeshire data are not presented due to small numbers in the Annual Population Survey. Across both the region and the country, people from ethnic minority groups are more likely to be economically inactive than the White population. While regional economic inactivity rates are lower than nationally among most groups, they are similar to the national level among the Pakistani/Bangladeshi population. It is likely that this reflects particularly low economic activity among women.

Figure 5 compares levels of unemployment by ethnic group across the region and country. People from Pakistani/Bangladeshi, Black/Black British and Mixed ethnic groups are more likely to be unemployed than the White population.

---

\(^{1}\) [http://www.eeda.org.uk/3411.asp](http://www.eeda.org.uk/3411.asp)
Figure 5: Unemployment by ethnic group, East of England and England
Source: ONS Annual Population Survey 2008-2009
Note: % of economically active 16+ population

Table 2 compares summary measures of economic inactivity and unemployment by ethnic group. Across Cambridgeshire, ethnic minorities make up just under 7% of the working age population, but represent 8.5% of the economically inactive population and over 13% of the unemployed population. This means that ethnic minority groups are over-represented among those not in work. Similarly, while 16% of the White working age population is economically inactive, the proportion among ethnic minorities is 21%. While the APS indicates that 5% of the White population is unemployed, the comparable figure among ethnic minority groups is 12% (approximately 2400 individuals).

It is interesting to note that the APS suggests the employment rate among Cambridgeshire’s ethnic minorities is the same as nationally, yet total unemployment in Cambridgeshire is lower. This suggests that the inequality between the employment rates of minority groups and the White population is wider locally than nationally.

Table 2: Economic inactivity and unemployment by ethnicity
Source: ONS Annual Population Survey 2008-2009
Note: Economic activity rate is as % of working age population; unemployment rate is as % of 16+ population
Disability

High level of disability and incapacity benefit claimants in Fenland

One in four Fenland working age residents consider themselves disabled according to the Annual Population Survey; more than the national average of nearly one in five. However, the disabled population of all districts, including Fenland, are more likely to be in employment than is the case nationally. The high level of disability reported in Fenland reflects a particularly high proportion of residents claiming Incapacity Benefit/Employment Support Allowance.

When responding to the Annual Population Survey, nearly one in Cambridgeshire residents of working age consider themselves to have a work limiting disability and/or current disability that affects their day to day activities. This is similar to the national average. Rates vary from 16% in Huntingdonshire to nearly 25% in Fenland, although it should be noted that these estimates are based on relatively small sample sizes.

In all districts across Cambridgeshire, the economic activity and employment rate among disabled people is significantly higher than seen nationally.

Within Cambridgeshire, Cambridge City shows the lowest rates of economic activity and employment among disabled people, while East Cambridgeshire shows the highest.

Table 3: Economic activity and employment among disabled people (% working age pop)
Source: ONS Annual Population Survey, July 2008 to June 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of working age population that is disabled</th>
<th>Economic Activity Rate</th>
<th>Employment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Non-disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hertfordshire</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmundsbury</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttlesford</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Cambridge</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of work benefit claimants

**Definition box**

Out of work benefit claimants include both those individuals classed as economically active (Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants) and economically inactive (Lone Parents income support, Employment and Support Allowance, other income related benefits). More information on individual benefits can be found later in this section.

**Worklessness concentrated in the west and north**

Huntingdonshire and Fenland account for over 50% of the county’s out of work benefit claimants. A high proportion of Fenland’s working age residents claim Employment Support Allowance/Incapacity Benefit (ESA/IB) compared with local, regional and national figures. This reflects high levels of job loss and unemployment going back to the 1980s when claimants were first shifted onto Incapacity Benefit, and a traditional industrial structure of manual labour in sectors such as farming and manufacturing.

Table 4 below shows the total number of out of work benefit claimants, grouped by their primary benefit as determined by the Department for Work and Pensions. In practice there could be more individuals claiming Lone Parents or other income support but if they also claim ESA/IB or JSA they are grouped under one of these two headings in order to avoid double counting. Huntingdonshire and Fenland have the largest number of benefit claimants. Almost twice as many residents claim Employment and Support Allowance or Incapacity Benefit as claim Jobseeker’s Allowance.

