



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

www.defra.gov.uk

Statistical Digest of Rural England 2013

September 2013



 Government
Statistical Service

© Crown copyright 2013

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

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

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

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

rural.statistics@defra.gsi.gov.uk

PB14029

Contents

Introduction	5
Official Statistics	5
Defining rural areas	6
Rural Context.....	9
Population.....	9
Population by residence type	10
Population by age	11
Population Change.....	12
Internal Migration	14
Education.....	16
Pupils Leaving School with 5+ A*- C at GCSE Level, based on residency of pupils	16
Pupils Leaving School with 5+ A*- C at GCSE Level, based on location of school	17
Full Time Entrants to Higher Education	19
Part Time Entrants to Higher Education	20
Health	21
Life Expectancy.....	21
Infant Mortality Rate	24
Potential Years of Life Lost (PYLL)	25
Housing.....	30
House Building.....	30
Homelessness and Temporary Accommodation	36
Housing Affordability	38
Private Rental Affordability	40
Fuel and Energy	43
Fuel Poverty.....	44
Household Energy Supply.....	47
Crime	51
Violence against the person offences.....	51
Sexual offences	52
Robbery offences.....	53
Domestic burglary offences.....	54
Vehicle offences.....	55
Poverty.....	56
Households with income below the poverty threshold	57
Working age people in households with income below the poverty threshold.....	58
Children in households with income below the poverty threshold	59
Pensioners in households with income below the poverty threshold	60
Expenditure.....	61
Nominal Expenditure and Disposable Income	61
Transport	64
Distance Travelled	66
Bus Availability	67
Accessibility	68
Measuring accessibility	68
Service Accessibility.....	69
Average Overall Accessibility	72
Broadband	75
Broadband Speed	75
Productivity	77
Contribution to England's Gross Value Added (GVA)	78
Contribution to England's Gross Value Added (GVA), 2010	78
Productivity by Industry	79

.....	81
Gross Value Added (GVA) per Workforce Job	82
Economic Activity	85
Employment Rate	85
Full Time and Part Time Workers	86
Unemployment Rate	88
Economic Inactivity	89
Earnings.....	92
Workplace Based Earnings	92
Residence Based Earnings	94
Skills	95
Residence Based Skills	95
Workplace Based Skills	101
Enterprise	106
Businesses per 10,000 Population	106
Business Start-Ups per 10,000 Population	107
Enterprise Composition	108
Enterprise by Industry Type	111
Enterprise by Size Band.....	113
Innovation	115
Businesses Engaged in Innovation	115
Investment	117
Capital Investment per Employee.....	117

Introduction

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

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

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

- Rural education

Official Statistics

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

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

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

Stephen Hall
Melanie Riley
Adele Storr
Monika Krzykawska

rural.statistics@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Defining rural areas

Wherever possible, the Rural-Urban Classification is used to distinguish rural and urban areas. The Classification defines areas as rural if they fall outside of settlements with more than 10,000 resident population. The Classification assigns one of four urban or six rural categories:

Census Output Areas - the smallest areas for which data are available from the 2001 and 2011 Censuses - are assigned to one of four urban or six rural categories:

Urban: Major Conurbation
Urban: Minor Conurbation
Urban: City and Town
Urban: City and Town in a sparse setting

Rural: Town and Fringe
Rural: Town and Fringe in a sparse setting
Rural: Village
Rural: Village in a sparse setting
Rural: Hamlets and Isolated Dwellings
Rural: Hamlets and Isolated Dwellings in a sparse setting

Those described as “in a sparse setting” reflect where the wider area is remotely populated.

Note: The 2011 Rural-Urban Classification was published on 30 August 2013, and it has not yet been possible to reflect the 2011 Census and Classification in the analysis within the Digest, other than in the main population tables in the Population section.

When data are not available at a small enough geographical scale, it may be possible to apply the Rural-Urban Local Authority Classification. This classification currently categorises districts and unitary authorities on a six point scale from rural to urban. It is underpinned by rural and urban populations as defined by the Classification. It should be noted, however, that the Local Authority Classification is currently based on the 2001 Census and Rural-Urban definition, but will be updated to reflect the 2011 Census and Classification in due course.

In the context of areas the size of local and unitary authorities, the Local Authority Classification also considers some urban areas as Large Market Towns. These Towns serve a wider rural hinterland and their populations are therefore classified as rural for the purposes of the Classification. The Market Towns have populations between 10,000 and 30,000 and meet various service criteria. The categories of the Classification are:

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

- Significant rural (SR) – districts with between 26 and 50 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns.
- Rural-50 (R50) – districts with at least 50 per cent but less than 80 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns, and
- Rural-80 (R80) – districts with at least 80 per cent of their population living in rural settlements and larger market towns.

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

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


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

More information on how to define rural areas can be found at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-environment-food-rural-affairs/series/rural-urban-definition>

England & Wales; 2011 Census Output Areas: Rural-Urban Classification 2011

- Urban major conurbation
- Urban minor conurbation
- Urban city and town
- Urban city and town in a sparse setting
- Rural town and fringe
- Rural town and fringe in a sparse setting
- Rural village
- Rural village in a sparse setting
- Rural hamlets and isolated dwellings
- Rural hamlets or isolated dwellings in a sparse setting



Rural Context

- In 2011 the population of England was 53.0 million, of which 43.7 million (82.4%) lived in urban areas and 9.3 million (17.6%) lived in rural areas.
- Within the rural areas, 0.5 million people lived in sparse settings.
- There are proportionately more older people living in rural areas – over 50% of the population in rural areas were aged 45 and above, compared with around 40% in urban areas.

Population

2011 Census population

	Population	Proportion (%)
Urban major conurbation	18,783,700	35.4
Urban minor conurbation	1,906,100	3.6
Urban city & town	22,978,800	43.3
<i>of which urban city & town in a sparse setting</i>	<i>88,900</i>	<i>0.2</i>
Rural town & fringe	4,657,000	8.8
<i>of which rural town & fringe in a sparse setting</i>	<i>186,300</i>	<i>0.3</i>
Rural village	2,930,500	5.5
<i>of which rural village in a sparse setting</i>	<i>157,700</i>	<i>0.3</i>
Rural hamlet	1,756,400	3.3
<i>of which rural hamlet in a sparse setting</i>	<i>137,400</i>	<i>0.3</i>
Urban	43,668,600	82.4
Rural	9,343,800	17.6
England	53,012,500	100.0

- 9.3 million people, or 17.6% of the population, live in rural areas. This compares with 9.8 million people (19% of the population) in 2001.
- This will be predominantly reflecting changes in the rural-urban classification, as in rural areas in 2001 now determined to be urban in 2011, rather than owing to people moving from rural areas.

Notes: The resident population of an area includes all people who usually live there, whatever their nationality. Members of UK and non-UK armed forces stationed in the UK are included and UK forces stationed outside the UK are excluded.

Students are taken to be resident at their term time address.

Source: ONS, 2013. Census 2011 Data at Output area level. This data uses the RUC2011.

Population by residence type

2011 Census population

	living in a residential household	living in a communal establishment
Urban major conurbation	18,519,400	264,300
Urban minor conurbation	1,867,300	38,900
Urban city & town	22,548,500	430,200
<i>of which urban city & town in a sparse setting</i>	<i>86,000</i>	<i>2,900</i>
Rural town & fringe	4,588,600	68,400
<i>of which rural town & fringe in a sparse setting</i>	<i>182,400</i>	<i>4,000</i>
Rural village	2,851,900	78,500
<i>of which rural village in a sparse setting</i>	<i>155,200</i>	<i>2,600</i>
Rural hamlet	1,684,200	72,200
<i>of which rural hamlet in a sparse setting</i>	<i>134,100</i>	<i>3,300</i>
Urban	42,935,200	733,400
Rural	9,124,700	219,200
England	52,059,900	952,500

- 2.3% of people in rural areas live in communal establishments compared with 1.7% in urban areas.
- 4.1% of people in *Rural hamlets* live in communal establishments compared with just 1.4% in *Urban major conurbations*
- Communal establishments include student accommodation, nurses' homes, care home and sheltered accommodation.


