



HAL
open science

Making the Links: Economic Deprivation, Neighbourhood Renewal and Scales of Governance

David John North, Stephen Syrett

► **To cite this version:**

David John North, Stephen Syrett. Making the Links: Economic Deprivation, Neighbourhood Renewal and Scales of Governance. *Regional Studies*, 2008, 42 (01), pp.133-148. 10.1080/00343400601147273 . hal-00514664

HAL Id: hal-00514664

<https://hal.science/hal-00514664>

Submitted on 3 Sep 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Making the Links: Economic Deprivation, Neighbourhood Renewal and Scales of Governance

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2005-0119.R2
Manuscript Type:	Policy Debates
JEL codes:	H79 - Other < H7 - State and Local Government Intergovernmental Relations < H - Public Economics, J48 - Public Policy < J4 - Particular Labor Markets < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, R23 - Regional Migration Regional Labor Markets Population < R2 - Household Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R58 - Regional Development Policy < R5 - Regional Government Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	England, deprived neighbourhoods, local economies, neighbourhood policy, regional/sub-regional economic strategy

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 **Making the Links: Economic Deprivation, Neighbourhood Renewal**
19 **and Scales of Governance**
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 DAVID NORTH and STEPHEN SYRETT
28
29
30
31

32 *Centre for Enterprise and Economic Development Research (CEEDR)*
33 *Middlesex University, The Burroughs, Hendon, London, NW4 4BT, UK.*
34 *Emails: d.north@mdx.ac.uk and s.syrett@mdx.ac.uk*
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *Revised Paper submitted to the Policy Debates section of*
44 *Regional Studies July 2006 (originally submitted June 2005)*
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Making the Links: Economic Deprivation, Neighbourhood Renewal and Scales**
4
5 **of Governance**
6
7
8
9

10 *Abstract*
11

12 A policy focus of the New Labour Government in the UK has been upon attempts to tackle
13 problems of concentrations of deprivation at the neighbourhood scale. This paper presents
14 evidence from five local authority districts to consider how issues of scale matter in seeking
15 to address such problems and the institutional arrangements and policies currently in place
16 to improve their economic prospects. The results demonstrate that for economic deprivation
17 to be tackled more effectively requires both a clearer specification of the rationale for the
18 kind of intervention needed and improved integration and co-ordination of strategies and
19 actions across spatial scales.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Key words:

35 deprived neighbourhoods; neighbourhood policy; local economies; England; regional/sub-
36 regional economic governance
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 JEL Classification: R23 R58 J48 H79
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Since New Labour came to power in the UK in 1997, a central feature of the policy agenda has been a focus upon attempts to tackle the problems arising from intense concentrations of deprivation. Such attention to deprived neighbourhoods is neither new nor confined to the UK, with a considerable history of varied interventions evident in North America and across Europe (BRIGHT, 2003; CARS, 2000; SKIFTER-ANDERSON, 2003; WILSON, 1987); interventions often prompted by high profile urban riots, whether in Los Angeles, suburban Paris or Burnley, that graphically demonstrate the challenges to social and community cohesion presented by the linking of intense spatial and social inequalities.

In the UK context, recent targeted policies at the neighbourhood scale have sought to tackle problems of social exclusion through integrated approaches that seek to simultaneously tackle problems of crime, education, health, housing, the physical environment, and employment, most notably through the New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme and the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (AUDIT COMMISSION 2002; BURGESS *et al.* 2001; IMRIE AND RACO, 2003). Yet despite a clear recognition of the importance of economic change and employment as central to the problems of deprived neighbourhoods, in practice the economic dimension of neighbourhood renewal policies remains underdeveloped, a fact that is increasingly recognised by the Government itself (e.g. ODPM, 2004).

With regard to economic development and employment policy, a fundamental question relates to the extent to which it is meaningful to look for policy solutions at the neighbourhood scale itself rather than at higher spatial scales. The failure in practice to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

develop appropriate economic policy initiatives at a very localised scale reflects that only a small proportion of economic activity is organised at the neighbourhood level. The economic processes that operate to shape the future employment prospects for the residents of deprived neighbourhoods operate at higher spatial scales and interventions narrowly focused at the neighbourhood level are consequently poorly placed to deal with these. Furthermore, neighbourhood based initiatives which seek to actively involve local people in the development process perhaps unsurprisingly prioritise immediate everyday concerns such as crime and the quality of the local physical environment, where localised initiatives can produce concrete results relatively quickly. In contrast, in the face of wider structural changes impacting upon local economies, the types of economic policy initiatives which can be usefully pursued at the neighbourhood scale remain less clear.

Current UK policy related to deprived neighbourhoods therefore raises two strongly interlinked issues which have been largely neglected within the current policy framework. The first, at a strategic level, concerns the rationale for interventions that seek to improve the economic and employment prospects for those living in deprived neighbourhoods and the appropriate scale for such interventions. The second, relates to the delivery of such strategies, in particular in terms of the ability to co-ordinate interventions across different scales to address the needs of deprived neighbourhoods.

Strategically, the rationales for economic interventions related to deprived neighbourhoods within the UK are drawn from both arguments related to economic competitiveness and social cohesion. Yet in practice, the policy environment demonstrates considerable political and practical tensions both between the pursuit of economic growth and social justice and between supply side and demand side strategies; tensions which are often reflected in the

1
2
3 positions of different government departments. Furthermore the policy focus upon 'deprived
4
5 neighbourhoods' often remains unclear as to whether it is seeking just to target areas which
6
7 have concentrations of households in the most deprived population groups (as defined by
8
9 the Government's Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004), or whether it aims to deal with issues
10
11 of deprivation rooted within the neighbourhoods themselves i.e. various 'neighbourhood
12
13 effects', such as the stigmatisation of residents through the poor reputation of a
14
15 neighbourhood, post code discrimination by employers, or the poor quality of local service
16
17 provision (ATKINSON and KINTREA, 2001; BUCK, 2001; McCULLOCH, 2001; LUPTON,
18
19 2003)[1]. In areas of more generalised deprivation, a focus on deprived neighbourhoods
20
21 can divert attention away from broader demand side deficiencies evident in the sub-regional
22
23 economy, whilst at the opposite spatial scale, the designation of deprived neighbourhoods
24
25 at the ward level has made it difficult to identify very small pockets of deprivation, although
26
27 this is now somewhat easier with the provision of data at the Super Output Area scale since
28
29 2004. Issues of scale in relation to understanding and identifying spatial concentrations of
30
31 deprivation raise important questions regarding the most appropriate levels for intervention.
32
33 Despite the preoccupation of much recent academic work with issues of changing scalar
34
35 relations, the lack of careful distinction between different scales and associated economic
36
37 processes of change evident in much discussion has in reality limited its ability to inform the
38
39 development of policy at different spatial scales (JONES and MACLEOD, 2004).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 With regard to policy delivery, although the need to promote co-ordination between national,
52
53 regional, local and neighbourhood scales within England is recognised within core New
54
55 Labour policy statements (e.g. the Urban White Paper (DETR, 2000a)), in practice the
56
57 joining-up of economic development policy has been limited, in large part due to the nature
58
59 of current governance and institutional arrangements. A surfeit of overlapping and
60

1
2
3 competing organisations and initiatives has produced a system of economic governance
4 that is multi-layered, complex and often confusing (HOUSE OF COMMONS ODPM 2003;
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

competing organisations and initiatives has produced a system of economic governance that is multi-layered, complex and often confusing (HOUSE OF COMMONS ODPM 2003; MCGREGOR *et al.*, 2003). Furthermore, the devolution of responsibilities for economic development to new regional level agencies alongside the development of the neighbourhood renewal agenda has produced fundamental tensions rooted within the rationales driving policy (ROBSON *et al.*, 2000). Whilst strategies for the pursuit of economic development and competitiveness are primarily pursued at the regional level (via the Regional Development Agencies - RDAs), those area based policies seeking to tackle social exclusion focus primarily upon the neighbourhood scale. The resulting lack of integration between economic and social agendas and different spatial scales remains fundamental, despite attempts to promote co-ordination through the introduction of Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) (GOODWIN *et al.*, 2002; FULLER *et al.*, 2004; GOODWIN, 2004).