**Table 4: Out of work benefit claimants**

Source: DWP, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Employment and Support Allowance/Incapacity Benefit</th>
<th>Lone Parents</th>
<th>Others on income related support</th>
<th>JSA claimants</th>
<th>Total Out of Work Benefit Claimants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>7,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>16,270</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>31,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that although the numbers claiming Employment and Support Allowance or Incapacity Benefit are very similar in Fenland and Huntingdonshire, the claimants make up a significantly larger proportion of the working age population in Fenland. All other benefit claimants within Fenland are at proportions equivalent to national figures. Fenland has a significantly higher proportion of JSA claimants and Lone Parent claimants than other districts across Cambridgeshire.

**Table 5: Out of work benefit claimants as a proportion of working age population**

Source: DWP, 2009 (2010, JSA claimants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Employment and Support Allowance/Incapacity Benefit (%)</th>
<th>Lone Parents (%)</th>
<th>Others on income related benefits (%)</th>
<th>JSA (%)</th>
<th>Total Out of Work Benefits (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants

Definition box

Jobseeker’s Allowance is the main benefit for people of working age who are out of work. To qualify, recipients must be: available for and actively seeking work; between 18 and State Pension age; and working less than 16 hours per week on average. Recipients must be capable of work – those too ill to work may now receive Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) or other benefits for people who are sick or disabled.

JSA claimants are considered a ‘narrow’ measure of unemployment. As not all unemployed people claim JSA, claimant rates are lower than shown by ‘broad’ measures such as the ONS model-based estimates.

Increasing employment inequalities

The highest increases in JSA claimant rate have occurred in those areas with the highest rates, notably Fenland, Huntingdon North and Kings Hedges, along with parts of St Neots and Littleport. The recession is therefore likely to have increased employment inequalities across the county and employability service provision needs to reflect this. Younger (18-24) claimants are over-represented within the JSA claimant population, particularly in Fenland where the resident age profile is older than average. Data suggests that a significant proportion of ethnic minority unemployed people are not claiming benefits, meaning they are unlikely to be engaging with mainstream employability provision.

Figure 6 shows the trend in proportion of the working age population claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance over the last ten years. JSA claimant rates in Cambridgeshire continue to be below the national average, however nationally, the claimant rate fell slightly over much of the decade, narrowing the gap relative to Cambridgeshire. Post recession, rates in Cambridgeshire have been consistently lower and have increased less than nationally.

Figure 6: Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants as % working age population, 2001-2010
Source: JSA Claimant Count, Nomis

As displayed in Table 6 and Figure 7, the recession has had varying impacts on the Cambridgeshire districts in terms of the claimant count rate.
Table 6: Number of Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants, January 2008 to January 2010
Source: JSA Claimant Count, Nomis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Jan-09</th>
<th>Jul-09</th>
<th>Jan-10</th>
<th>% change Jan 08-Jan 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>141.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>108.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>151.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>147.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>4,641</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>7,727</td>
<td>9,873</td>
<td>9,965</td>
<td>114.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>154.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hertfordshire</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>171.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmundsbury</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttlesford</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>203.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Cambridge</td>
<td>7,125</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>12,454</td>
<td>15,947</td>
<td>16,113</td>
<td>126.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>58,229</td>
<td>59,870</td>
<td>95,475</td>
<td>118,930</td>
<td>124,473</td>
<td>113.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>690,667</td>
<td>722,897</td>
<td>1,065,839</td>
<td>1,311,098</td>
<td>1,369,811</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>830,542</td>
<td>871,288</td>
<td>1,282,645</td>
<td>1,573,139</td>
<td>1,654,025</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Greater Cambridge districts except Fenland have shown a lower percentage point increase in the claimant rate than the national average. The increases in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire have been particularly low at just 0.8 and 1.1 percentage points respectively. Fenland is the only district to show an increase in the claimant rate on a par with the national increase, taking the overall claimant rate in January 2010 to 4.4%, just higher than the national figure.

Figure 7: Cambridgeshire’s Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants as % working age population
Source: JSA Claimant Count, Nomis

Another impact of the recession has been underemployment. The recession is causing more people to take on jobs below their skill level, impacting negatively on individuals with lower skills competing for the same jobs. Furthermore, many individuals are being encouraged or choosing to undertake Level 4 qualifications even when their desired job doesn’t require it.
The distribution of JSA claimants within Cambridgeshire is explored further in Map 1 overleaf, which compares the claimant rate across the county’s electoral wards. This shows that the claimant rate is low (under 2%) across most of South Cambridgeshire and rural parts of East Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire. Areas where the rate is similar to or higher than the national average are concentrated in the north of Cambridge, Huntingdon North, parts of March and Whittlesey and much of Wisbech and its surrounding rural area.