Notes: The resident population of an area includes all people who usually live there, whatever their nationality. Members of UK and non-UK armed forces stationed in the UK are included and UK forces stationed outside the UK are excluded.

Students are taken to be resident at their term time address.

Source: ONS, 2012. Census 2011 Data at Output area level. This data uses the RUC2011.

Population by age

2011 Census population by age



- More than 50% of those living in rural areas are aged 45 years over, compared with 40% in urban areas, and overall there are proportionately more older people in sparse areas.
- In urban areas 21.2% of the population are aged 15 to 29 years, but in rural areas this falls to 14.6% of the population.
- Differences between age bands in rural and urban areas will be reflecting a variety of effects such as younger people moving to urban areas to study and work, and for older people moving to rural areas.

Age groups as a percentage of total 2011 Census population

	0 - 14 years old	15 - 29 years old	30 - 44 years old	45 - 64 years old	65 + years old
Urban major conurbation	18.6	22.3	22.6	23.0	13.4
Urban minor conurbation	17.3	22.5	20.0	24.4	15.7
Urban city & town	17.5	20.0	20.3	25.4	16.9
<i>of which urban city & town in a sparse setting</i>	14.8	16.0	16.2	28.0	25.1
Rural town & fringe	16.7	15.4	18.7	28.3	20.9
<i>of which rural town & fringe in a sparse setting</i>	14.7	15.1	16.5	27.9	25.8
Rural village	15.9	13.8	17.1	31.7	21.4
<i>of which rural village in a sparse setting</i>	13.8	12.7	15.4	32.5	25.6
Rural hamlet	15.2	14.5	16.2	33.5	20.6
<i>of which rural hamlet in a sparse setting</i>	13.7	13.3	14.7	34.9	23.2
Urban	18.0	21.2	21.3	24.4	15.3
Rural	16.2	14.6	17.7	30.3	21.0
England	17.7	20.0	20.6	25.4	16.4

Notes: The resident population of an area includes all people who usually live there, whatever their nationality. Members of UK and non-UK armed forces stationed in the UK are included and UK forces stationed outside the UK are excluded.


Students are taken to be resident at their term time address.

Source: ONS, 2012. Census 2011 Data at Output area level. This data uses the RUC11.

Population Change

(This section has not been updated with 2011 Census data)

Index of population change, 2001 to 2010



- The population of each area type in 2001 has been taken as the base year (and set to 100) on which the population figures for each of the subsequent year are compared. (This will be updated when new rural-urban definition is revised and updated with 2011 Census data later this year.
- Between 2001 and 2010 the greatest rate of population change has been in *less sparse village & dispersed areas* where the population has grown by 6.7%.
- In contrast, over the same period the population of *sparse urban areas* has increased by an average of 3.3%. Between 2008 and 2009 rates of population growth slowed or reversed except in *less sparse urban areas* which have experienced slightly accelerated population change. Between 2009 and 2010 the population in all area types except *sparse village & dispersed* have increased.

Index of population change, 2001 to 2010

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

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


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

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

Internal Migration

(This section has not been updated with 2011 Census data)

Internal migration, 2000/01 to 2010/11



- Between 2000/01 and 2003/04 the general trend for migration between places in England was of net migration to rural areas from urban areas.
- Whilst this overall trend has continued since 2003/04 the extent of net migration to rural areas has been decreasing.
- *Rural-80 areas* saw net inward migration of 25,000 people and *Rural-50 areas* saw net internal migration of 23,000 in 2010/11.
- In contrast, *major urban areas* lost more residents to internal migration, with a net decrease of 61,000 in 2010/11.
- Population change has many drivers and whilst the evidence presented here does not point directly to these causes, changes in the extent of internal migration over the last couple of years suggests a causal link with the economic downturn of the same period. It is likely that the ongoing economic recession and subsequent suppressed housing market have both acted to reduce the extent of movements between rural and urban areas.

Internal migration, 2000/01 to 2010/11, thousands

	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Major urban	-101.7	-134.2	-144.8	-148.1	-111.1	-97.4	-103.6	-92.1	-48.3	-62.8	-60.8
Large urban	-7.5	-9.0	-11.0	-12.2	-9.1	-6.4	-15.2	-8.3	-6.7	-5.1	-6.6
Other urban	-3.0	-3.7	-2.1	-4.7	-2.6	-6.4	-9.7	-2.5	-3.7	-6.9	-0.8
Significant rural	20.8	31.1	31.8	30.2	24.2	22.0	22.2	19.3	13.6	15.9	15.0
Rural-50	38.5	47.2	50.5	52.6	38.4	35.8	44.6	32.8	20.0	26.9	22.9
Rural-80	41.6	52.5	53.4	53.3	38.0	35.9	44.3	32.8	19.9	26.9	25.1
Predominantly urban	-112.2	-146.9	-157.9	-165.0	-122.8	-110.2	-128.5	-102.9	-58.7	-74.8	-68.2
Predominantly rural	80.1	99.7	103.9	105.9	76.4	71.7	88.9	65.6	39.9	53.8	48.0

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

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


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

Education

- In the 2011/12 academic year 83.6% of pupils living in rural areas left school with 5 or more A* - C GCSEs, very similar to the proportion in England overall (83.2%).
- In 2011/12 the proportion of pupils attending schools in rural areas who left school with at least 5 A* - C GCSEs was lower than the percentage of pupils achieving those grades who attended schools in urban areas.
- In 2011/12 there were 165 full time entrants to higher education institutions per 1,000 18-20 year olds from *predominantly rural areas* compared with 159 in England overall. This was an increase from 121 per 1,000 in 2004/05.
- In 2011/12 there were 10 part time entrants to higher education per 1,000 18 – 20 year olds in *predominantly rural areas*, compared with 8 in England overall.

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

Percentage of pupils achieving 5 A* - C grades at GCSE, based on residency of pupil




Percentage of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 leaving school with 5 A* - C GCSEs, based on residency of pupils, 2007/08 to 2011/12

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Urban areas	63.4	69.1	75.8	80.5	83.1
Rural areas	69.7	74.0	78.6	81.6	83.6
Rural town & fringe	67.1	72.0	77.4	80.7	82.7
Rural village	71.6	75.4	79.3	82.1	84.2
Rural hamlet & isolated dwellings	74.2	77.2	81.0	83.2	85.4
England	64.6	70.0	76.3	80.7	83.2

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

Percentage of pupils achieving 5 A* - C grades at GCSE, based on location of school



- The proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more A* - C grades in their GCSEs at the end of Key Stage 4 has been steadily increasing since 2007/08.
- Until 2009/10 a higher proportion of pupils at schools based in rural areas achieved 5 or more A* - C grades at GCSE than pupils in England.
- Since 2010/11 the proportion of pupils at rural schools achieving 5 or more A* - C grades has been lower compared with those attending schools in urban areas.
- There will be differences between residency and location of school as pupils living in rural areas may travel to schools in urban areas and vice versa.

Percentage of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 leaving school with 5 A - C GCSEs, based on location of school, 2007/08 to 2011/12*


	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Urban areas	64.1	69.7	76.2	80.8	83.4
Rural areas	67.3	71.7	76.7	79.9	82.1
Rural town & fringe	67.7	72.0	77.1	80.4	82.5
Rural village	67.3	71.4	76.3	79.2	82.0
Rural hamlet & isolated dwellings	64.9	70.1	75.1	78.0	79.6
England	64.5	70.0	76.3	80.7	83.2

Notes: Includes pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 in each academic year, also includes international GCSEs (iGCSEs), England percentages for school-location and pupil-location are not the same, because pupils with a missing or incorrect residential postcode have been excluded. There is also a small number of pupils resident in Scotland or Wales who attend a school in England – these are included in the location of school analysis, but not in the location of the pupil analysis.