This paper focuses attention on the missing links between the realities of change in local and regional economies in which deprived neighbourhoods are embedded and the policy responses and institutional arrangements which are currently in place to improve the economic livelihoods of those who reside in concentrated areas of deprivation. It draws upon research from five case study locations which analysed the relationship between local and regional economic development and deprived neighbourhoods, as well as the manner in which policies and institutions interacted in delivering economic development strategies and employment initiatives to these neighbourhoods [2]. The selected case studies analysed processes of economic change at the local authority district scale and were chosen to cover a range of deprived area types - inner city, coastal, coalfield, manufacturing - within different regional contexts ranging from the high growth London and

1
2
3 South East region, to lower growth areas in Northern England. All were ranked within the
4 Government's 88 most deprived local authority districts in 2004 and included localised
5 concentrations of deprivation (see Table 1) [3]. The focus on the local authority district scale
6 reflected the past and ongoing importance of local economic development policy at this
7 governance level as well as the availability of economic performance statistics at this level.
8 Such local authority areas clearly do not constitute coherent local economies, rather
9 different aspects of economic development are manifest at different spatial scales. The
10 local authority scale provides important insights into many of these in relation to deprived
11 neighbourhoods, although analysis at other spatial levels (e.g. Travel to Work Areas, sub-
12 regions, city-regions) provides additional insights.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 (insert Table 1)
30
31
32
33

34 The next two sections of the paper analyse the wider economic contexts of deprived
35 neighbourhoods and the various processes contributing to localised concentrations of
36 working age people experiencing exclusion from the formal economy. This leads onto a
37 consideration of the kinds of economic strategies and initiatives being undertaken at various
38 levels of governance and the extent to which they address the economic needs of those
39 living in deprived neighbourhoods, before addressing the degree of integration and co-
40 ordination between the policy levels in the final section. The paper argues that tackling the
41 economic problems of deprived neighbourhoods requires both a clearer conception of what
42 economic interventions at different scales are seeking and able to achieve in relation to
43 deprived neighbourhoods, as well as improved integration and co-ordination of strategies
44 and actions at various spatial scales. This is needed to ensure that economic development
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 strategies developed at regional and sub-regional levels are developed and implemented in
4
5 a manner that benefits those living in deprived neighbourhoods.
6
7
8
9

10 **PLACING DEPRIVED NEIGHBOURHOODS WITHIN THEIR WIDER ECONOMIC** 11 **CONTEXTS** 12 13

14
15
16
17 One of the conclusions of the Social Exclusion Unit's study of jobs and enterprise in
18 deprived areas was the existence of a limited understanding of the economic and labour
19 market contexts in which concentrations of worklessness exist (ODPM, 2004). In terms of
20 specific contexts this may be true, although it is generally accepted amongst academic
21 researchers that the problems which beset deprived areas are rooted within economic
22 restructuring processes operating at wider sub-regional, regional, national and global scales,
23 particularly the job losses arising from the continuing process of deindustrialisation on the
24 one hand, and the increased segmentation of the labour market associated with service
25 sector led job growth on the other. The impacts of these processes are spatially uneven,
26 giving rise to localised concentrations of unemployment and economic inactivity that have
27 become entrenched among certain groups (particularly older men, single parents, and
28 ethnic minorities) and in certain areas, particularly towns and cities in northern Britain and
29 inner London, as well as former coalfield areas and some seaside towns (GREEN and
30 OWEN, 1998; BEATTY and FOTHERGILL, 1996; BEATTY *et al.*, 2000; BEATTY and
31 FOTHERGILL 2004; TUROK and EDGE, 1999; WEBSTER, 2000).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 In the case of the older industrial northern towns and many coalfield areas a lack of jobs
56 arising from weak labour demand remains a central explanation for the persistence of
57 localised concentrations of worklessness and other forms of deprivation, despite a long
58
59
60

1
2
3 period of falling unemployment nationally (TUROK and EDGE, 1999; BEATTY and
4 FOTHERGILL, 1996; ADAMS, 2005). GORDON and TUROK (2005) argue that the growth
5
6 in the UK economy has not been sufficient to remove the slack in these local labour
7
8 markets by using evidence from GREGG and WADSWORTH's (2003) study, which showed
9
10 no change in the employment rate for men with low qualifications between 1993 and 2002
11
12 in several northern conurbations. Moreover, whilst the problems of unemployment and
13
14 economic inactivity are most manifest at a localised scale, their origins relate to the
15
16 structural weaknesses that are still found at the regional and sub-regional scales within
17
18 these former industrial and coalfield regions.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The ongoing consequences of the long-term decline of mining and manufacturing over the
28
29 last thirty years or so are central to understanding the current economic problems facing
30
31 deprived neighbourhoods within the five case study areas analysed here. The decline of
32
33 manufacturing continues to lie at the heart of the job losses being experienced by these
34
35 deprived areas (see Table 2). For example, four of the five largest declining sectors in
36
37 absolute terms in both Oldham and Sunderland over the 1997-2004 period were
38
39 manufacturing sectors; in fact, manufacturing employment declined by 32.7 per cent (8223
40
41 jobs) in Oldham and 28 per cent (7410 jobs) in Sunderland over this seven year period.
42
43 Similarly, in Mansfield all five of the largest declining sectors were in manufacturing,
44
45 resulting in the loss of a third of its manufacturing employment.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 (insert Table 2)
54
55
56
57

58 Despite the continued decline of these key manufacturing sectors, all five case study areas
59
60 achieved net job growth over the 1997-2004 period, although the rate of growth varied

1
2
3 widely from 15 per cent in the case of Brighton and Hove to 8 per cent in the cases of
4
5 Mansfield and Oldham. Employment rates for those of working age similarly vary between
6
7 the local economies (see Table 3) from rates above the national average in 2004/05 in
8
9 Brighton and Hove (76 per cent) through to rates significantly below in Newham (56 per
10
11 cent) and Sunderland (69 per cent). The bulk of new employment opportunities were found
12
13 within various service sectors and especially within consumer and public services rather
14
15 than in business and producer services. Table 4 ranks the top five largest employment
16
17 creation sectors in absolute terms in each case study area and highlights the importance of
18
19 both the retail and wholesale trade sectors on the one hand, and public service employment
20
21 on the other, to job growth within these local economies.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 (insert Tables 3 and 4).
30
31
32
33

34 A defining feature of this service sector growth has been the increasing polarisation
35
36 between relatively well paid and high skilled professionals working in the 'knowledge-based'
37
38 sectors on the one hand and the growth of a flexible workforce, including many low paid
39
40 workers in insecure and low grade service sector employment, on the other. One of the
41
42 consequences of the loss of semi-skilled and skilled jobs in manufacturing has been the
43
44 disappearance of the kinds of jobs that had previously occupied the middle ground in local
45
46 labour markets. This division of the labour market has become most marked within the
47
48 more successful city-regions where deprived neighbourhoods provide sources of cheap,
49
50 flexible, non-unionised and often immigrant labour as required by the growing personal and
51
52 consumer service sectors (BODDY, 2002; POTTS, 2002). As such, this can be interpreted
53
54 as a continuation of the historic role of such neighbourhoods in the production and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reproduction of low cost labour to provide cheap services to businesses and residents
4 within cities (FAINSTEIN *et al*, 1993; SASSEN, 2001).
5
6
7
8
9

10 The persistence of localised concentrations of worklessness in these more successful
11 regions reflects in part the types of jobs being created and the inability of the most socially
12 excluded to compete effectively for them (GORDON, 2003). Thus much of London's recent
13 job growth has been met at the top end by drawing upon the national and international
14 labour market and by commuters in the middle skill range (KLEINMAN, 1998). However,
15 the lack of participation in formal employment also reflects the poor quality of the jobs
16 available as the low skill, low paid jobs which are on offer hold little attraction to individuals
17 and communities who have been marginalised from the labour market over a long period of
18 time, and provide few incentives to move off state benefits (see also RHODES *et al*. 2002 in
19 relation to Single Regeneration Budget case study areas). The persistence of deprived
20 neighbourhoods within Newham and Brighton, despite labour market shortages within the
21 London and South East economy illustrates these processes. In Newham, unemployment
22 and economic inactivity remain stubbornly high in some of the borough's most deprived
23 neighbourhoods. With additional problems of discrimination and lower female participation
24 rates resulting from Newham's highly ethnically diverse population, the result is an
25 employment rate considerably below the national average (see Table 3). Such
26 concentrated deprivation within areas of economic growth demonstrates the need to
27 understand the work experiences, skills, and job expectations of those living in deprived
28 neighbourhoods within the context of wider labour market changes and to reject any
29 reliance upon processes of employment trickle-down to eliminate such spatial inequalities
30 (BODDY AND PARKINSON, 2004).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PROCESSES LEADING TO CONCENTRATIONS OF ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION

The manner in which the wider economic context interacts with a variety of other processes to provide particular concentrations of economic deprivation is central to understanding differences between deprived neighbourhoods and the problems that they face. The importance of these differences is recognised by a number of authors in the development and delivery of policy (e.g. MCGREGOR and McCONNACIE, 1995; SEU, 1999; MACLENNAN, 2000; BUCK, 2001; LUPTON, 2003). In areas where labour market problems are rooted within a lack of labour demand coupled with supply side problems, the extent of deprived areas are more generalised with a large number of total wards classified as deprived (for example Sunderland), and this contrasts significantly with the pockets of deprivation found in more affluent areas (for example Brighton).