Map 2 shows the percentage point change in the claimant rate over the two years from December 2007 to December 2009. This shows clearly that the highest increases have been concentrated in the areas with the highest rates, notably Fenland, Huntingdon North and King’s Hedges along with parts of St Neots and Littleport. The implication of this is that the recession has had a more profound impact on communities that were already doing less well. In this sense the recession is likely to have increased inequalities across the county.
Map 1: % working age population claiming JSA, by ward, December 2009

Source: JSA Claimant Count December 2009, Nomis; rates based on CCC Research Group ward population estimates

Cambridgeshire Jobseekers Allowance Claimants December 2009: % of working age population

Cambridgeshire average: 2.6%
England average: 4.1%

Source: NOMIS - JSA Claimant Count, December 2009
Map 2: Percentage point change in the JSA claimant rate, by ward, December 2007 - 2009
Source: JSA Claimant Count December 2007 & 2009, Nomis; rates based on CCCRG ward population estimates
Around 70% of JSA claimants are male in all Cambridgeshire districts, reflecting the national breakdown. The majority of JSA claimants are in the 25-49 age bracket, however Fenland has a slightly higher proportion of younger claimants (18-24) than is seen nationally, indicating an overrepresentation of this age group in the JSA claimant population given that they make up a small proportion of the total resident population. Since the onset of the recession, increases in the number of JSA claimants have been fairly equitable across all age ranges.

Across Cambridgeshire, just under 5% of JSA claimants are from ethnic minority groups, yet APS data suggests ethnic minorities make up 13% of the unemployed population. On comparing the proportion of JSA claimants from minority groups with the proportion of the working age population from minority groups, ethnic minorities are over-represented among JSA claimants nationally, yet under-represented across Cambridgeshire. It seems likely that the figures at least partly reflect lower uptake of benefits to which people are entitled.
Incapacity Benefit, Severe Disablement Allowance & Employment Support Allowance Claimants

**Definition box**
Incapacity Benefit (IB) is a payment for people who become incapable of work while under State Pension age. Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) was introduced on 27 October 2008 and replaces Incapacity Benefit for new claimants. Existing IB recipients will move to the new benefit between 2010 and 2013. Severe Disablement Allowance (SDA) has not been available to new claimants since 2001, but some people who began claiming prior to then still receive it. New claimants would since have received IB instead, now replaced by ESA.

**ESA/IB claimant rate increasing**
Of particular concern is a steady increase in the ESA/IB claimant rate in Fenland since 2000, compared with a steady decrease nationally. JSA claimant rates across Cambridgeshire increased significantly with the recession, but the rate of increase was no higher, and for most districts, lower, than that seen nationally, indicating a relatively resilient economy across most of the county. One impact of the recession has been many people taking jobs lower than their skill level, impacting negatively on people with lower skills levels competing for the same jobs.

The number of residents claiming out of work benefits increased steadily from 2000, with a sharp increase from 2008 to 2009 caused by increased numbers of JSA claimants, reflecting the impact of the recession.

Employment Support Allowance / Incapacity Benefit (ESA/IB) claimants form a significant proportion of all out of work benefit claimants and are responsible for much of the steady increase from 2000, yet as a proportion of the working age population, the ESA/IB claimant rate has remained fairly constant across most districts in Cambridgeshire apart from Fenland.

From 2000 to 2009, the number of ESA/IB claimants in Fenland increased at a faster rate than any other district in the sub region and Fenland is the only district to see a steady increase in claimants as a proportion of the resident working age population. This contrasts with a steady decrease nationally.

**Figure 8: Incapacity Benefit and Employment Support Allowance claimants as a proportion of resident working age population**
Source: DWP, 2000-2009
Long term claimants – variations in pattern and nature of ESA/IB claims between Fenland and Cambridge City

Nearly 8% of Fenland’s working age population claim IB/SDA/ESA, over 4000 individuals. Over half of these claimants have been claiming for over five years. A higher than average proportion of Fenland-based IB/ESA claims are for musculoskeletal disorders, reflecting the district’s background in agriculture and heavy industry. A high proportion of Cambridge City based IB/ESA claims are for mental/behavioural disorders. Cambridge City also has a higher than average proportion of male IB/ESA claimants aged between 25 and 49. Provision of support for IB/ESA clients needs to ensure it is sensitive to these variations.