Source: Department for Education: 'GCSE and equivalent attainment by pupil characteristics in England: 2011 to 2012: residency and school location based tables, tables A2 and B1: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gcse-and-equivalent-attainment-by-pupil-characteristics-in-england>

Full Time Entrants to Higher Education

Full Time entrants to higher education per 1,000 population of 18 – 20 year olds, 2004/05 to 2011/12




- The rate of 18 – 20 year olds enrolling for full-time courses at higher education institutions has increased in England between 2004/05 and 2011/12.
- The rate was higher for 18 – 20 years olds who were living in *significant rural areas* prior to starting university than the England average.
- *Predominantly urban areas* have a consistently lower rate than other areas
- This does not take account of the location of the higher education institutions, only where the student was originally resident prior to attending the institution.

Full Time entrants to higher education per 1,000 population of 18-20 year olds, 2004/05 to 2011/12

	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Predominantly urban	117	125	122	126	137	142	141	151
Significant rural	144	156	146	153	164	164	165	175
Predominantly rural	121	129	122	129	139	153	154	165
England	124	133	127	132	143	149	149	159

Part Time Entrants to Higher Education

Part-Time entrants to higher education per 1,000 population of 18 – 20 year olds, 2004/05 to 2011/12



- In England the rate of 18 – 20 year olds enrolling for part –time courses at higher education institutions has decreased since 2008/09.
- The rate was higher for 18 – 20 years olds living in *significant rural areas* until 2009/10, when the rate has since been higher for 18 – 20 year olds living in *predominantly rural areas*.
- *Predominantly urban areas* have consistently had a lower rate than other areas.
- This does not take account of the location of the higher education institutions, only where the student was originally resident prior to attending the institution.

Part-Time entrants to higher education per 1,000 population of 18-20 year olds, 2004/05 to 2011/12

	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Predominantly urban	6	7	8	8	8	7	8	7
Significant rural	7	8	10	9	10	9	10	9
Predominantly rural	6	7	8	8	9	11	10	10
England	6	7	8	8	9	8	8	8

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

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


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

Health


- **Overall health outcomes are more favourable in rural areas than urban areas:** life expectancy (the number of years of life a person is expected to live) is higher, infant mortality rate lower and potential years of life lost from common causes of premature death lower in rural areas than in urban areas.
- **Average life expectancy is highest in Rural-80 areas:** On average, males born in *Rural-80 areas* in 2009-11 are expected to live two years longer than males born in *major urban areas* and on average females born in *Rural-80 areas* in 2009-11 are expected to live one and a half years longer than females born in *large urban areas*.
- **Infant mortality is lower in rural areas:** In 2011, the infant mortality rate in rural areas was 3.7 deaths per 1,000 live births, compared with the England average of 4.3 deaths per 1,000 live births.
- **Potential years of life lost (PYLL) from common causes of death is lower in rural areas.** This means that fewer people living in rural areas are dying prematurely than those living in urban areas. For example PYLL from cancer in *predominantly rural areas* in 2008-10 was 134.7 years per 10,000 people - over fifteen years lower than the 150.6 years per 10,000 people in *predominantly urban areas*.
- In 2008-10, PYLL from stroke or related diseases in *predominantly rural areas* was 12.5 years per 10,000 people and lower than the 16.6 PYLL per 10,000 people in *predominantly urban areas*
- PYLL from Coronary Heart Disease in *predominantly rural areas* in 2008-10 was 36 years per 10,000 people and lower than the 51.2 years per 10,000 people in *predominantly urban areas*.

Life Expectancy

Male life expectancy at birth, 1991-93 to 2009-11



Female life expectancy at birth, 1991-93 to 2009-11



- Life expectancy has increased in all areas across England
- In 2009-11 life expectancy for men was 78.8 years and 82.9 years for women. This means that a newborn baby boy born in England can expect to live to 78.8 years of age, if mortality rates stay the same throughout his lifetime. Likewise, for a newborn baby girl, they can expect to live to 82.9 years of age.
- Life expectancy was higher for people born in rural areas compared with urban areas. This means that if mortality rates do not change, people born in rural areas can expect to live longer than people born in urban areas.
- Life expectancy was highest in *Rural-80* areas with men born in these areas expected to live until 80.2 years of age and women expected to live until 83.9 years.
- Life expectancy was lowest in *major urban areas* for men and in *large urban areas* for women.
- Men born in *Rural-80 areas* were expected to live two years longer than men in *major urban areas*.
- Women in *Rural-80 areas* were expected to live almost one and a half years longer than women born in *large urban areas*.

Male life expectancy at birth in years, 1998-00 to 2009-11

	1998-00	1999-01	2000-02	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10	2009-11
Major urban	74.4	74.7	75.0	75.2	75.6	76.0	76.4	76.7	77.0	77.4	77.8	78.2
Large urban	75.0	75.3	75.6	75.7	76.0	76.3	76.8	77.0	77.3	77.5	77.9	78.3
Other urban	75.1	75.4	75.6	75.9	76.1	76.5	76.8	77.1	77.4	77.6	77.9	78.3
Significant rural	76.1	76.5	76.8	77.1	77.2	77.5	77.9	78.3	78.6	78.9	79.2	79.6
Rural-50	76.2	76.6	76.9	77.1	77.4	77.8	78.2	78.5	78.8	79.1	79.4	79.7
Rural-80	76.8	77.2	77.4	77.7	77.9	78.3	78.6	79.0	79.2	79.5	79.9	80.2
Predominantly urban	74.7	75.0	75.3	75.5	75.8	76.2	76.6	76.9	77.2	77.5	77.8	78.2
Predominantly rural	76.5	76.9	77.1	77.4	77.6	78.0	78.4	78.7	79.0	79.3	79.6	79.9
England	75.3	75.7	75.9	76.2	76.4	76.8	77.2	77.5	77.8	78.1	78.4	78.8

Female life expectancy at birth in years, 1998-00 to 2009-11


	1998-00	1999-01	2000-02	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10	2009-11
Major urban	79.6	79.8	80.1	80.2	80.4	80.6	81.0	81.3	81.5	81.9	82.1	82.5
Large urban	80.0	80.2	80.4	80.4	80.6	80.8	81.2	81.4	81.5	81.8	82.0	82.4
Other urban	80.0	80.2	80.3	80.4	80.6	80.8	81.2	81.4	81.6	81.9	82.1	82.5
Significant rural	80.6	80.8	81.2	81.3	81.4	81.6	82.0	82.2	82.4	82.7	82.9	83.3
Rural-50	80.7	81.0	81.2	81.3	81.5	81.6	82.0	82.3	82.5	82.8	83.0	83.4
Rural-80	81.2	81.5	81.8	81.8	81.9	82.2	82.6	82.9	83.0	83.2	83.5	83.9
Predominantly urban	79.8	80.0	80.2	80.3	80.5	80.7	81.1	81.4	81.6	81.9	82.1	82.5
Predominantly rural	80.9	81.2	81.4	81.5	81.7	81.9	82.3	82.5	82.7	83.0	83.2	83.6
England	80.2	80.4	80.6	80.7	80.9	81.1	81.5	81.8	82.0	82.2	82.5	82.9

Notes: Figures for 2000/02 – 2008/10 have been revised by ONS following publication of mid-year sub-national population estimates. Weighted average is calculated using Census 2001 population by Local Authority. The life expectancy calculation is based on the mortality rate, so if a life expectancy is high, the mortality rate is low for younger age groups.

Source: ONS, Life expectancy at birth and at age 65 by local areas in England and Wales, 2009 –11; for more information see <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-314574>

Infant Mortality Rate

Infant mortality rate, by settlement type in England, 2004 to 2011



- The Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) is the number of infant deaths (where infants are under one year old) per 1,000 live births.
- In 2011, the IMR was lower in rural areas than the England average at 3.7 deaths per 1,000 live births, compared with 4.3 in England
- The IMR has been decreasing in England overall. However the IMR for rural areas fluctuates more than urban areas and there is no clear trend in the data shown owing to the smaller populations involved. There are many factors that are shown to influence the IMR, including birth weight, mothers' age, and socio-economic status.