Whilst the underlying causes of deprivation are rooted within economic restructuring, the operation of housing markets and residential sorting mechanisms, both in the private and social housing sectors play a central role in creating highly localised concentrations of deprivation (ATKINSON and KINTREA, 2000; MACLENNAN, 2000; CHESHIRE *et al.*, 2003). In private sector markets, falling market values often result in properties being bought up for use as low grade rented accommodation, with a subsequent lack of investment by exploitative and often absentee landlords. Hathershaw ward in Oldham and Northfield in Mansfield similarly demonstrate a process whereby private landlords have bought up properties that have subsequently become empty and boarded up, or let on a short term basis and without exercising any control over the nature of the tenants. Public housing allocation policies also tend to concentrate the most disadvantaged in estates with

1
2
3 poor images, reputation, and where demand is low (BRENNAN *et al.*, 2000). In the case of
4 North Moulsecoomb ward in East Brighton, what is now the city's second most deprived
5 ward was originally built as a large council housing estate to house the workforce of two
6 large manufacturing plants that have subsequently closed.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14
15 Residential sorting mechanisms necessarily have a major impact upon population
16 composition and labour market characteristics which can vary significantly even between
17 deprived neighbourhoods within the same local authority. For example in East Brighton, the
18 North Moulsecoomb ward on the outskirts of the city has a relatively stable population,
19 living mainly in social housing, many of whom have experienced several generations of
20 unemployment and low levels of educational attainment. In contrast, the Saunders Park
21 ward, which is closer to the city centre, has a more transient and diverse population
22 including a high proportion of single parents. The transient nature of this area's population
23 means that there is little wealth retention and limited commitment to the neighbourhood
24 given that the majority of residents expect to move at the earliest opportunity. This
25 produces quite different policy challenges compared to those areas where stable
26 populations are locked into neighbourhoods over long time periods. The process of 'get on
27 and get out' by the more financially successful residents, a feature evident to varying
28 degrees across all deprived neighbourhoods (see BRENNAN *et al.* 2000 in relation to
29 Single Regeneration Budget case study areas) also removes local connections to the
30 worlds of work and education as well as potential role models and contact with more
31 aspirational behaviour. Paradoxically, policy initiatives that may be effective in improving
32 employability and access to jobs of those living within a deprived neighbourhood can
33 actually lead to the most able leaving, even leading to deterioration in the unemployment
34 rate of current neighbourhood residents (CHESHIRE *et al.*, 2003).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Interactions between housing markets, population characteristics and social histories
7 arising from economic integration within deprived neighbourhoods create particular labour
8 market characteristics, attitudes towards work and job seeking behaviours. For example in
9 Mansfield, the complex of social relations and work culture that is associated with the coal
10 mining industry remains central to understanding attitudes towards work, including the lack
11 of a culture of enterprise and self-employment and an expectation that employment needs
12 to be located close to the place of residence. In contrast, Newham provides a radically
13 different set of population and labour market characteristics. Here the ethnically diverse
14 local population (61 per cent non-white in 2001) is relatively young, giving the borough one
15 of the fastest growing populations within England (15 per cent from 1991 – 2001 compared
16 with 4.4 per cent in England as a whole). Whilst there is still a link between the high level of
17 economic inactivity on sickness and health grounds and the closure of the docklands more
18 than 25 years ago in some deprived neighbourhoods (e.g. in the Canning Town and
19 Beckton wards), in other parts of the Borough the factors contributing to high levels of
20 economic inactivity include barriers to employment and different patterns of female working
21 within ethnic groups. Barriers include discrimination and low levels of educational
22 attainment and English language difficulties which contribute to Newham's very low
23 employment rate, as does the fact that the borough has the highest proportion of lone
24 parent households with dependent children in England.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 Localised concentrations of deprivation are further exacerbated by 'neighbourhood effects'.
54 Although these are marginal relative to the importance of factors related to individuals and
55 households in understanding processes of labour market exclusion (BUCK, 2001; BUCK
56 and GORDON, 2004), the existence of localised concentrations of deprivation can
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 accentuate various barriers of entry to formal employment leading to the development of a
4 local culture characterised by a loose sense of attachment to the mainstream labour market.
5
6 Within the case study deprived neighbourhoods, low expectations and aspirations
7 emanating from limited experience of employment extending across generations, and an
8 acceptance of the need to 'get by' on the basis of state benefits supplemented by various
9 forms of paid and unpaid informal work, produced particular 'cultures of worklessness'.
10
11 Importantly, such attitudes and expectations do not pervade all residents of deprived
12 neighbourhoods, nor are they confined only to these areas. Rather they are different by
13 degree, reinforced by the material circumstances of residents and their more restricted
14 social networks. In terms of employment limited social networks not only reduce the
15 likelihood of integration into the informal recruitment networks (WATT, 2003), but also their
16 highly localised nature tends to limit the knowledge and perception of job opportunities in
17 the wider labour market (ATKINSON and KINTREA, 2001; McQUAID and LINDSAY, 2002).
18
19 Access to formal employment also reflects practical problems relating to limited flexibility
20 and high transport costs in relation to low wages, which result from lower levels of car
21 ownership and the absence in some deprived areas of good, reliable and affordable public
22 transport (DETR, 2000b).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **POLICY INTERVENTIONS TO ADDRESS THE ECONOMIC NEEDS OF DEPRIVED** 49 **NEIGHBOURHOODS** 50 51

52
53
54
55 The wider processes of economic change in which deprived neighbourhoods are
56 embedded combined with the particular processes producing differentiated neighbourhood
57 contexts provides a considerable challenge for policy interventions across different spatial
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

levels. In the UK, the development of a multi-layered governance structure and a range of public and quasi-public organisations has ensured that the issue of different levels of governance and their responsibility for economic development policy has become a central concern, not least within central government itself. This involves not only identifying the most appropriate level at which to formulate and deliver various economic development functions, but also clarifying what organisations at each level are seeking to achieve in terms of tackling the economic problems of deprived neighbourhoods as well as their means of achieving it. Figure 1 demonstrates the complex scalar relationships between various spatial levels of governance and the main agencies, programmes and policies relating to economic development and neighbourhood renewal. In this section we draw upon evidence from the five case study areas to discuss the kinds of economic strategies and initiatives being undertaken at various levels of governance and the extent to which they address the economic needs of deprived neighbourhoods [4].

(insert Figure 1)

Neighbourhood and local level interventions

For the majority of local economic development activity the neighbourhood scale has not been a significant scale of intervention. In the five case study areas there are relatively few economic and employment policy initiatives operating at this scale. The priorities of LSPs and neighbourhood renewal strategies are predominantly focused upon 'liveability issues' such as ameliorating the poor environmental conditions and tackling problems of crime and anti-social behaviour that beset deprived neighbourhoods. LSPs have a poor record with respect to addressing the problems of worklessness in deprived neighbourhoods, partly