Figure 9 shows how the proportion of the working age population claiming one of these benefits varies by district. The proportion of claimants in Fenland is approaching double that of Cambridge City, which has the next highest proportion in the county. In contrast, the rates in South Cambridgeshire and Uttlesford are around half of the national average.

Figure 9: % working age population claiming IB/SDA/ESA, by district
Source: DWP, Nomis, year to August 2009

Figure 10 shows the duration of IB/SDA/ESA claims across Cambridgeshire. Over 50% of people have been claiming one of these benefits for over five years and just 18% began claiming within the last year. The distribution seen for Cambridgeshire overall is close to the national average and there is remarkably little variation by district.
The most common conditions associated with an IB/SDA claim in Cambridgeshire are mental and behavioural disorders. 42% of claims are made for this reason, which is a similar proportion to nationally. In Cambridge City, however, the proportion is much higher at 57%. The proportion of people claiming due to diseases of the musculoskeletal system or connective tissue disease is higher than nationally in Fenland. Claims related to diseases of the nervous system are more common than nationally in Uttlesford. Other proportions are broadly similar to nationally.

Table 7: Incapacity benefit and Severe Disablement Allowance claimants by condition
Source: DWP, Nomis, year to August 2009. Note: Data do not include ESA (new) claimants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mental and behavioural disorders</th>
<th>Nervous system diseases</th>
<th>Circulatory system diseases</th>
<th>Musculoskeletal &amp; connective tissue diseases</th>
<th>Other symptoms, signs &amp; abnormal findings</th>
<th>Injury, poisoning &amp; other external causes</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambs</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambs</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Herts</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Eds</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttlesford</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Cambs</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 shows claimants of Incapacity Benefit and Severe Disabled Allowance broken down by gender and age. Broadly the distribution across age and gender of Cambridgeshire claimants matches the national and regional distribution; however Cambridge has a particularly high proportion of male claimants aged between 25 and 49.
Figure 11: Incapacity benefit and Severe Disablement Allowance claimants by age and gender

Source: DWP, Nomis, year to August 2009. Note: Data do not include ESA (new) claimants
Indices of Deprivation 2007

The Indices of Deprivation, published by Communities and Local Government, present a comprehensive measure of relative deprivation across small areas of England. The Indices contain seven ‘domains’ of deprivation, which are combined to give the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). The IMD allows direct comparison between areas while recognising the multidimensional nature of deprivation. The seven individual domains are: income deprivation; employment deprivation; health deprivation and disability; education, skills and training deprivation; barriers to housing and services; living environment deprivation; and crime.

The Indices of deprivation measure deprivation at lower super output area (LSOA) level. Each LSOA is made up of a grouping of Census output areas and contains, on average, about 1,500 residents. There are 365 LSOAs in Cambridgeshire and 32,482 in England.

Each domain of the Indices is composed of a number of different indicators, which are combined to give each LSOA a score. The scores are then ranked, with the LSOA ranked 1 being the most deprived. It is this relative position that is key to the Indices of Deprivation; the scores do not allow absolute deprivation to be determined, but allow comparison of an area’s deprivation relative to other areas.

More information on the Indices of Deprivation is available on the CLG website: http://www.communities.gov.uk/communities/neighbourhoodrenewal/deprivation/deprivation07/

In addition, further maps and analysis for Cambridgeshire are available on the County Council’s website: http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/research/economylab/deprivation/IMD2007.htm

Fenland wards among most deprived in the country

There is a clear geographical pattern to deprivation in Cambridgeshire, with more deprived areas clustering to the north and east of the county and less deprived areas clustering to the south and east. Fenland is the only district that contains small areas among the most deprived in national terms.

Table 8 summarises the number of LSOAs in each district that fall within the most deprived 20% nationally on a selection of domains. On the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation, Fenland is the only district with LSOAs among the most deprived. This means that these three LSOAs are the only ones in the sub-region that would be considered ‘deprived’ in national terms. More LSOAs feature among the most deprived for individual domains. 23 LSOAs are among the most deprived nationally in terms of education, skills and training. These are mostly located in Fenland and Huntingdonshire.