Infant deaths (aged under 1 year) per 1,000 live births, by settlement type in England, 2003 to 2011

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Urban	5.6	5.2	5.2	5.2	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.5	4.4
Rural	3.8	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.7
Rural town & fringe	4.1	3.7	4.4	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.3	3.8
Rural village	3.2	4.2	3.5	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.1	3.7
Rural hamlet & isolated dwellings	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.1	4.3	3.4	3.4
England	5.3	5.1	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.3

Notes: Infants are defined as less than one year old
 Source: ONS, for more information contact vsob@ons.gov.uk

Potential Years of Life Lost (PYLL)


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

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

For people to recover from these conditions it is also important to have access to medical facilities and in the case of having a stroke or heart attack, it is essential to receive treatment quickly. Early detection of these diseases will mean that people can get the necessary treatment before the disease progresses.

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

Potential years life lost from cancer, 2001-03 to 2008-10




- In 2008-10, PYLL from **cancer** in *Rural-80 areas* was 131.8 years per 10,000 people. This means that 131.8 years of life was lost from people prematurely dying from cancer for every 10,000 people living in *Rural-80 areas*.
- PYLL was lower in rural areas than in urban areas between 2001-03 and 2008-10. PYLL was lowest in *Rural-80 areas* and highest in *large urban areas*.
- PYLL from cancer was decreasing in all areas between 2001-03 and 2008-10 and the PYLL from cancer in England decreased by just under 18 years per 10,000 people in this period.

Potential years of life lost from cancer per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

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

Potential years of life lost from stroke and related illnesses, 2001-03 to 2008-10




- The PYLL from **stroke and related diseases** was lowest for *Rural-80 areas* and highest in *major urban areas*.
- In 2008-10 PYLL from Stroke in *Rural-80 areas* was 12.2 years per 10,000 people, 5.2 years per 10,000 people lower than PYLL in *major urban areas*, and lower than for England overall.
- PYLL decreased between 2001-03 and 2008-10 in England and in both rural and urban areas, from 22.5 years to 15.5 years per 10,000 people.

Potential years of life lost from stroke and related diseases per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

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

Potential years life lost from coronary heart disease, 2001-03 to 2008-10




- PYLL from **Coronary Heart Disease (CHD)** in England was 46.9 years per 10,000 people in 2008-10.
- PYLL in *predominantly rural areas* was approximately 10 years lower per 10,000 people, and PYLL was lowest in *Rural-80 areas* at 34.1 years per 10,000 people.
- In *major urban areas*, PYLL was considerably more at 52.3 years per 10,000 people.
- PYLL from CHD in England has decreased overall by over 20 years per 10,000 people between 2001-03 and 2008-10, with reductions in all areas.

Potential years of life lost from coronary heart disease per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

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

Potential years of life lost from suicide and undetermined injuries, 2001-03 to 2008-10



- PYLL due to **suicide or undetermined injuries** in England in 2008-10 was 26.3 years per 10,000 population.
- There does not appear to be a clear relationship between PYLL and the different settlement types

Potential years of life lost from suicide and undetermined injuries per 10,000 population, 2001-03 to 2008-10

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

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


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

Housing

- There is a higher rate of house-builds started and completed in *predominantly rural areas* than in *predominantly urban areas* and compared with the national average.
- The rate of house-builds being started decreased in *predominantly rural* and *predominantly urban areas* between 2010/11 and 2011/12, but increased slightly for *significant rural areas*, while the rate of completions saw an increase in all areas.
- There are proportionally fewer homeless people and people in temporary accommodation in rural areas than in urban areas.
- Housing affordability is lower in *predominantly rural areas* than *predominantly urban areas*. In 2011, the average lower quartile house price was 7.8 times the average lower quartile earnings in *predominantly rural areas*. This compares with 7.1 in *predominantly urban areas* and 7.3 in England as a whole.
- Average Private Registered Provider rents per week are similar in rural areas to those in urban areas, outside of London.

House Building

Permanent dwellings started and completed per 10,000 population, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2004/05 to 2011/12



- In 2011-12 the rate of house building starts and completions per 10,000 population was highest in *predominantly rural areas*. This may be the result of specific targets for new homes to be built in smaller rural settlements. The availability of space to build new homes, which is perhaps limited in *major urban areas*, may also have an impact.
- In 2010-11 the rate of starts per 10,000 population for *significant rural areas* was below the national average. The long term pattern, however, has been reasonably similar across the different area types.
- Statistics on house building are used by housing market analysts to give an indication of the likely stock of available housing in the future, whereas house-builds completed indicate the availability of additional housing now.
- There was sustained growth in building starts until 2007-08, when there was a sharp downturn. This is likely to reflect the economic downturn and later recession. After the 2008-09 the rate of starts began to recover, but completions increased more gradually.


Permanent dwellings started, by tenure and Local Authority Classification in England, 2004/05 to 2011/12

		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
		Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000s)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n
Private	Major urban	32	19.0	39	22.9	33	19.1	34	19.6	14	8.0	14	8.0	18	10.0	20	11.0
	Large urban	14	20.0	17	24.7	17	25.3	15	21.8	7	10.3	6	9.2	8	11.1	8	10.8
	Other urban	24	32.2	26	33.9	25	32.2	20	26.5	8	10.2	10	13.1	11	13.7	12	14.5
	Significant rural	20	30.1	20	29.0	19	28.3	16	22.9	7	10.4	9	12.6	9	12.8	10	13.8
	Rural-50	21	29.9	22	30.7	21	29.2	20	27.9	8	11.7	9	11.9	11	15.3	11	15.5
	Rural-80	17	33.4	18	34.1	18	33.7	17	32.6	8	15.7	9	17.3	12	21.5	10	19.1
	England	129	25.6	141	27.9	132	26.1	122	23.9	53	10.3	57	11.0	68	13.0	71	13.3
Local Authority / Registered Social Landlord	Major urban	6	3.8	8	4.8	6	3.6	6	3.8	5	3.0	6	3.4	9	5.1	7	3.9
	Large urban	1	2.2	1	2.1	2	2.4	2	2.6	1	1.9	1	1.7	1	1.9	1	1.8
	Other urban	3	4.4	4	5.5	4	5.2	4	4.7	3	4.5	3	3.7	3	3.5	2	2.8
	Significant rural	2	2.6	3	3.8	3	3.9	3	4.3	3	4.0	3	3.6	2	3.5	2	3.3
	Rural-50	2	2.4	2	3.0	2	2.5	3	4.1	2	3.3	2	2.4	3	4.3	3	3.8
	Rural-80	2	3.1	2	3.6	2	3.4	3	5.0	2	4.2	2	4.1	3	5.3	2	4.1
	England	16	3.2	20	4.0	18	3.5	20	4.0	17	3.4	16	3.2	22	4.1	18	3.4
All	Major urban	38	22.7	44	26.0	39	22.5	39	22.9	19	11.1	20	11.4	27	15.2	27	15.2
	Large urban	13	19.8	17	25.1	16	23.5	16	23.0	9	12.4	8	11.4	9	12.8	9	12.4
	Other urban	26	34.6	30	39.4	29	37.3	24	31.0	11	14.5	13	16.8	14	18.3	14	17.3
	Significant rural	22	32.7	22	32.7	22	31.4	20	29.5	11	15.7	11	16.1	11	16.3	12	17.0
	Rural-50	22	31.7	24	33.7	21	30.3	23	32.0	11	15.1	10	13.2	14	19.7	14	19.3
	Rural-80	18	35.8	19	37.3	19	36.4	20	37.5	11	19.8	11	21.4	14	26.8	14	26.3
	England	141	28.1	157	31.0	145	28.6	142	27.8	71	13.9	73	14.1	90	17.3	91	17.1


Permanent dwellings completed, by tenure and Local Authority Classification in England, 2004/05 to 2011/12