1
2
3 because of their lack of engagement with employment and enterprise organisations such as
4 Jobcentre Plus and Business Link (ODPM, 2004). Moreover, the strong emphasis within the
5 government's current policy agenda upon formal employment, self-employment, and
6 enterprise formation as the route out of poverty has led to a relative neglect of a range of
7 community based economic initiatives (e.g. credit unions, time banks, community
8 enterprises, and intermediate labour markets). Yet the rationale for these kinds of initiatives
9 is not only the creation of employment and additional income, but critically also about
10 building social capital, encouraging local participation and developing community and
11 individual capacities in communities where long-term unemployment and worklessness
12 have become entrenched (MAYO *et al.*, 2003; BURNS *et al.*, 2004; EVANS *et al.*, 2004). In
13 this view, mainstream economic development initiatives, such as the provision of small
14 business workspace or providing job recruitment centres, are unlikely to succeed on their
15 own within these communities and alternative approaches are needed. Sunderland was
16 the one case study where a significant number of community economic development and
17 intermediate labour market initiatives, targeted at the most deprived neighbourhoods within
18 the city, did exist. However, the future of these initiatives is uncertain given their
19 dependence upon Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and EU Objective 2 (priority 4)
20 funding, both of which are being phased out after 2006.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Prior to the arrival of New Labour in 1997, the local district scale was the principal focus for
49 much local economic policy in the UK, largely because the local authority had a key role in
50 delivering central government regeneration programmes (notably City Challenge and the
51 SRB) and a statutory responsibility during the 1990s to produce local economic
52 development strategies. Local economic policy consequently embraced a wide range of
53 activities (AUDIT COMMISSION, 1999). The legacy of past practice is reflected in the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 current role of local authorities in local economic development in the five case studies. This
4 varies from Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council which has a 'hands on' approach,
5 directly responsible for some forms of business support, industrial estates, and town centre
6 improvements, to Brighton and Hove District Council which has been moving towards a
7 more facilitating approach, working with a range of partner organisations responsible for the
8 delivery of economic development services.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 With regard to deprived neighbourhoods, the current emphasis of local policies variously
21 sponsored by local authorities and regeneration programmes such as New Deal for
22 Communities (NDCs) is principally in terms of getting residents into formal employment
23 within the wider labour market. Although there is some attention to issues of labour
24 demand through various business led initiatives such as the Government's City Growth
25 Strategy and its initiatives to stimulate investment in under-served markets (HM Treasury,
26 2005), the predominantly supply-side approach assumes that localised concentrations of
27 unemployment and worklessness are not the result of a lack of jobs within commuting
28 distance of deprived neighbourhoods, but rather the result of a number of individual and
29 institutional barriers preventing people accessing the jobs that are to be found. As such, it
30 is closely associated with the welfare-to-work thinking of New Labour, as represented by its
31 range of New Deal for the Unemployed programmes (PECK, 1999) and other employment
32 initiatives targeted at the most deprived neighbourhoods, such as 'the Action Teams for
33 Jobs' and the 'Working Neighbourhoods Pilots' run by Jobcentre Plus.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Interestingly, this supply-side orientation was as evident in the case studies from the former
57 industrial northern regions as those from the more 'jobs rich' southern regions and took on
58 various forms. Firstly, a number of supply-side measures focus upon improving
59
60

1
2
3 employability and seeking to better equip local residents to compete for jobs where these
4 are available. This involves the development of 'soft skills' (e.g. presentation, time-keeping,
5 interview preparation), basic skills training, language training, and actions that seek to
6 remove local barriers to work and improve access to jobs in the wider labour market, such
7 as support for childcare provision. Examples of such initiatives can be found in both the
8 'EB4U' NDC programme in East Brighton and the West Ham and Plaistow NDC programme
9 in Newham. Secondly, there are schemes that seek to actively link residents of deprived
10 areas to new job opportunities in order to try to ensure that the benefits of employment
11 growth flow to deprived neighbourhoods. These may involve local employers in job
12 brokerage schemes, such as the Job Linkage programme run by Sunderland City Council,
13 focused on the hardest to help such as the long-term unemployed and those on incapacity
14 benefit. In a number of instances under such schemes local employers work with Jobcentre
15 Plus and other local agencies to offer subsidised public transport travel and childcare costs
16 and or agreements whereby residents from certain neighbourhoods are guaranteed job
17 interviews. Thirdly, there are examples of sector specific schemes that seek to develop
18 skills in areas of employment growth, such as in Oldham and Brighton where agreements
19 have been drawn up with local construction companies to take a quota of recruits from
20 deprived neighbourhoods. As is also evident from the evaluation of the national level NDC
21 programme (CRESR, 2005), much of the thrust of recent local level economic initiatives has
22 been on assisting those from deprived neighbourhoods to access jobs within the wider
23 labour market, often requiring personalised, one-to-one outreach and delivery methods at
24 the neighbourhood scale to stand any chance of being effective.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Regional and sub-regional interventions

With a strengthened tier of regional governance after 1997, and the formation of the RDAs in particular, economic interventions at the regional and sub-regional scales have become more important. This scale is seen as more appropriate to a number of areas of intervention, notably in relation to innovation and technological development, the attraction of inward investment, and the development and co-ordination of large scale physical investments (e.g. major business parks and transport infrastructure). Moreover, the sub-regional or city-wide level is commonly identified as the most appropriate in terms of addressing many labour market demand and supply issues relating to shifts in sectoral employment and changing skills needs. In particular, initiatives directed at influencing labour demand are best addressed at this level given that when generating new employment opportunities there is little evidence to support the case for targeting job creation specifically at the neighbourhood or local scales. This is because of the difficulties in attracting businesses to deprived areas as well as the problems of 'leakage' effects due to migration and commuting (NORTH *et al.*, 2003; GORDON, 2000).

Regional and sub-regional economic strategies within the case study areas all focus, to a greater or lesser degree, upon the development of a higher skill and higher wage economy, this being the route to improving regional economic performance and prosperity favoured by the RDAs. Typical of this is the regional economic strategy of the North East region's RDA ('One North East') which aims to create what it calls a 'knowledge intensive economy' through moving towards a 'high skills equilibrium', developing a number of globally competitive business clusters, and establishing a new entrepreneurial culture within the region. To quote from an interviewed One North East officer, "the thing the RDA can do with

1
2
3 its limited resources is to get more jobs, more businesses, and more economic activity into
4 the region, letting somebody else worry about who benefits from that and all the social
5 issues.” However, such strategies prioritise the generation of the kind of jobs that those
6 living in the region’s most deprived neighbourhoods are unlikely to be able to successfully
7 compete for (i.e. in terms of qualifications, experience, social networks etc.), whilst
8 geographically they are likely to be difficult to access from deprived neighbourhoods given
9 preferred locations on business parks on the outer fringes of the urban area. These
10 strategies have little or nothing to say about the need also to target some lower skilled and
11 lower paid employment in some localities, despite their importance to residents of deprived
12 neighbourhoods. This results in an evident lack of attention being paid at the regional and
13 sub-regional scales to the kinds of jobs most appropriate to the needs of those living in
14 deprived neighbourhoods, including consideration of how disadvantaged groups might gain
15 access to the ‘better quality’ low and semi-skilled jobs in service sectors, such as those
16 resulting from the expansion of public service employment (e.g. the non-professional
17 grades in the health and social care sector).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Although one of the original objectives of the RDAs was to reduce economic disparities
42 within their regions (Robson et al, 2000), their overriding concern has been the
43 improvement of the region’s economic performance relative to European league tables.
44 Various concerns have been expressed about the lack of commitment RDAs have shown to
45 tackling the problems facing deprived areas. For example, the HOUSE OF COMMONS
46 TRADE AND INDUSTRY SELECT COMMITTEE in 2003-04, noted that one effect of the
47 replacement of the SRB by ‘Single Pot’ funding was to increase the RDAs’ commitment to
48 business development at the expense of regeneration related activities. Similarly, a report
49 by the National Association of Councils for Voluntary Service (LUCAS, 2004) claimed that
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 most RDAs are focusing on economic issues to the detriment of both social regeneration
4 and a more joined-up approach, whilst a report from the Cabinet Office recorded the lack of
5
6 commitment shown by RDAs in promoting enterprise in deprived areas (CABINET OFFICE,
7
8 2005). There is some indication that the RDAs are being pressurised by central government
9
10 to give more attention to the needs of deprived areas; for example, to quote from
11
12 Government guidance concerning revisions to Regional Economic Strategies, the strategies
13
14 “should identify areas or communities with significant problems such as deprivation,
15
16 inequalities and social exclusion and identify the main social, environmental and economic
17
18 factors which underlie these issues” (DTI 2005: p.7).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 In terms of policy agendas there is thus clear evidence of differences in both the rationale
28
29 and focus of policy interventions relating to economic development at the various spatial
30
31 scales. A division of labour between an economic focus at the regional level and a social
32
33 focus at the neighbourhood level is seen by some commentators as entirely appropriate, on
34
35 the basis that local labour market adjustment occurs through job vacancies rippling through
36
37 the regional labour market, and hence the neighbourhood focus should be on raising skills
38
39 to make residents of deprived areas better able to compete for these jobs (CHESHIRE *et al*,
40
41 2004; GORDON 1999). However, the persistence of pockets of deprivation in fast growing
42
43 regions such as London and the South East suggests that the sectoral and occupation
44
45 structure of much of the growth by-passes those living within deprived neighbourhoods.
46
47 This suggests the need for a greater local economic development role to address demand
48
49 side issues including job creation measures targeted at appropriate sectors and
50
51 occupations within locations reasonably accessible to deprived neighbourhoods (TUROK
52
53 and EDGE, 1999; TUROK *et al*, 2004).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In policy practice, the difference in scalar focus is largely attributable to tensions and
4 contradictions between the different policy agendas within central government,
5 responsibility for which is variably devolved to different levels of governance. The
6 Department of Work and Pensions remains heavily focused on a national supply side
7 agenda and has moved only slowly towards a more decentralised approach partly through
8 the need for the local delivery of welfare-to-work programmes. The regional tier relates
9 particularly to the national economic competitiveness, growth agenda (principally driven by
10 the Department of Trade and Industry), with greater emphasis upon demand-side factors,
11 whereas the local and neighbourhood tiers relate principally to the social cohesion and
12 neighbourhood renewal agendas (principally via the Department for Communities and Local
13 Government) (see Figure 1). What this means in practice is that the economic needs of
14 deprived localities and residents receive little attention at higher spatial scales where
15 economic strategy development occurs and decisions about resource allocation are
16 increasingly concentrated.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **CO-ORDINATING AND INTEGRATING INTERVENTION BOTH ACROSS SCALES AND** 42 **WITHIN LOCAL AREAS** 43 44 45 46 47