Table 8: Number of LSOAs among most deprived 20% nationally
Source: CLG, ID2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total number of LSOAs</th>
<th>Number of LSOAs among most deprived national 20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hertfordshire</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Edmundsbury</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttlesford</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maps 3 to 5 overleaf show the Index of Multiple Deprivation by LSOA in Cambridgeshire and a selection of individual domains. These are shaded relative to national deprivation quintiles, so only those LSOA among the most deprived nationally are shaded the darkest colour.

Overall, there is a consistent geographical pattern seen across all the maps, which is broadly shared with the income and benefit claimant maps presented previously. In all cases, areas to the north and east of the county tend to rank among the more deprived nationally, while areas to the south and west tend to rank among the less deprived. The same pattern can be seen within Cambridge City. The main exceptions to this geographical trend tend to be parts of Huntingdon and St Neots. In addition, an LSOA covering Papworth scores among the more deprived in terms of employment and health. This may be because of the Papworth Trust, which provides accommodation for disabled people.
Map 3: Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007
Source: CLG ID2007
Map 4: Employment Deprivation
Source: CLG ID2007

Indices of Deprivation 2007: Employment Deprivation, rankings relative to England

Employment Deprivation National Rankings
- Ranked 1-6,496 (most deprived nationally) (5)
- Ranked 6,496-12,992 (48)
- Ranked 12,992-19,496 (52)
- Ranked 19,496-25,995 (85)
- Ranked 25,995-32,482 (least deprived nationally) (175)

Based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes copyright and may lead to prosecution. 1000235295 2010.
Map 5: Education, Skills and Training Deprivation
Source: CLG ID2007
Employment and Skills

Skills and Participation in Education, Employment and Training

Low qualifications in Fenland; NEET hotspots in Fenland, Huntingdon and Cambridge City

A higher proportion of Fenland’s working age population has no qualifications than seen nationally and proportions of 16-19 year olds that are NEET are highest in Fenland and Cambridge City. As individuals with low skill levels are limited in their employment opportunities it will be important to raise skills levels in these districts in order to reduce future economic and social exclusion.

Across England 12% of adults have no qualifications. This proportion is lower across all districts in Cambridgeshire except Fenland, where 14% of the population has no qualifications.

Figure 12: % 19-59/64 population with no qualifications
Source: ONS Annual Population Survey Jan-December 2008

Local data on the numbers and proportions of young people that are not in education, employment or training (known as NEET) are available from Cambridgeshire Connexions. Figure 13 compares proportions across the Cambridgeshire districts. Note that the data shown here may not be comparable to that published elsewhere as time periods, age coverage and denominators may vary. Proportions of young people NEET are highest in Fenland (8%) and Cambridge City (7.5%) and lowest in South Cambridgeshire (3.7%).

Figure 13: % of 16-19 year olds NEET by Cambridgeshire district, December 2009
Source: Cambridgeshire Connexions Q32009

Individuals with low skills levels are limited in their employment opportunities, which in turn limit income levels. Low skills are linked with poor health, crime and low social cohesion. Low skills also impact on the productivity and competitiveness of business and economies. Consequently, the number of young people who are NEET is a major predictor of future economic and social exclusion (EP Study, 20092).

2 http://www.eeda.org.uk/3411.asp
Employer Demand Issues

- High levels of entrepreneurialism but low levels of part time working

A similar proportion of Cambridgeshire residents are self-employed to that seen nationally, with levels highest in South Cambridgeshire and lowest in Huntingdonshire, however the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor rates the East of England as one of the most entrepreneurial in the UK, so it is perhaps surprising that self employment is not higher. The proportion of people working part time is generally lower in Cambridgeshire than nationally. Part time work can be an important route back into work for the unemployed, including parents.

The ways in which people offer jobs (i.e. flexibly) can have a significant impact on worklessness.

13% of Cambridgeshire’s employed residents are self-employed. This is the same proportion as nationally. Within the county proportions vary from 11% in Huntingdonshire and Cambridge City to 18% in South Cambridgeshire, as shown in Figure 14. The 2008 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) report regarded the East of England as one of the most entrepreneurial in the UK, with particularly high rates of business start ups among people aged between 18-24 and women, so it is surprising that self employment rates are not slightly higher.