		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
		Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n	Number (000's)	Rate per 10,000 pop'n
Private enterprise	Major urban	31	18.6	35	20.5	31	18.2	36	21.2	29	16.7	21	11.9	20	11.3	21	11.4
	Large urban	13	19.8	13	19.4	16	22.9	16	22.6	12	17.2	10	13.7	9	12.1	9	12.3
	Other urban	20	26.0	23	29.9	23	29.6	22	28.6	16	20.3	13	16.2	11	13.7	14	17.4
	Significant rural	19	27.9	19	27.1	17	25.1	17	24.6	12	17.4	10	14.8	10	14.0	11	15.0
	Rural-50	18	25.7	22	31.0	21	29.9	20	28.7	14	19.8	9	13.1	12	15.0	12	15.7
	Rural-80	16	30.5	17	32.0	18	33.6	17	32.0	14	26.6	11	21.1	11	19.9	10	19.2
	England	117	23.4	128	25.3	126	24.7	128	25.1	97	18.9	74	14.3	71	13.5	76	14.3
Local Authority/ Registered Social Landlord	Major urban	6	3.8	6	3.7	7	4.3	7	4.1	7	4.2	7	4.0	9	4.9	10	5.7
	Large urban	1	1.5	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	3.1	2	2.9	2	2.4	2	2.4	2	2.8
	Other urban	2	3.1	3	4.4	4	4.8	4	5.2	4	5.5	4	5.3	3	3.7	3	4.1
	Significant rural	2	2.4	2	2.7	3	3.8	2	3.4	3	4.7	3	4.8	3	3.9	4	5.0
	Rural-50	1	1.9	2	2.8	2	2.6	2	2.9	3	3.5	2	2.5	3	3.7	3	4.1
	Rural-80	1	2.8	2	3.4	2	3.0	2	3.5	4	6.8	2	4.7	2	4.1	3	5.3
	England	14	2.8	17	3.3	18	3.6	19	3.8	23	4.5	21	4.0	21	4.0	25	4.7
All	Major urban	36	21.5	39	22.8	39	22.7	43	25.1	37	21.2	28	15.9	29	16.5	32	17.7
	Large urban	12	17.1	13	19.8	15	21.3	17	24.3	14	20.1	12	16.7	10	14.5	11	15.3
	Other urban	22	28.0	26	34.3	26	34.4	26	33.7	20	25.2	17	21.5	14	17.8	17	21.6
	Significant rural	21	30.4	20	29.8	19	28.1	21	29.7	16	23.4	14	19.6	13	17.8	14	20.1
	Rural-50	19	27.1	24	33.9	22	31.2	22	31.4	17	23.4	10	14.5	14	18.7	15	19.8
	Rural-80	17	32.8	18	34.9	19	36.4	19	35.5	18	33.3	14	25.7	13	24.0	15	28.1
	England	125	25.0	141	27.9	140	27.6	147	28.9	121	23.5	94	18.2	93	17.7	104	19.6

House-Building: permanent private enterprise dwellings started per 10,000 population, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2004/05 to 2011/12




House-Building: permanent Local Authority/Registered Social Landlord dwellings started per 10,000 population, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2004/05 to 2011/12




- In 2011-12, 17 house-builds were started by private enterprise per 10,000 population in the most rural areas (dark green line), a decrease of one percentage point compared with the previous year.
- In 2011-12, all areas except for *significant rural areas* showed a decline or remained the same for house builds started per 10,000 population.
- The private sector was affected more immediately by the economic downturn of 2008, with a sharp downturn in house-builds started. The Local Authority/Registered Social Landlord starts do not show as strong an impact, which in part may reflect the rate of builds being much lower than private enterprise house building.

House-Building: permanent private enterprise dwellings completed per 10,000 population, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2004/05 to 2011/12



House-Building: permanent Local Authority/Registered Social Landlord dwellings completed per 10,000 population, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2004/05 to 2011/12




- In 2011-12, 17 house-builds were completed by private enterprise per 10,000 population in the most rural areas (dark green line), a similar level to the previous year. Private enterprise dwelling completions have been steady between 2009-10 and 2011-12.
- In 2011-12, all areas showed an increase in the rate of house-build completions except private sector completions in *Rural-80* areas.
- The rate of Local Authority/RSL completions is much lower than private house building.

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


Source: Communities and Local Government, Table 253 Housebuilding: permanent dwellings started and completed, by tenure and district, 2011/12, www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-house-building

Homelessness and Temporary Accommodation

Homeless and in priority need per 1,000 households, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2002/03 to 2011/12



People in temporary accommodation per 10,000 households, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2002/03 to 2011/12



- The proportion of people who are homeless and in priority need of assistance in securing permanent settled accommodation, as a rate per 1,000 households, was 2.9 in *predominantly urban areas* and 1.8 in *predominantly rural areas*.
- The proportion of people who are in temporary accommodation, per 1,000 households, was 3.6 in *predominantly urban areas* and 0.5 in *predominantly rural areas*.
- The rate of homeless and in priority need of assistance increased for all area types between 2009-10 and 2010-11.
- Homelessness and being in temporary, rather than settled, accommodation is a social problem associated both with individual and wider wellbeing.
- Historically, changes in homelessness levels coincide with changes in numbers of people in temporary accommodation a few years later.

People who are homeless and in priority need per 1,000 households, by Local Authority Classification in England, 2002/03 to 2011/12

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12
Major urban	8.2	8.5	7.4	4.8	4.5	3.8	3.6	2.7	2.9	3.3
Large urban	5.2	6.1	5.6	3.9	3.2	2.5	2.5	1.8	2.0	2.2
Other urban	6.4	6.5	5.9	4.6	3.6	3.1	2.5	2.0	2.2	2.5
Significant rural	4.3	4.6	4.2	3.0	2.4	2.1	1.7	1.3	1.4	1.7
Rural-50	4.1	4.5	4.4	3.3	2.5	2.1	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.8
Rural-80	3.8	3.7	3.4	2.7	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.6	1.7
Predominantly urban	7.1	7.5	6.7	4.5	4.0	3.4	3.1	2.4	2.5	2.9
Predominantly rural	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.0	2.3	2.0	1.6	1.3	1.5	1.8
England	6.3	6.7	5.9	4.6	3.6	3.1	2.6	2.0	2.2	2.5

People in Temporary Accommodation per 1,000 Households, by Local Authority Classification, in England, 2002/03 to 2011/12

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12
Major urban	6.7	8.4	8.5	9.3	8.8	7.9	7.0	5.7	5.3	5.5
Large urban	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.0	0.7	0.8	0.9
Other urban	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.8	2.9	2.4	1.9	1.4	1.3	1.4
Significant rural	2.0	1.9	2.1	1.9	1.4	1.2	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7
Rural-50	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.5	1.3	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5
Rural-80	1.8	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.5	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.7
Predominantly urban	5.1	6.0	6.1	6.4	5.8	5.2	4.6	3.7	3.4	3.6
Predominantly rural	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.5
England	4.4	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.3	3.8	3.1	2.5	2.4	2.5


Notes: Temporary accommodation includes Bed and Breakfast, hostels, women's refuges, local authority and housing association stock, and private sector leased properties. These statistics use the new Local Authority class for mid-population figures, so there may be minor adjustments to previously published figures.