48 Through analysis of the economic problems of deprived neighbourhoods within their wider
49 local contexts, this paper contends that tackling the economic and employment problems of
50 deprived neighbourhoods needs to be much better linked into wider local, sub-regional and
51 regional economic development programmes than it is at present. Although strategies
52 relating to the interrelationship between economic activities and labour markets are best
53 conceived at the regional and sub-regional scales, more attention needs to be given in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 these strategies to addressing the varied economic problems facing deprived
4 neighbourhoods rather than assuming that the benefits of stimulating new business
5 investment and creating new job opportunities will somehow automatically trickle down to
6 residents of deprived localities. Successive evaluations of major regeneration projects
7 demonstrate the limited economic and employment benefits that flow to residents of
8 adjacent deprived neighbourhoods, in large part due to the failure of such schemes from
9 the outset to identify and implement mechanisms that would achieve the often stated
10 objective of benefiting deprived communities and neighbourhoods (LAWLESS, 1995;
11 NEVIN, 1998; GORDON, 2000). Responding to such repeated failure indicates the
12 importance of closer integration and co-ordination between the kinds of economic
13 development functions carried out at different spatial scales as well as between supply and
14 demand measures, strategic policies and effective delivery mechanisms.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The five case studies reveal a number of ways in which the current arrangements for
35 achieving vertical and horizontal linkages between different levels of governance are
36 deficient and limited in their effectiveness, although there are admittedly differences
37 between them, relating to the role of local institutional arrangements and key local actors,
38 as well as some examples where initiatives are being taken to achieve better joint working
39 between different organisations. Firstly, there is an evident limited ability of neighbourhood
40 based organisations to communicate their needs upwards. In all of the case studies,
41 neighbourhood based organisations complained that they felt marginalised and distant from
42 strategy formulation and decision making. A common complaint from community level
43 organisations is a feeling their actions are peripheral and undervalued within the wider local
44 economic strategies being pursued by local and sub-regional authorities. This was
45 particularly evident with respect to some of the NDCs. For example, in Oldham the lack of a
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 local economic strategy group as part of the LSP meant that neighbourhood level
4 organisations had no wider strategy with which to articulate their activities. For their part,
5
6 the local authority and LSP viewed the NDC as being 'out on a limb' and insufficiently
7
8 integrated into local governance and management structures.
9
10
11

12
13
14
15 Secondly, particular weaknesses exist in terms of the structures at the sub-regional level,
16
17 despite the sub-region arguably being the best spatial scale for bringing together those
18 policies concerned with the demand side and the supply side agendas. Whilst the RDAs
19 and the LSPs are now well established, sub-regional level organisations are more variable
20 in the scope of their activity and their level of institutional development (FULLER *et al*,
21
22 2004). The weakness of the sub-regional level within the current institutional framework is a
23
24 particular concern with regard to labour market policy, given that local labour markets
25
26 largely operate at a scale above that of the local authority district and below that of the
27
28 region. Thus for example in Mansfield, although the RDA (East Midlands Development
29
30 Agency) established seven business-led sub-regional partnerships, the underdeveloped
31
32 nature of the 'Alliance Sub-Regional Strategic Partnership' covering North Derbyshire and
33
34 North Nottinghamshire limited its ability to take forward a sub-regional strategy.
35
36 Consequently Mansfield District Council and the Mansfield Area Strategic Partnership (the
37
38 LSP) were largely unable to link their actions into any clearly articulated sub-regional
39
40 strategy. This is of some importance given the significance of the sub-regional level for key
41
42 economic development issues, particularly those related to sites of future employment,
43
44 enterprise growth and the improvement of skills and levels of productivity.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 In contrast, a distinctive feature of the Sunderland case study was the existence of a well
59
60 established sub-regional level partnership in the form of the five local authorities which

1
2
3 made up the Tyne and Wear Strategic Partnership (TWSP). Here, good levels of co-
4 operation between the Tyne and Wear local authorities developed out of past actions
5 related to EU programmes and inward investment attraction. This was built upon by the
6 RDA through the adoption of a sub-regional model of organisation which devolved 75 per
7 cent of its funds to four sub-regions, although this has been subsequently reduced. Whilst
8 this sub-regional level of economic governance suits organisations like the Learning and
9 Skills Council and Business Link which operate at this scale anyway, it does not fit well with
10 the localised scale at which the voluntary and community sector operates. This sector lacks
11 an infrastructure suitable for engaging at this scale and such uneven institutional capacities
12 reinforce the lack of integration between economic development and social inclusion
13 objectives at the sub-regional level.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Thirdly, a central government driven policy agenda means that key local delivery agents,
33 such as Jobcentre Plus or Local Business Links, are focused on the delivery of centrally
34 derived policies and targets, a system that provides limited ability, resource and motivation
35 for such agencies to adapt to local circumstances. In all five case studies there was
36 criticism of Jobcentre Plus for its seeming reluctance to become actively involved in
37 regeneration partnerships and the inflexible way its services were being delivered, despite
38 being the government's main agency for the delivery of welfare to work and other
39 employment programmes targeted at the most disadvantaged in local labour markets.
40 Whilst the economic needs of deprived neighbourhoods need to be given more prominence
41 in the economic development strategies at the regional and sub-regional scales, evidence
42 suggests that such strategies are only likely to be effective if they are rooted within an
43 understanding of the particularities of deprived neighbourhoods and are owned and
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 delivered by trusted actors based within the locality and operating with a degree of flexibility
4
5 to adapt to specific local conditions.
6
7
8
9

10 Where greater integration and co-ordination has been achieved, evidence from a number of
11 project evaluations indicates that residents of deprived neighbourhoods do benefit,
12 particularly with regard to getting individuals living in deprived neighbourhoods who are out
13 of the labour market into employment. Evidence from the major national evaluation of NDCs
14 (CRESR, 2005) demonstrates that the requirement for Jobcentre Plus to be directly
15 involved in NDCs has had positive results in getting people back into the labour market
16 through promoting better linkages between national programmes and local populations and
17 circumstances. In the case study areas too, more effective policy delivery was apparent
18 where effective neighbourhood based organisations that were trusted by the local
19 population were involved in delivery, and where central government services were
20 developing 'outreach' activities. For example in Mansfield and Newham, there was evidence
21 that Jobcentre Plus had become more involved in partnership working and in developing
22 ways of delivering its services to deprived communities more effectively, alongside
23 increased recognition of the need for employment advisers to work more closely with the
24 residents of deprived neighbourhoods to develop appropriate employment skills, provide
25 reassurance over fears relating to coming off benefits, and to ensure awareness of job and
26 training opportunities. In seeking to encourage marginalised groups to engage with formal
27 employment, therefore, delivery needs to be highly sensitive to local particularities, flexible,
28 in order to adjust to these, and delivered by individuals and organisations which have a
29 degree of trust and credibility.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In their evaluation of employment strategies in Newham and Hull NDCs, SANDERSON *et al*
4
5 (2005) identified greater effectiveness where the needs and aspirations of the local
6
7 community, the expertise and interest of local agencies and evidence of local
8
9 circumstances are brought together to make informed judgements about what is
10
11 appropriate for the local community. Good relations and a consistency of strategy between
12
13 the NDCs and the local authority is a key element here. However this evidence also
14
15 suggests that developing such relationship and blending the interests of different
16
17 stakeholders and deliverers of mainstream services, particularly with regard to bodies with
18
19 a wider spatial remit, such as the LSCs and RDAs, remains a constraint on current strategy
20
21 development. However there are examples where greater integration across spatial levels
22
23 has been achieved to produce improved performance, often where strong partnership
24
25 working and leadership comes together around larger, sub-regional regeneration projects.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 CONCLUSIONS