Figure 14: Proportion of employed residents who are self employed
Source: ONS Annual Population Survey, July 2008 to June 2009

Part-time working is slightly less common in Cambridgeshire than nationally, with 22% of local residents working part-time compared to 24% nationally. Just East Cambridgeshire and Forest Heath have a higher proportion of part-time workers than nationally. St Edmundsbury has a particularly low proportion of part-time workers at just 16%. A lack of part-time opportunities could act to the detriment of unemployed people, particularly parents, seeking more flexible hours.

Figure 15: Proportion of employed residents working part-time
Source: ONS Annual Population Survey, July 2008 to June 2009
Skills demand and forecasting

Skills demand in health, retail, tourism, creative industries, agriculture, manufacturing.

Pre-recession, education and health, business services and construction saw the largest growth, however the recession hit construction and business services hard, and higher education budgets have recently been significantly reduced. In the short and medium term, health, retail and business services are likely to provide the greatest number of opportunities for employment however recent vacancy levels are significantly lower than those previously seen, limiting the opportunities available for the unemployed. Longer term, health, tourism, creative industries, agriculture and high value manufacturing may be the sectors that pull Cambridgeshire out of the recession.

Drawing on labour market statistics, local strategic documentation and the focus group with local stakeholders, this section considers where future employment opportunities are most likely so that future ESF and mainstream provision can be designed to support and prepare workless individuals towards and into real, sustainable jobs.

Recent Employment Trends

Learning first from the five years leading up to the start of the recession, employment growth in Cambridgeshire was greatest in:

- By industry: public administration; education and health; financial and business services; and construction.
- By occupation: professional occupations; and managers and senior officials.

In contrast, manufacturing employment declined but by only 4% suggesting that Cambridgeshire’s high-tech manufacturing is more robust than the traditional manufacturing functions elsewhere. By occupation declines were greatest in lower-skilled service sector occupations such as administrative and secretarial, sales and customer service, and personal service occupations.

Current and Short-Term Opportunities

Using Jobcentre Plus vacancy data and local input, the greatest numbers of opportunities currently or recently available are in:

- **Health and Care sector.** The sector is widely viewed as a growing employment sector but struggles to recruit and retain staff due to the perceived negative image of the sector.

- **Retail sector.** The retail sector has been affected by the recession with a number of prominent high street chains closing, but the high turnover rates within the sector mean there is a regular flow of entry-level vacancies in Cambridgeshire.

- **Business and professional services.** The sector, which spans ICT, legal, finance and accounting, marketing and advertising, and real estate services, is a major employer in Cambridgeshire and had a high number of vacancies in 2009.

- **Elementary occupations.** Jobs such as seasonal agricultural jobs in Fenland and security jobs will continue to become available.

However, in mid-late 2010 the number of vacancies advertised through Job Centre Plus has significantly reduced. This will inevitably start to impact on JSA claimant figures as people increasingly struggle to find work.

Longer-Term Opportunities

Looking further forward, the local focus group highlighted opportunities from the **New Industry, New Jobs** growth sectors and a ‘high-tech’ cluster developing around biotechnology, software, instruments & engineering, ICT non-software, sound & imaging, materials, printing and packaging, and environmental goods and services. However, it was recognised that the number of lower-skilled jobs within these sectors may be limited. The local construction industry is also expected to pick up – especially around the
ecotown development at Northstowe (the UK’s first ecotown), where there are plans for approximately 9,500 new homes. Beyond these, the *Greater Cambridge Sub-Regional Economic Strategy 2009-2012* (Greater Cambridge Partnership, 2009) put forward the following potentially important sectors.

- **Health** – linked to the biotechnology cluster.
- **Tourism and hospitality** – with particular benefits flowing from the 2012 Olympics.
- **Creative industries** – in particular publishing, computer games and software.
- **Agriculture** – remains an important sector with future opportunities from building on the existing success of the agri-business sector and in diversifying into biorenewables.
Accessibility and Quality of Life

Cambridgeshire is partly a rural county. The rural geographies have low population densities and this impacts on residents’ access to jobs and education, training and employability services (EP study, October 2009\(^3\)).

Rural communities are characterised by low levels of economic participation due to the lack of local opportunities. Limited access to jobs and education, training and employability services means individuals without access to private transport and on low incomes are particularly affected. Many young people move away from rural areas because of the limited job opportunities. Access to transport is likely to be a key barrier to the economic participation rate in rural areas. In Cambridgeshire 17% of the economically inactive 16 to 74 year olds live in a household without access to a private car (2001) (EP study, October 2009\(^4\)).