Source: Communities and Local Government, housing statistics table 784, 2011-12.

www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-homelessness

Housing Affordability

Ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings, by Local Authority Classification, 1997 to 2011



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

Ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile workplace-based earnings, 1997 to 2011

	1997	199	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
	8														
Major urban	3.8	4.0	4.3	4.8	5.2	5.9	6.3	7.2	7.5	7.9	8.4	8.4	7.2	7.7	7.7
Large urban	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.9	4.3	4.9	5.4	6.3	6.8	7.0	7.4	7.2	6.2	6.6	6.3
Other urban	3.4	3.5	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.9	5.4	6.3	6.9	7.1	7.4	7.2	6.1	6.5	6.3
Significant rural	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.9	5.2	5.9	6.6	7.5	8.1	8.2	8.5	8.3	7.3	7.8	7.6
Rural-50	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.8	5.1	5.8	6.5	7.5	7.9	8.1	8.4	8.3	7.2	7.8	7.5
Rural-80	4.4	4.5	4.8	5.2	5.6	6.5	7.2	8.5	9.0	9.0	9.5	9.3	8.0	8.6	8.3
Predominantly urban	3.6	3.8	4.0	4.4	4.8	5.4	5.9	6.8	7.2	7.5	7.9	7.8	6.7	7.2	7.1
Predominantly rural	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.9	5.3	6.1	6.8	7.9	8.4	8.5	8.9	8.7	7.6	8.1	7.8
England	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.6	5.0	5.7	6.2	7.1	7.6	7.8	8.2	8.1	7.0	7.5	7.3

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

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

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

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


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

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


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

Private Rental Affordability

Average private registered provider (PRP) rents, £ per week, by Local Authority Classification, 2011



Average private registered provider (PRP) rents, £ per week, by Local Authority Classification, 1997 to 2011



- These charts and table show the average private registered provider rents per week are highest in London, but very similar for all other areas.
- Costs have steadily increased between 1997 and 2011, with the national average rental cost at £78 per week in 2011.
- Affordability, however, will be affected by average incomes in those areas, and lower earners may choose to rent where they cannot afford to purchase a property.
- Average earnings for individuals who work or live in urban areas are generally slightly higher than for individuals who work or live in rural areas, which may result in lower affordability in rural areas.

Average private registered providers (PRP) rents £s per week, 1997 to 2011

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
London	54	58	61	62	64	66	68	71	76	80	83	87	92	97	99
Major urban (excl. London)	43	46	48	50	51	53	54	56	59	62	64	67	70	74	75
Large urban	47	49	51	53	53	55	57	58	61	63	65	68	71	75	75
Other urban	47	50	52	53	54	56	57	59	62	65	67	70	74	78	78
Significant rural	48	51	53	55	55	57	59	60	63	66	69	72	76	80	81
Rural-50	47	50	52	53	54	56	57	59	63	65	67	70	73	78	78
Rural-80	46	48	50	51	52	53	55	56	59	62	65	67	71	75	76
Predominantly urban (excl London)	45	48	50	51	52	54	56	57	60	63	65	68	71	75	75
Predominantly rural	47	50	51	53	54	55	57	58	62	64	66	69	73	77	77
England	47	50	52	53	54	56	57	58	61	64	67	70	74	78	78

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

Source: Communities and Local Government, Table 704: RSL rents, by district, from 1997 www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-rents-lettings-and-tenancies

Fuel and Energy

Households in fuel poverty are those that are at risk of being unable to afford to heat their homes to an adequate standard. They may also be less able to spend money on other necessities. A household is said to be in fuel poverty if it needs to spend more than 10% of its income on fuel to maintain an adequate level of warmth (usually 21 degrees for the main living area, and 18 degrees for other occupied rooms). It is not based on what is actually spent. Fuel poverty rates are influenced by household incomes, fuel usage and fuel prices. In addition it may be affected by ability to take up energy saving initiatives.

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

Fuel Poverty

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



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

	2006	2008	2009	2010
Less sparse urban	10.6	14.5	17.4	15.9
Sparse urban	16.4	29.8	34.0	21.1
Less sparse rural town & fringe	10.6	13.4	16.6	15.7
Sparse rural town & fringe	16.7	27.3	31.7	21.0
Less sparse village	15.7	23.7	25.3	18.7
Sparse village	25.3	35.6	39.1	28.0
Less sparse hamlet & isolated dwellings	22.9	27.4	29.1	22.8
Sparse hamlet & isolated dwellings	38.9	42.9	46.8	34.1
Urban	10.7	14.5	17.5	15.9
Rural	15.3	20.5	23.0	18.4
England	11.6	15.7	18.6	16.4

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

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

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



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

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

In March 2012, Professor John Hills presented his final report to Government on his independent review of Fuel Poverty.

In that report he proposed a new way to define fuel poverty. The report can be viewed at:

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



(c) Crown Copyright
All rights reserved
Defra 100018880 2010

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

0 20 40 80 Miles

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

(c) Crown Copyright
All rights reserved
Defra 100018880 2012

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


0 20 40 80 Miles

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

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


Household Energy Supply

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



Note: AEA Technology modelled data based on DECC LSOA estimates

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




Note: AEA Technology modelled data based on DECC LSOA estimates

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

	All House Types	Detached	Semi Detached	Terrace	Flat	Other
Urban	9	9	8	9	13	19
Rural	38	46	35	29	27	52
Rural town & fringe	16	17	15	16	17	29
Rural village	57	60	55	50	50	63
Rural hamlet & isolated dwellings	64	68	62	49	52	55
England	15	23	13	12	14	36

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



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

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


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

http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/fuelgov_stats/regional/regional.aspx
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6757/2173775.xls#DA2202!A1

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

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

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



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

Notes: Main heating fuel types have been grouped together. For example, 'Gas fired systems' is made up from 'Gas – Mains', 'Gas – Bulk/LPG' and 'Gas – Bottled'. Figures may therefore differ from DCLG published data.
 Source: DECC, English Housing Condition survey, 2007, energy.stats@decc.gsi.gov.uk, DCLG, English Housing Survey 2009 and 2010
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6757/2173775.xls#DA2202!A1
 For more discussion of fuel poverty statistics see <http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/stats/fuel-poverty/5270-annual-report-fuel-poverty-stats-2012.pdf> though note this does not contain any rural-urban analysis. For statistics on energy costs from the Expenditure and Food Survey see <http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/statistics/source/prices/qep262.xls>.

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


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

Crime

- Average crime rates are lower in rural areas than urban areas.
- In 2012/13, the rate of violence against the person was 7.2 per 1,000 people in *predominantly rural areas* compared with 12.3 per 1,000 people in *predominantly urban areas*.
- The rate of sexual offences in *predominantly urban areas* was 1.1 per 1,000 in 2012/13, compared with 0.7 per 1,000 in *predominantly rural areas*.
- The rate of recorded crime was also higher in urban areas than rural areas for crimes such as robbery, domestic burglary and vehicle offences (theft of, theft from or vehicle interference). For example, there were 8.4 vehicle offences per 1,000 people in *predominantly urban areas* and 4.2 per 1,000 people in *predominantly rural areas* in 2012/13.
- Overall, the rate of crime has been decreasing between 2005/06 and 2012/13 for all types of crime in both rural and urban areas.

Violence against the person offences

Police recorded violence against the person offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13




- Since 2005/06 the rate of violence against the person offences has been much higher in *predominantly urban areas* than *predominantly rural areas*. For all rural classifications, the rate of violent offences has been lower than the average England rate.
- In 12 months ending in March 2013, the rate of violence against a person was lowest in *Rural-80 areas*, where there were 6.9 recorded acts of violent crime per 1,000 people, considerably lower than the rate in *major urban, large urban and other urban areas* where the rate was between 12.2 to 12.4 recorded acts of crime per 1,000 people.

Police recorded violence against the person offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Major urban	18.6	17.6	15.9	15.3	15.0	14.1	13.0	12.2
Large urban	19.3	18.8	17.4	16.1	15.5	14.3	13.2	12.2
Other urban	18.1	17.6	16.2	15.0	14.7	14.1	13.2	12.4
Significant rural	13.1	12.8	11.9	10.9	10.8	10.4	9.7	8.9
Rural-50	10.5	10.6	9.5	9.0	8.7	8.3	7.8	7.5
Rural-80	8.9	8.5	8.0	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.2	6.9
Predominantly urban	18.6	17.8	16.3	15.4	15.0	14.1	13.1	12.3
Predominantly rural	9.8	9.7	8.9	8.3	8.2	7.9	7.6	7.2
England	15.7	15.2	13.9	13.1	12.8	12.1	11.3	10.6

Sexual offences

Police recorded sexual offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13




- Since 2005/06, the rate of sexual offences in *predominantly rural areas* has been lower than in *predominantly urban areas*.
- In 2012/13, the rate of recorded sexual offences in *predominantly rural areas* was 0.7 per 1,000 population, 0.4 lower than the rate in *predominantly urban areas*.