37
38
39
40
41 This paper has argued that deprived neighbourhoods are part of the wider economic
42
43 system and any dealing with them in isolation from this broader economic context risks mis-
44
45 specifying their problems. Given that the economic problems manifested in deprived
46
47 neighbourhoods are the result of processes of change taking place at higher spatial scales,
48
49 policy interventions focused solely at the local scale, such as many of those pursued under
50
51 the Neighbourhood Renewal agenda, are liable to be inappropriate and ineffective.
52
53 Therefore, fundamental to tackling the economic and employment needs of those living in
54
55 deprived neighbourhoods is to ensure that their needs and how to address them are
56
57 incorporated into regional, sub-regional and local economic development strategies. This
58
59
60

1
2
3 also requires addressing the current divide between strategy, which often deals at the
4 spatial level of the region or sub-region, and local delivery, to ensure that those working in
5 deprived neighbourhoods can incorporate the specificities of their areas within the strategy
6 and policy development process.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13
14
15 Institutionally, such an approach requires a stronger orientation of local levels of
16 governance (such as the LSPs), towards economic development issues, the development
17 of stronger sub-regional, city-wide or regeneration project related partnerships and
18 strategies that incorporate a clear focus upon the economic needs of deprived communities,
19 alongside improved co-ordination and integration between a wide range of partners [5]. Yet
20 the case studies demonstrate that the sub-regional level remains the least developed within
21 the scalar development of New Labour's policies, even though it is arguably the optimal
22 scale for economic management from a labour market perspective. The sub-regional scale
23 provides the best chance to join up those agencies and policy initiatives operating at the
24 local and neighbourhood scales concerned with tackling the problems of economic and
25 social exclusion with those operating at the regional and sub-regional scales that are
26 primarily concerned with the economic growth and competitiveness agenda. It is also the
27 most appropriate scale for achieving effective co-ordination and integration between those
28 responsible for strategy development and those responsible for making policy work at the
29 local and neighbourhood scales. However producing more effective partnership working at
30 this scale clearly represents a major challenge, not only because of the relative lack of
31 strong institutional structures, but also because of the problems of getting a wide range of
32 partners genuinely committed to delivering partnership objectives towards deprived
33 neighbourhoods and communities rather than their own more narrowly focused
34 organisational objectives.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 As well as the need to address these weak links in the current governance structures, this
7
8 paper has illustrated the tensions between current demand and supply side approaches
9
10 and the need for a better balance between such interventions and more consistent policy
11
12 measures across spatial scales. This is particularly evident with regard to the gap between
13
14 the jobs that are currently being created and the employment needs of those living in
15
16 deprived neighbourhoods. Notwithstanding the question of there still being insufficient
17
18 numbers of jobs in many former industrial and coalfield areas, there is also the issue of the
19
20 quality and suitability of many of the new jobs that are being generated within commuting
21
22 distances of deprived neighbourhoods. Whilst capital is relatively mobile, labour is much
23
24 less so, restricted by housing costs, transport and existing social networks. In terms of
25
26 getting residents from deprived neighbourhoods into employment, greater attention needs
27
28 to be given to the types of employment that are being created within the local economy.
29
30 Residents from such areas are unlikely to be able to compete for the more highly skilled
31
32 jobs typically prioritised by regional economic strategies. Conversely, very low wage and
33
34 unstable employment in many of the low value added services reinforce low expectations
35
36 and aspirations and provide little or no incentive for the unemployed and economically
37
38 inactive to move off of benefits. Therefore, a key issue for policy development is how to
39
40 generate a wider range of jobs, particularly semi-skilled jobs, including working more
41
42 closely with employers to reduce discrimination and provide greater opportunities for
43
44 training and career progression within different service sectors and public sector
45
46 organisations. This needs to be addressed both in terms of national level labour market
47
48 policies and more centrally within regional and sub-regional economic development
49
50 strategies than it has been hitherto.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the contribution of Rob Baldock, Stacey Clift, Mark Ramsden and Ian Vickers for their contribution to the research on which this paper is based.

The authors would also like to thank three anonymous referees for their helpful comments.

NOTES

[1] In this paper the term deprived neighbourhoods is used in line with current English government definitions where such areas were defined initially at ward, and latterly at Super Output Area, on the basis of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (2004). This is based on the measurement of seven dimensions of deprivation, namely: income; employment; education, skills and training; housing and services; crime; and living environment.

[2] Results reported in this paper are taken from research completed in 2004 for the Government's Neighbourhood Renewal Unit entitled 'The Dynamics of Local Economies and Deprived Neighbourhoods' (NORTH and SYRETT, 2006). The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Government.

[3] For each case study location the research combined a review of the existing literature and evidence base with primary research on the relationship between local economic development and neighbourhood renewal. As well as analysing changes at the district scale, the research focused on two of the most deprived wards in each case study area in order to highlight the specificities of deprived neighbourhoods and differences between them in terms of their economic contexts (e.g. city centre fringe locations compared to outer housing estates) and their spatial dynamics (e.g. changes in local economic structures and local housing markets). The deprived neighbourhoods selected comprised: for Mansfield:

1
2
3 Northfield and West Titchfield; Sunderland: Hendon and East End; Oldham: Hathershaw
4 and Fitton Hill; Brighton and Hove: East Brighton specifically Saunders Park and North
5
6 Moulsecoomb and Newham: Beckton and Green Street.
7
8
9

10
11
12 [4] Results presented in the following sections draw upon the analysis of economic
13 development and neighbourhood renewal strategies and policies and semi-structured, face-
14 to-face interviews with a number of 'key actors'. These interviews provided insights into the
15 workings of governance arrangements at various spatial levels with regard to the economic
16 aspects of neighbourhood renewal. The selection of key actors was specific to each case
17 study, but included: those with responsibility for economic development at the regional, sub-
18 regional and local levels (i.e. within RDAs, sub-regional partnerships, and local authorities);
19 members of local strategic partnerships; representatives of private sector organisations;
20 representatives of key public sector organisations (e.g. Learning and Skills Councils;
21 Business Link Operators; Jobcentre Plus); neighbourhood managers and community
22 workers; and other key local stakeholders.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 [5] The authors are currently conducting research (funded by the Joseph Rowntree
42 Foundation) which considers how emerging governance structures at the regional and sub-
43 regional scales are impacting on the economic and employment needs of those living in the
44 most deprived areas. This involves identifying effective partnership working across various
45 spatial levels of governance as well as effective integration between the pursuit of improved
46 economic performance and greater economic inclusion.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **REFERENCES**
4
5
6
7

8 ADAMS, J. (2005) *A Full Employment Region*, Institute of Public Policy Research,
9 Newcastle.
10

11
12
13
14
15 ATKINSON, R. and KINTREA, K. (2000) Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood
16 impacts, *Policy and Politics*, **28**, 93-108.
17
18

19
20
21
22 ATKINSON, R. and KINTREA, K. (2001) Disentangling area effects: evidence from
23 deprived and non-deprived neighbourhoods, *Urban Studies*, **38**, 2277-2298.
24
25
26

27
28
29 AUDIT COMMISSION (1999) *A Life's Work: Local Authorities, Economic Development and*
30 *Economic Regeneration*, Audit Commission, London.
31
32

33
34
35
36 AUDIT COMMISSION (2002) *Policy Focus: Neighbourhood Renewal*, Audit Commission,
37 London.
38
39

40
41
42
43 BEATTY, C. and FOTHERGILL, S. (1996) Labour market adjustment in areas of chronic
44 industrial decline: the case of the UK coalfields, *Regional Studies*, **30**, 627-640.
45
46
47

48
49
50
51 BEATTY, C. and FOTHERGILL, S. (2004) Economic change and the labour market in
52 Britain's seaside towns, *Regional Studies*, **38**, 461-480.
53
54

55
56
57
58 BEATTY, C., FOTHERGILL, S. and MACMILLAN, R. (2000) A theory of employment,
59 unemployment and sickness, *Regional Studies*, **34**, 614-630.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 BODDY, M. (2002), Linking competitiveness and cohesion, in BEGG, I. (Ed.) *Urban*
7
8 *Competitiveness: Policies for Dynamic Cities*, pp. 33 – 54, Policy Press, Bristol.
9