Access to education

Accessibility data collected by the DfT suggests that ease of access to both secondary and further education is lowest in East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, South Cambridgeshire and Forest Heath.\(^5\)

85% of Cambridgeshire residents participating in Further Education do so in Cambridgeshire, with 11% travelling to surrounding counties, predominantly to Peterborough Regional College, the Norfolk Campus of the College of West Anglia and Bedford College. Early year data for 2009/10 shows that Cambridgeshire residents were more likely to leave the area to take Level 2 courses, with 22% attending FE provision outside the area, compared with 13% travelling for Level 3 courses and 11% travelling for Level 1 courses. However, the main reason for the travel to learn patterns appears to be geographical proximity, with some element of choice around Level 2. The proportion of Cambridgeshire residents that travel out of the area to study in school sixth forms is much higher than the other Local Authorities in the Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk and Suffolk Sub Region. 9% of Cambridgeshire residents travel to neighbouring counties, predominantly to Stanground College, the Kings School in Peterborough, King Edward VII School in Norfolk and Newmarket College in Suffolk.\(^6\)

Most of the out-commuting for learning seems to be to counties to the north of Cambridgeshire, suggesting movement out from Fenland. It is currently unclear whether young people that travel out of an area to study are more likely to drop out than people that do not.

Access to employment

Accessibility of employment is relatively low

Accessibility of jobs by public transport, cycling or walking is relatively low across Cambridgeshire, as it is in many other rural counties. Residents of Cambridge City are most likely to be able to access jobs by sustainable means while residents of East Cambridgeshire are least likely.

National indicator 176 measures the percentage of people of economically active age with access within a reasonable time to more than 500 jobs by public transport, cycling and/or walking.

\(^3\) http://www.eeda.org.uk/3411.asp
\(^4\) ibid
\(^5\) ILR LO1 and Termly School Census SO2, quoted in YPLA Strategic Analysis 2010.
79% of Cambridgeshire residents are able to access more than 500 jobs within a reasonable time by public transport, cycling and/or walking. This is within the lower quartile of all authorities monitoring this indicator within their Local Area Agreement, but is on a par with many of the more rural authorities. Within the county, residents of Cambridge City have the greatest access to employment with 86% of residents and 85% of JSA claimants able to access employment by public transport, cycling or walking. In contrast, 72% of East Cambridgeshire and 76% of Fenland residents are able to access employment by the same means.

Table 9 Accessibility of employment
Source: DfT core accessibility data, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of working aged people who have access to job by alternative travel mode</th>
<th>% of Jobseekers who have access to jobs by alternative travel mode</th>
<th>Number of jobs accessible by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public transport or walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Edmundsbury</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hertfordshire</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttlesford</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>&gt; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cambridge</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing stock condition

Condition of housing stock relatively good but with some poorer pockets and risks of fuel poverty in some rural areas.

Generally housing stock condition is equal to or better than the national average, although with some issues around energy efficiency and fuel poverty in rural areas. Within districts there exist pockets of poorer condition housing; such as in Littleport, St Ives and Wisbech.

Housing stock condition was examined as part of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The key elements considered included; fabric cost of repair, level of unfitness, facilities and services, energy efficiency, houses in multiple occupation, health and safety and environmental assessment. The general condition of housing stock can have a significant impact on the health and well-being of residents. The following conclusions were made by district regarding housing stock condition:

Cambridge City: Generally similar dwelling conditions and better energy performance to that found nationally – possibly due in part to the universal access of areas to mains gas.

East Cambridgeshire: The highest rate of ‘unfitness’ was found to be in the Littleport and north area – the poorest condition housing appeared to be in isolated pockets rather than across a broad area. Many occupiers of dwellings requiring extensive repair and renewal were found to have low household incomes.

Huntingdonshire: Stock was of poorer condition in St Ives and the north sub-area however generally housing condition was above the national average, particularly across rural areas.

South Cambridgeshire: The vast majority of stock was found to be in good condition. Energy efficiency was the most common problem identified by the stock condition survey.

Forest Heath: Particularly problems were found in Iceni and Manor warms, particularly with respect to energy efficiency.