Police recorded sexual offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Major urban	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0
Large urban	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1
Other urban	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1
Significant rural	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Rural-50	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Rural-80	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Predominantly urban	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Predominantly rural	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
England	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9

Robbery offences

Police recorded robbery offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13




- Robbery offences occurred at a substantially higher rate in *major urban areas* than any other type of settlement in England.
- The rate of recorded robbery offences in 2012/13 in *major urban areas* was 2.6 per 1,000 population, 0.5 lower than in 2011/12.
- The rate in *predominantly urban areas* was 9 times the rate observed in *predominantly rural areas*.

Police recorded robbery offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Major urban	4.0	4.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.6
Large urban	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.0	0.8
Other urban	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7
Significant rural	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3
Rural-50	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
Rural-80	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Predominantly urban	2.8	2.9	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.8
Predominantly rural	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
England	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.2

Domestic burglary offences

Police recorded domestic burglary offences per 1,000 households, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13




- Since 2005/06 the rate of domestic burglary offences has been higher in *predominantly urban areas* than *predominantly rural areas*;
- In 2012/13 the rate of domestic burglary in *major urban areas* was more than three times the rate recorded in *Rural-80 areas*.

Police recorded domestic burglary offences per 1,000 households, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Major urban	19.6	18.7	18.0	18.1	17.6	17.3	16.6	15.1
Large urban	16.4	15.4	14.6	14.6	13.0	11.9	11.0	10.4
Other urban	14.2	14.1	12.9	13.3	11.5	11.0	10.5	9.7
Significant rural	9.4	9.1	8.6	8.7	8.4	7.7	7.2	6.7
Rural-50	7.7	7.6	7.0	7.2	6.4	5.8	5.4	5.3
Rural-80	5.8	5.3	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.2
Predominantly urban	17.6	16.8	16.0	16.2	15.1	14.6	13.9	12.8
Predominantly rural	6.9	6.6	6.1	6.2	5.7	5.2	4.9	4.8
England	13.9	13.3	12.6	12.7	11.9	11.3	10.8	10.0

Vehicle offences

Police recorded vehicle offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13



- In 2012/13 the rate of vehicle offences (theft of, theft from or vehicle interference) in England fell to 6.9 per 1,000 population, less than half the rate in 2005/06.
- The rate was higher in *predominantly urban areas* than *predominantly rural areas*.
- The rate was highest in *major urban areas*, where there were 9.5 vehicle offences per 1,000 people compared with 3.9 offences recorded in *Rural-80 areas*.

Police recorded vehicle offences per 1,000 population, England, 2005/06 to 2012/13

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Major urban	18.8	17.9	15.5	14.0	11.9	11.3	10.6	9.5
Large urban	18.8	17.9	14.3	12.4	9.8	8.3	7.6	7.0
Other urban	16.3	15.7	13.6	12.0	9.5	8.5	7.6	7.1
Significant rural	10.9	10.8	9.2	8.4	7.0	6.3	5.7	5.1
Rural-50	9.3	9.0	7.9	7.3	5.9	5.2	4.9	4.4
Rural-80	7.3	6.9	6.1	5.6	4.9	4.3	4.1	3.9
Predominantly urban	18.2	17.4	14.8	13.1	10.9	10.0	9.2	8.4
Predominantly rural	8.5	8.1	7.2	6.5	5.5	4.8	4.5	4.2
England	14.9	14.2	12.2	10.9	9.0	8.2	7.6	6.9

Source: ONS, *Recorded crime data at Community Safety Partnership / Local Authority level from 2002/03' – Supplementary Excel tables to 'Crime Statistics, period ending March 2013*, available from: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcn%3A77-322086>

Unlike the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), recorded crime figures do not include crimes that have not been reported to the police or incidents that the police decide not to record. It was estimated in 2012/13 that around 44 per cent of CSEW comparable crime was reported to the police, although this proportion varied considerably for individual offence types.

See <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/method-quality/specific/crime-statistics-methodology/user-guide-to-crime-statistics.pdf> (Chapter 3) for more information.


Crime rates are calculated using the mid-year population / household numbers for the year immediately prior to the crime reporting period.

Poverty

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

Households with income below the poverty threshold

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




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

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

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

Working age people in households with income below the poverty threshold

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




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

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

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

Children in households with income below the poverty threshold

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




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

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

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

Pensioners in households with income below the poverty threshold

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



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

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

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

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

The measures have been determined by disposable income, both before and after housing costs. If housing costs are not taken into account, improvements in living standards could be overstated for individuals whose housing costs are high relative to the quality of accommodation or those who receive Housing Benefit. If housing costs are included then a shift from renting to owning a house will reduce the income of low-income individuals who used to receive Housing Benefit. There was a lower proportion of pensioners below the poverty threshold after housing costs than before housing costs as many pensioners have paid their mortgages and so will have low housing costs.


Source: DWP, bespoke data request.

Expenditure

- Levels of household expenditure are unsurprisingly closely related to disposable income.
- However there are differences in absolute and proportional spending patterns, appearing to reflect where households live.
- These differences may illustrate where changes in price or spending patterns would have the greatest impacts.
- Both average weekly expenditure and disposable income are highest in *hamlet & isolated dwellings* and lowest in *rural town & fringe areas*

Nominal Expenditure and Disposable Income

Weekly Expenditure and Disposable Income, 2010



- Average household expenditure as a proportion of disposable income ranges from 68% in *rural hamlets & isolated dwellings* to 78% in *rural villages*.
- For both settlement types, average weekly household expenditure is around £100 more than the England average, but their average disposable incomes are also higher.
- However, average weekly disposable income in *rural hamlets & isolated dwellings* is around £100 more than in *rural villages*, hence those in *rural villages* spend proportionately more of their disposable income each week. Average disposable income

Weekly household expenditure, as a percentage of disposable income, 2010

Commodity or Service	Urban	Rural town & fringe	Rural village	Rural hamlet & isolated dwellings	England
Food & non-alcoholic beverage	9.0	9.9	9.1	8.3	9.1
Alcoholic Beverages, Tobacco	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.0	1.8
Clothing and Footwear	3.9	4.1	3.7	2.4	3.9
ousing, Water, Electricity	10.9	10.0	9.6	8.3	10.5
Furnishings, HH Equipment, Carpets	5.3	6.5	6.2	5.2	5.5
Health expenditure	0.9	1.2	1.2	0.5	0.9
Transport costs	10.7	12.5	13.9	12.0	11.2
Communication	2.3	2.1	2.3	1.7	2.3
Recreation	9.4	10.6	14.0	12.3	10.1
Education	1.6	0.9	2.3	3.4	1.7
Restaurants and Hotels	6.8	6.4	6.5	6.2	6.7
Miscellaneous Goods and Services	6.1	6.7	7.3	6.0	6.3
Total Expenditure as a % of Disposable Income	68.8	73.1	78.2	68.2	70.1

- For most commodities there are only slight differences in the amount spent across settlement types.
- Average weekly transport costs for those in rural villages are £14 higher than the national average and account for 13.9% of disposable income, compared with England as a whole (11.2%).
- In some cases, those in *rural villages* and *rural hamlets & isolated dwellings* may spend more than households in other settlement types, e.g. they spend an average of over £30 more per week on recreation compared with the national average. However, this may in part reflect higher levels of disposable income.


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

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

Transport

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

Travel Behaviour



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

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

	Trips per person	Travelling time per person	Miles per person	Average trip distance
Urban	99	99	92	92
Rural town & fringe	103	102	128	124
Rural village & hamlet	103	106	145	140
England	100	100	100	100


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

	Trips per person	Travelling time per person	Miles per person	Average trip distance
Urban	990	376	6,381	6
Rural town & fringe	1,025	389	8,902	9
Rural village & hamlet	1,027	403	10,067	10
England	997	380	6,957	7

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

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

Distance Travelled




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

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

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

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

Bus Availability



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

Bus availability, 2002 to 2009

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Urban	93%	95%	95%	95%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Rural town & fringe	76%	80%	84%	80%	80%	81%	83%	82%
Rural village & hamlet	39%	41%	47%	49%	46%	50%	50%	47%
England	87%	90%	89%	89%	90%	90%	90%	91%

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

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

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

Accessibility

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


Measuring accessibility

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


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

Service Accessibility


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



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



Proportion of target population likely to travel to employment centres, towns and shops that sell groceries, 2011



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

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


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

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

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

Average Overall Accessibility

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




This indicator gives a statistical estimate of the general accessibility of different types of places rather than being a measure of actual accessibility to any one particular service.