10
11
12 BODDY, M. and PARKINSON, M. (2004) Competitiveness, cohesion and urban
13
14 governance, in BODDY, M. and PARKINSON, M. (Eds.) *City Matters - Competitiveness,*
15
16 *Cohesion & Urban Governance*, pp. 407-432, Policy Press, Bristol.
17

18
19
20
21
22 BRENNAN, A., RHODES, J. and TYLER, P. (2000) The nature of local area social
23
24 exclusion in England and the role of the labour market, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*,
25
26 **16**, 129-46.
27

28
29
30
31
32 BRIGHT, E. (2003) *Reviving America's Forgotten Neighbourhoods*, Routledge, New York.
33

34
35
36
37 BUCK, N. (2001) Identifying neighbourhood effects on social exclusion, *Urban Studies*, **38**,
38
39 2251-2275.
40

41
42
43
44 BUCK, N. and GORDON, I (2004) Does spatial concentration of disadvantage contribute to
45
46 social exclusion? In BODDY, M. and PARKINSON, M. (Eds) *City Matters: Competitiveness,*
47
48 *Cohesion and Urban Governance*, pp. 237 – 254, Policy Press, Bristol.
49

50
51
52
53
54 BURGESS, P., HALL, S., MAWSON, J. and PEARCE, G. (2001) *Devolved Approaches to*
55
56 *Local Governance*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
57

58
59
60
BURNS, D., WILLIAMS, C.C. and WINDEBANK, J. (2004) *Community Self-Help*, Palgrave,

1
2
3 Macmillan, London.
4
5
6
7

8 CABINET OFFICE (2005), *Improving the prospects of people living in areas of multiple*
9 *deprivation in England*, Joint report with the ODPM, Strategy Unit, London.
10
11
12

13
14
15 CARS, G. (2000) *Social Exclusion in European Neighbourhoods – Processes, Experiences*
16 *and Responses*, Final Report of project funded under the TSER programme, European
17 Commission, Brussels.
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 CHESHIRE, P., MONASTIRIOTIS, V. and SHEPPARD, S. (2003) Income inequality and
25 residential segregation: labour market sorting and the demand for positional goods, in
26
27 MARTIN, R. and MORRISON, P. (Eds) *Geographies of Labour Market Inequality*, pp. 83-
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

109, Routledge, London.
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160

161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND REGIONS, (2000a) *Our Towns*
and Cities: The Future – Delivering an Urban Renaissance, HMSO, London.
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500

1
2
3 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND REGIONS, (2000b) *Social*
4 *Exclusion and the Provision of Public Transport: Main Report*, London: Department of the
5 Environment, Transport and the Regions, London.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY, (2005) *Guidance to RDAs on Regional*
13 *Strategies*, Department of Trade and Industry, London.
14
15
16
17

18
19
20 EVANS, M., SYRETT, S.. and WILLIAMS, C.C. (2006) *Informal Economic Activities and*
21 *Deprived Neighbourhoods*, Department of Communities and Local Government, London.
22
23
24
25

26
27 FAINSTEIN, S., GORDON, I. and HARLOE, M. (1993) *Divided Cities: Economic*
28 *Restructuring and Social Change in London and New York*, Blackwell, London.
29
30
31
32

33
34 FULLER, C., BENNETT, R.J. and RAMSDEN, M. (2004), Local government and the
35 changing institutional landscape of economic development in England and Wales,
36 *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, **22**, 317-347.
37
38
39
40

41
42
43 GOODWIN, M, (2004) The scaling of 'urban' policy: neighbourhood, city or region? in
44 JOHNSTONE, C. and WHITEHEAD, M. (Eds) *New Horizons in British Urban Policy:*
45 *Perspectives on New Labour's Urban Renaissance*, pp.173-184, Ashgate, Aldershot.
46
47
48
49

50
51
52
53 GOODWIN, M., JONES, M., JONES, R., PETT, K and SIMPSON, G (2002), Devolution and
54 economic governance in the UK: Uneven geographies, uneven capacities?, *Local Economy*,
55 **17**, 200 –215.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 GORDON, I. (1999) 'Move on up the car', dealing with structural unemployment in London,
4
5 *Local Economy*, **14**, 87-95.
6
7

8
9
10 GORDON, I. (2000) Targeting a leaky bucket: the case against localised employment
11
12 creation, *New Economy*, **6**, 199-203.
13
14

15
16
17 GORDON, I. (2003) Unemployment and spatial labour markets: strong adjustment and
18
19 persistent concentration, in MARTIN, R. and MORRISON, P. (Eds) *Geographies of Labour*
20
21 *Market Inequality*, pp. 55-82, Routledge, London.
22
23
24

25
26
27 GORDON, I and TUROK, I. (2005) How urban labour markets matter, in BUCK, N.,
28
29 GORDON, I., HARDING, A. and TUROK, I. (Eds) *Changing Cities: Rethinking Urban*
30
31 *Competitiveness, Cohesion and Governance*, pp. 242-264, Palgrave, Macmillan,
32
33 Basingstoke.
34
35
36

37
38
39 GREEN, A. E. and OWEN, D. (1998) *Where are the Jobless? Changing Unemployment*
40
41 *and Non-employment in Cities and Regions*, Policy Press, Bristol.
42
43
44

45
46
47 GREGG, P., and WADSWORTH, J. (2003), Labour market prospects of less skilled
48
49 workers over the recovery, in DICKENS, R., GREGG, P and WADSWORTH, J. (Eds), *The*
50
51 *Labour Market under New Labour*, Palgrave, Macmillan, Basingstoke.
52
53
54

55
56
57 HM TREASURY (2005) *Enterprise and Economic Opportunity in Deprived Areas*, HMSO,
58
59 London.
60

1
2
3 HOUSE OF COMMONS ODPM: HOUSING, PLANNING, LOCAL GOVERNMENT and
4
5 REGIONS COMMITTEE (2003) *The Effectiveness of Government Regeneration Initiatives*,
6
7
8 Seventh Report of Session 2002-03, London.
9

10
11
12 HOUSE OF COMMONS TRADE AND INDUSTRY SELECT COMMITTEE (2003-04), Fifth
13
14 report, London.
15
16

17
18
19 IMRIE, R. and RACO, M. (Eds) (2003) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, Community and*
20
21 *Urban Policy*, Policy Press, Bristol.
22
23

24
25
26 JONES, M. and MACLEOD, G. (2004) Regional spaces, spaces of regionalism: territory,
27
28 insurgent politics and the English question, *Transactions of the Institute of British*
29
30 *Geographers*, **29**, 433- 452.
31
32

33
34
35 KLEINMAN, M. (1998) *Include Me Out? The New Politics of Place and Poverty*, CASE
36
37 paper no.11, London School of Economics, London.
38
39

40
41
42 LAWLESS, P. (1995) Inner city and suburban labour markets in a major English
43
44 conurbation: processes and policy implications, *Urban Studies* **32** (7), 1097-1125
45
46
47

48
49
50 LUCAS, B., (2004) *Will the Single Pot tackle Social Regeneration?* National Association of
51
52 Councils for Voluntary Service, Sheffield.
53
54

55
56
57 LUPTON, R. (2003) *Poverty Street: The Dynamics of Neighbourhood Decline and Renewal*,
58
59 Policy Press, Bristol.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

MACLENNAN, D. (2000) *Changing Places, Engaging People*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

MAYO, M., THAKE, S. and GIBSON, T. (2003) *Taking Power: An Agenda for Community Economic Renewal*, New Economics Foundation, London.

McCULLOCH, A. (2001) Ward level deprivation and individual social and economic outcomes in the British Household Panel Study, *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 667-684

McGREGOR, A. and McCONNACHIE, M. (1995) Social exclusion, urban regeneration and economic reintegration, *Urban Studies*, **32**, 1587-1600.

McGREGOR, A., GLASS, A., HIGGINS, K., MACDOUGALL, L. and SUTHERLAND, V. (2003) *Developing People – Regenerating Place: achieving greater integration for local regeneration*, Policy Press, Bristol.

McQUAID, R. W. and LINDSAY, C. (2002) The 'employability gap': long-term unemployment and barriers to work in buoyant labour markets, *Environment and Planning C*, **20**, 613-628.

NEVIN, B. (1998) Renewing the Black Country: An assessment of the employment impact of the Black Country UDC, *Local Economy* **13**. 3, 239-254.