Fenland: In many respects, the condition of dwellings in Fenland follows the national profile however the district as a whole had levels of ‘unfitness’ slightly above the national rate – mainly due to disrepair. The Wisbech sub-area had an unfitness level above the district average and the lowest levels of energy efficiency. Not all rural parishes had a mains gas supply.

St Edmundsbury: Homes in rural parishes were found to consume far more energy than the urban centres; the report identified fuel poverty as a specific issue for the district.

For more information on housing stock, condition and tenure type, see chapters 11 and 12 of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

Fuel Poverty

The government target is to move all fuel-poor vulnerable households out of fuel poverty by 2010. The bulk of fuel poverty is in the private sector. Fuel poverty is recorded when a household spends over 10% of their net household income on heating and hot water.

Fuel poverty often leads to poor health, especially in the very old, very young and the disabled. Each winter there are over 40,000 additional deaths compared to the average mortality rate for the rest of the year.

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identified the risk of fuel poverty as a specific issue within St Edmundsbury, however low energy efficiency housing was also identified as an issue within South Cambridgeshire, Forest Heath and Fenland. In areas where average incomes are lower, poor energy efficiency could raise the risk of fuel poverty within these districts. The JSNA and Cambridgeshire Child Poverty Assessment will include a more detailed analysis of fuel poverty and its impact on deprivation.
Crime in Cambridgeshire

**Crime levels decreasing across the county.**

*Generally crime levels are decreasing across Cambridgeshire but rose in West Suffolk between 2009 and 2010. By district, the highest numbers and rates of crime were recorded in Cambridge City.*

A recent business survey undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council revealed that crime is a significant factor determining where businesses would choose to locate.

Consistent with previous years, the 2009/10 British Crime Survey (BCS) shows the risk of being a victim of any household crime was higher for households living in the most deprived areas compared with those in the least deprived areas in England (19% compared with 14%). In the most deprived areas of the country:

Between April and June 2010, 16,773 crimes were committed across Greater Cambridge. This is compared to 17,380 in the same period of 2009. There was a reduction of crime in most Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership areas across Greater Cambridge, with the one exception being within Western Suffolk, where numbers increased by 12%.

Cambridgeshire Police collate data for the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships within the county on crime trends. The following graphs outline the progress each Crime and Disorder Partnership has made since 2007 with regards to all crime.

For Cambridgeshire overall, changes in all crime levels have been fairly similar for each Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. For all five districts we see that there has only been a nominal drop in all crime, with some seeing a slight increase over the more recent months.

The highest numbers of crime are recorded in Cambridge City and Huntingdonshire, the lowest in East Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire. The highest rates of crime (i.e. numbers of crime recorded per 1000 residents) are in Cambridge City followed by Huntingdonshire and Fenland.

**Figure 16: All Crime recorded in Cambridge City**

Source: Cambridgeshire Police

In Cambridge City the overall number of crimes has decreased on average over the past two years. However, over the longer term, there is little change in numbers. The crime

---

6 When examining crime data, crime counts are typically examined by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) areas. Within Suffolk, Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury come under the same CDRP area – Western Suffolk – which also covers Mid-Suffolk. When looking at Greater Cambridge, therefore, numbers will also include those from Mid-Suffolk.
rate per 1000 residents at around 10.2 is significantly higher in Cambridge than in other districts.

**Figure 17: All crime recorded in East Cambridgeshire**

Source: Cambridgeshire Police

The level of crime overall in East Cambridgeshire has remained relatively unchanged over the past three years. Whilst there has been a slight decline over the past year, this may change due to the slow increase in cases over the past three months. The crime rate per 1000 residents is approximately 4.4, the second lowest in the county.

**Figure 18: All crime recorded in Fenland**

Source: Cambridgeshire Police

The level of crime in Fenland over the past three years has not changed significantly. The crime rate per 1000 residents is approximately 5.9, third highest in the county and only slightly behind Huntingdonshire’s current rate of 6.1
The level of crime in Huntingdonshire over the past three years has not changed significantly. Despite there being a promising drop in numbers at the start of 2010, numbers are now on the increase and are at their highest in July 2010. As of June 2010, the crime rate per 1000 residents was 6.1, the second highest in the county – prior to June 2010, the rate was closer to 4.2, the second lowest in the county.

The level of all crime in South Cambridgeshire has decreased over the past three years, in what appears to be a steadily declining trend. The crime rate per 1000 residents is approximately 3.1, the lowest in the county.