Evidence supporting the Plan
Population Profile

1.1 The area covers 265 hectares and contains 4,751 households, which are spread throughout the neighbourhood area as follows:

- Blackthorn / Cherry Lodge – 1,814 households
- Lings – 1,193 households
- Goldings / Overstone Lodge – 910 households
- Lumbertubs – 862 households

1.2 The principal source of population profiling data is the 2011 Census. However, Census data is no longer collated or published by electoral ward, but by Middle Super Output Areas (MSOAs), subdivided into Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs).

- The majority of the area is covered by the Northampton 007 MSOA. This MSOA falls almost entirely within the Growing Together Area and comprises 5,901 residents (i.e. 65% approx. of the total population). It does not include Goldings or Lumbertubs.
- LSOA 004A covers Lumbertubs, again falling almost entirely within the Growing Together area. It has a population of 1,575 residents.
- Goldings falls within LSOA 005E, which also includes a significant part of Southfields. LSOA 005E has 1,854 residents.

1.3 On the basis of the above, it is estimated that the Growing Together area has a population of approximately 9,100* (*the 2011 census shows that MOA 007, LSOA 004A and LSOA 005E have a combined population of 9,330 residents, however some of LSOA 005E falls outside of the Neighbourhood Plan area).

1.4 Census data suggests that, by comparison with Northampton as a whole, the population of the Growing Together area:

- has more teenagers;
- has fewer people in their 70s and 80s; and
- is more ethnically diverse.

Quality of life issues

1.5 The principal source of quality of life data for the area is the most recent Index of Multiple Deprivation, compiled in 2015. This nationwide data-set divides the country into over 33,000 neighbourhoods, known as Super Output Areas (or SOAs) and combines eight sub-sets (“domains”) to produce a top to bottom ranking of all 33,000 plus SOAs. The eight domains are also ranked separately. These are as follows:

- Income
- Employment
- Health and disability
- Education, Training and skills
- Crime and disorder
1.6 The area is covered by a total of ten Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs), as shown in Figure 1 below. Five of the LSOAs are entirely within the neighbourhood area (007A, 007B, 007D, 007C and 005D), whilst another five partially fall within the neighbourhood area. Of the LSOAs which are partially within the neighbourhood area, 004A, 005B, and 005E cover the most sizeable areas and contain significant proportions of the area’s population.

1.7 The percentage rankings for those LSOAs which cover the largest stretches of the neighbourhood area, according to the Indices of Deprivation 2015 are as follows provided in Figure 2 (the lower the percentage score, the more deprived the neighbourhood).
### Figure 2: Indices of Deprivation (2015) data

![Table of Indices of Deprivation](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMD Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs)</th>
<th>004A</th>
<th>007A</th>
<th>007B</th>
<th>007C</th>
<th>007D</th>
<th>005B</th>
<th>005D</th>
<th>005E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Super Output Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health deprivation and disability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to housing and services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IME Decile (where 1 is most deprived 10% of LSOAs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Other than pockets of relative affluence in Cherry Lodge and the eastern part of Lings (predominantly the privately owned Paddocks and Priors Courts), the general picture is that of an area which suffers from high levels of deprivation.

1.9 Looking at the specific domains, a distinct picture emerges:

- Very low scores under the crime domain, common across most of Northampton East, stand out.
- Income deprivation, particularly within 007D, which covers much of Blackthorn are of real concern.
- Level of skills and qualifications are low throughout the neighbourhood plan area, with all of the LSOAs falling within the 20% most deprived in this category.
- Low scores for educational attainment across the area do not bode well for the social mobility of future generations.
- Environmental quality is fairly high, reflecting the variety of green spaces and proximity to open countryside.
- Access to services and housing (a measure of homelessness, access to housing, housing conditions and distance from essential services) is generally low.
- Health and disability scores are reasonable in a number of the LSOAs, perhaps reflecting the relatively young age profile of these areas.

1.10 Given the income deprivation levels seen within the Growing Together area, it is not surprising that fuel poverty is also an issue for many local residents. Northampton Borough Council’s
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Affordable Warmth Strategy 2011-2014 estimates that in May 2011 there were 14,547 households in Northampton suffering from fuel poverty; this is 15.3% of the number of households in Northampton, which is above the national average of 14.6% in England.

1.11 The same document identifies the former electoral ward of Lumbertubs, which covers the Growing Together Neighbourhood Plan area, as experiencing an increase in fuel poverty between 2003 and 2011 - in 2003 only 6.3% of households were suffering from fuel poverty, but this figure rose to 15.4% by 2011, exceeding even the average for Northampton as a whole.

**Employment opportunities**

1.12 The Indices of Deprivation data above suggests that unemployment is a serious issue, especially on Blackthorn and Lumbertubs estates and the western part of Lings. The most recent data on household unemployment at this level is from the Census and it confirms much higher levels of unemployment than in Northampton as a whole.

1.13 A number of barriers to employment other than qualification levels are also evidenced by Census data on car ownership, lone parent households and households with a full-time carer (i.e. providing 20 hours or more of unpaid care) in the Figure 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blackthorn and Lings (MSOA 007)</th>
<th>Goldings (LSOA 005E)</th>
<th>Lumbertubs (LSOA 004A)</th>
<th>Northampton as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed households</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without a car</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one car</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with 2 cars</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent households</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with a carer providing 20 hours or more of unpaid care per week</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Barriers to employment data**

1.14 There is poor availability of child care in the local area. The estates also suffer from poor public transport links, which hamper job opportunities for those without access to a car. Whilst bus links to the Weston Favell centre and on into Northampton town centre are adequate, movement between the estates and to other centres of employment can be difficult, involving long journeys and multiple changes. In many cases, what should be a fairly straightforward journey can only be completed by travelling into Northampton town centre and then travelling back out again.

1.15 Other than the Weston Favell District centre and public sector provision, there are very few employment opportunities available within or close to the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Quality of housing and mix

1.16 Northampton Borough Council’s own Stock Condition Survey (2010) found that Council housing in the programme area is in poor condition and, without investment, will not meet nationally recognised ‘Decent Home Standards’:

- Blackthorn: 427 of the 495 homes were expected to become non-decent by 2013 (86%)
- Lings: 283 of the 303 homes were expected to become non-decent by 2013 (93%)
- Lumbertubs: 163 of the 244 homes were becoming non-decent by 2013 (67%)
- Overstone Lodge: 114 of the 117 homes were expected to become non-decent by 2013 (97%)
- Goldings: 246 of the 284 homes were expected to become non-decent by 2013 (87%)

1.17 The two most common reasons for properties failing to meet the Decent Homes Standard are poor repair (76%) and poor heating (20%).

1.18 The estates were developed as Council housing and Northampton Partnership Homes (the arms-length management organisation that is responsible for the management of Northampton’s council housing) remains by far the largest landlord. However, the Right to Buy policies introduced in the 1980s now mean that well over half of the housing is now in owner-occupation or the private rented sector.

1.19 In terms of those homes still within Northampton Borough Council housing stock, the area is primarily made up of 3-bed properties, and there is also a large proportion of 1-bed properties. There a much lower proportion of 2-bed properties and few 4-bed and above properties.

1.20 However, despite the apparently reasonable proportion of 1-bed properties, there is still a local need for more of these, and also 2-bed properties. Many individuals, couples and those with small families, who currently reside in 3-bed properties, wish to downsize in response to the ‘bedroom tax’ and the associated financial burden this is placing on them. However, due to the lack of locally available 1 and 2-bed properties, they have limited opportunities to downsize.

![Figure 4: NBC Housing Stock - housing mix (Nov 2014)](image-url)