1
2
3 NORTH, D. and SYRETT, S. (2006) *The Dynamics of Local Economies and Deprived*
4
5
6 *Neighbourhoods*, Department of Communities and Local Government, London.
7
8
9

10 NORTH, D., SMALLBONE, D., LYON, F. and POTTS, G. (2003) *Business-Led*
11
12 *Regeneration of Deprived Areas: A Review of the Evidence Base*, Research Report No.5,
13
14
15 Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London.
16
17

18
19 OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, (2004) *Jobs and Enterprise in Deprived*
20
21 *Areas*, Social Exclusion Unit Report, London.
22
23
24

25
26
27 PECK, J. (1999) New labourers? Making a New Deal for the 'workless class', *Environment*
28
29 *and Planning C*, **17**, 345-372.
30
31

32
33
34 POTTS, G. (2002) Competitiveness and the social fabric: links and tensions in cities, in
35
36 BEGG, I. (Ed.) *Urban Competitiveness: Policies for Dynamic Cities*, pp. 55 – 80, Policy
37
38 Press, Bristol.
39
40

41
42
43 RHODES, J., TYLER P., BRENNAN A., STEVENS S., WARNOCK C., AND OTERO-
44
45 GARCIA M. (2002) *Lessons and Evaluation Evidence from Ten Single Regeneration*
46
47 *Budget Case Studies – Mid Term Report*, Department of Transport Local Government and
48
49
50 Regions.
51
52

53
54
55 ROBSON, B., PECK. J and HOLDEN, A. (2000) *Regional Agencies and Area-Based*
56
57 *Regeneration*, The Policy Press, Bristol and Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
58
59
60

1
2
3 SASSEN, S. (2001) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton University Press,
4
5
6 Princeton and London.

7
8
9
10 SKIFTER-ANDERSON, H. (2003) *Urban Sores: On the Integration Between Segregation,*
11
12
13 *Urban Decay and Deprived Neighbourhoods*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

14
15
16
17 SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT (1999) Policy Action Team 3: Enterprise and Social Exclusion:
18
19
20 Final Report, Social Exclusion Unit, London.

21
22
23
24
25 SANDERSON, I., GREEN, A. and WHITE, R. (2005) Employment Strategies in Newham
26
27
28 and Hull NDCs, *Research Report 62, New Deal for Communities: The National Evaluation*,
29
30
31 Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield.

32
33
34
35
36 TUROK, I. and EDGE, N. (1999) *The Jobs Gap in Britain's Cities: Employment Loss and*
37
38
39 *Labour Market Consequences*, The Policy Press, Bristol.

40
41
42
43
44 TUROK, I., BAILEY, N., ATKINSON, R., BRAMLEY, G., DOCHERTY, I., GIBB, R.,
45
46
47 GOODLAD, R., HASTINGS, A., KINTREA, K., KIRK, K., LEIBOVITZ, J., LEVER, B.,
48
49
50 MORGAN, J. and PADDISON, R., (2004) Sources of city prosperity and cohesion: the case
51
52
53 of Glasgow and Edinburgh, in BODDY, M. and PARKINSON, M. (Eds) *City Matters*, pp.13-
54
55
56 32, Policy Press, Bristol.

57
58
59 WATT, P. (2003) Urban marginality and labour market restructuring: local authority tenants
60
and employment in an Inner London Borough, *Urban Studies*, **40**, 1769-1789.

1
2
3
4
5
6 WEBSTER, D. (2000) The geographical concentration of labour market disadvantage,
7
8 *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, **16**, 114-28.
9

10
11
12 WILSON, W.J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged: the Inner City, the Underclass and Public*
13
14 *Policy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Rankings of five case study local authority districts on index of multiple deprivation within England (2004)

LOCATION (REGION)	AREA TYPE	LOCAL AUTHORITY DISTRICT SCORE (Worst SOA* within district))	LOCAL AUTHORITY DISTRICT RANK (OUT OF 354 NATIONALLY) (Worst SOA rank out of 32,482 nationally)
Brighton & Hove (South East)	Coastal	25.68 (64.53)	83 (569)
Mansfield (East Midlands)	former coalmining /manufacturing	32.53 (72.14)	33 (213)
Newham (London)	inner city	40.41 (66.94)	11 (433)
Oldham (North West)	manufacturing	30.73 (78.88)	43 (37)
Sunderland (North East)	former coalmining /manufacturing,	34.24 (76.34)	22 (98)

*From 2004 the IMD was published for Super Output Areas which are aggregates of Census Output Areas. The data relates to the lower size of SOAs which have an average of 1,500 people.

Source: ONS

Table 2: Sectors experiencing the largest employment decline in case study areas, 1997-2004

Sectors ranked by absolute decline with percentage decline in parenthesis

BRIGHTON	MANSFIELD	NEWHAM	OLDHAM	SUNDERLAND
Post & telecommunications -1,766 (-52.3%)	Manufacture of textiles -710 (-66.5%)	Financial intermediation -1,612 (-87%)	Manufacture of machinery and equipment -1,414 (-48.2%)	Manufacture of wearing apparel -1,747 (-89.5%)
Insurance & pension funding -1,685 (-46.5%)	Manufacturing of food & beverages -630 (-81.4%)	Computer and related activities -601 (-55.1%)	Manufacture of textiles -1,408 (-55%)	Manufacture of machinery and equipment -1,624 (-61%)
Financial intermediation -806 (-14.1%)	Manufacture of furniture -547 (-60.7%)	Manufacturing of food and beverages -466 (-22.7%)	Hotels and restaurants -1,381 (-26%)	Manufacture of radio, television and communication -1,290 (-78.8%)
Sewage & refuse disposal -641 (-84.1%)	Tanning and dressing of leather -414 (-99%)	Manufacture of wearing apparel -440 (-64%)	Manufacture of medical instruments -1,061 (-69.4%)	Manufacturing of food and beverages -1,060 (-56.4%)
Construction -541 (-18.7%)	Manufacture of fabricated metal products -393 (-40.3%)	Post and telecommunications -426 (-20.1%)	Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products -751 (-90.6%)	Land transport; transport via pipelines -987 (-33.6%)

Source: Annual Business Inquiry

Table 3: Employment rates for those of working age in case study areas, 1997-2002

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	Average
Brighton and Hove	71.3%	75.1%	76.8%	78.1%	75.9%	75.4%
Mansfield	68.0%	71.3%	68.5%	64.9%	72.7%	69.1%
Newham	50.5%	54.0%	52.7%	52.4%	55.6%	53.0%
Oldham	68.6%	72.2%	73.5%	73.4%	71.9%	71.9%
Sunderland	65.8%	65.9%	67.0%	66.0%	68.5%	66.6%
England	75.2%	75.1%	75.0%	75.0%	74.8%	75.0%


Source: DWP

Table 4: Sectors experiencing the largest employment growth in case study areas, 1997-2004

Sectors ranked by absolute growth with percentage growth in parenthesis

BRIGHTON	MANSFIELD	NEWHAM	OLDHAM	SUNDERLAND
Other business activity 4,786 (39%)	Retail trade 1,630 (34.1%)	Other business activity 3,847 (84.3%)	Retail trade 5,501 (67.9%)	Public administration and defence 3,739 (73%)
Retail trade 3,259 (28.1%)	Other business activity 863 (35.2%)	Retail trade 2,401 (36.1%)	Health and social work 3,175 (52.5%)	Retail trade 2,797 (25.8%)
Hotels and restaurants 3,109 (37.6%)	Construction 766 (35.6%)	Education 2,249 (44.2%)	Other business activity 2,973 (92.8%)	Other business activity 2,207 (27.1%)
Education 3,026 (26.1%)	Public administration and defence 546 (29.9%)	Public administration and defence 2,000 (59%)	Construction 816 (19.8%)	Education 2,117 (26.3%)
Health and social work 2,715 (20.2%)	Education 369 (11.2%)	Construction 988 (46.5%)	Education 744 (10.7%)	Health and social work 1,633 (12.7%)

Source: Annual Business Inquiry



Abbreviations for Figure 1

BL	Business Link
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
GO	Government Office
HMT	Her Majesty's Treasury
JCP	Job Centre Plus
LA	Local Authority
LSC	Learning and Skills Council
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership
NDC	New Deal for Communities
RDA	Regional Development Agency
SBS	Small Business Service
SRP	Sub Regional Partnership
URC	Urban Regeneration Company

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figures

Figure 1: Levels of Governance relating to Economic Development and Neighbourhood
Renewal in England

For Peer Review Only