- Nationally, average accessibility in England is 51.3%, with accessibility in urban areas at 53.6% and in rural areas 41.4%.
- Accessibility is lowest in *sparse rural villages & hamlets* at 30.6% . This is almost seven percentage points lower than *less sparse rural villages & hamlets*.

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


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



(c) Crown Copyright
All rights reserved
Defra 100018880 2011

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

0 20 40 80 Miles



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

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

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

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

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


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

Broadband

- The average broadband speeds in rural areas are considerably lower than speeds in urban areas. In 2012 the average broadband speed in *sparse hamlets & isolated dwellings* was 4.4 Mbit/s compared with 14.8 Mbit/s in *less sparse urban areas*.
- Speeds vary because it is harder for network operators to recoup the fixed costs necessary for upgrading exchanges and cabinets in rural areas, where there are lower population densities, and therefore fewer end subscribers.
- Access to broadband is increasingly important for economic development, access to services and social activities. A Government programme to roll out broadband to rural areas will mean average speeds will increase significantly.

Broadband Speed

Average Broadband Speed (Mbit/s), 2012



- In 2012, the average broadband speed was highest in *less sparse urban areas* at 14.8 Mega bit per second (Mbit/s).
- The average broadband speed in rural areas varied between 4.4 Mbit/s in *sparse hamlet & isolated dwelling* to 11.1 Mbit/s in *less sparse town & fringe*.

Figures are based on OFCOM postcode level data on average speeds for fixed broadband weighted by the number of premises. Where the average speed was shown as greater than 30 Mbit/s, but not specified, it was assumed to be 30 Mbit/s for the purposes of determining an average.
Source: OFCOM, www.ofcom.org.uk

Average broadband speed, 2012

	Average Speed (Mbit/s)
Less Sparse Urban	14.8
Sparse Urban	10.8
Less Sparse Town and Fringe	11.1
Sparse Town and Fringe	11.0
Less Sparse Village	5.6
Sparse Village	4.9
Less Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	5.6
Sparse Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling	4.4
England	13.7

Productivity


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

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

- In 2010, Gross Value Added (GVA) from Predominantly Rural areas contributed to 19% of England's GVA, and was worth £211bn. This compares with 68% from Predominantly Urban areas (£751bn) and 12% from Significant Rural areas (£137bn).
- 'Distribution; transport; accommodation and food' and 'Public administration; education; health' each contributed roughly one fifth of GVA in both Predominantly Rural and Predominantly Urban areas. Around 2% of rural GVA came from 'Agriculture, forestry and fishing'.
- Tourism GVA in predominantly rural areas was £10.7bn in 2010 (5.1% of total GVA in such areas). This compares with tourism GVA of £26.4bn in predominantly urban areas, excluding London (5.6% of total GVA in such areas). In 2010, productivity per job was far higher in London than in other areas (around 39% above the average for England). The differences between other types of area were less pronounced.
- Average productivity levels were lowest in Rural-50 areas, followed by Rural-80 areas.
- A lower proportion of rural districts fell into the top performing 25% of districts and a higher proportion into the lowest performing 25% than for England as a whole.

Contribution to England's Gross Value Added (GVA)

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




Contribution to England's Gross Value Added (GVA), by local authority classification in England (data broadly at county level apportioned at local district level), 2010

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

- Predominantly Urban areas, excluding London, make the largest contribution (£474bn, 43%) to England's GVA and more than twice the contribution of Predominantly Rural areas (£211bn, 19%). London (£277m, 25%) also has a higher contribution to GVA than Predominantly Rural areas.
- The GVA figures are based on GVA at broadly county level apportioned at local district level to provide a more refined analysis of GVA across the local authority classification. The total GVA for rural and urban areas in the table above is different to the industry breakdown following this, which is less finely detailed being based on data at broadly county level.

Productivity by Industry

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



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

Gross Value Added (GVA) by industry: percentage breakdown by local authority classification (broadly at county level), 2010

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

- GVA in Predominantly Rural areas comes from a range of industries. A noticeably smaller proportion of Predominantly Rural GVA is contributed by the combination of 'Business service activities', 'Financial and insurance activities' and 'Information and communication' (18%) compared with Predominantly Urban areas (34%).
- Whilst these types of highly specialised businesses do exist in Predominantly Rural areas, they are more prevalent in cities and larger towns.
- Even in Predominantly Rural areas, 'Agriculture, forestry and fishing' contributes the smallest share of GVA of any category (2%) (though this likely to under-estimate the value of agriculture owing to data collection issues).
- The industry breakdown is based on the lowest level of geography available which is broadly at county level. The total GVA for rural and urban areas in the table above is different to the headline figures for GVA which are based on data apportioned at broadly local district level to provide a more refined analysis of GVA.
- Many of the industries above will include activities relating to tourism. Separate detailed analysis of tourism related activity is shown in the table below.

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

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

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

GVA (£ million) of tourism related industries by local authority classification (at broadly local district level) (2001 to 2010)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
London	20,294	20,069	20,654	23,167	23,801	22,690	27,206	23,901	21,472	23,711
Major Urban excl. London	8,659	8,448	9,558	10,525	10,764	11,995	12,434	10,096	10,180	11,042
Large Urban	4,748	5,764	5,524	6,419	6,441	6,514	7,307	6,657	6,720	6,268
Other Urban	7,506	7,927	8,334	8,650	8,674	8,578	9,916	8,039	9,010	9,092
Significant Rural	5,777	5,867	6,023	6,680	6,745	7,561	8,056	6,627	7,023	6,788
Rural-50	4,800	4,949	5,362	6,037	6,346	6,474	6,834	6,085	6,440	6,070
Rural-80	3,972	4,050	4,721	4,895	5,373	5,575	6,057	4,638	4,366	4,597
Predominantly Urban	41,207	42,208	44,070	48,760	49,679	49,776	56,862	48,693	47,381	50,114
Significant Rural	5,777	5,867	6,023	6,680	6,745	7,561	8,056	6,627	7,023	6,788
Predominantly Rural	8,771	8,999	10,083	10,932	11,718	12,048	12,890	10,723	10,806	10,667
England	55,755	57,073	60,176	66,372	68,143	69,385	77,809	66,043	65,209	67,569

- GVA from tourism related industries (tourism GVA) is highest in predominantly urban areas, with London contributing significantly to this. Tourism GVA from predominantly urban areas, excluding London, was £26,402 million in 2010, compared with tourism GVA from predominantly rural areas at £10,667 million in 2010.
- Tourism GVA was affected by the recent recession but has been relatively stable over the period between 2008 to 2010.


Notes: Tourism related GVA covers the following types of activity: amusement parks and theme parks; conference organisers; exhibition and fair organisers; tourist guides; artistic creation; botanical and zoological gardens and nature reserves activities; camping grounds recreational vehicle parks and trailer parks; event catering; gambling and betting; holiday centres and villages; hotels and similar accommodation; inland passenger water transport; letting and operating of conference and exhibition centres; letting and operating of own or leased real estate; licensed clubs & restaurants; management of real estate on a fee or contract basis; museums activities; news agency activities; non-scheduled passenger air transport; operation of arts facilities; operation of historical sites and buildings and similar visitor attractions; operation of sports facilities; other accommodation; other amusement and recreation activities; other food services; other holiday and other collective accommodation; other passenger land transport n.e.c.; other reservation service activities not including activities of tourist guides); other sports activities (not including activities of racehorse owners) n.e.c.; passenger rail transport interurban; performing arts; public houses and bars; renting and leasing of cars and light motor vehicles; renting of buses and coaches; renting and leasing of passenger air transport equipment; renting and leasing of passenger water transport equipment; renting and leasing of recreational and sports goods; scheduled passenger air transport; sea and coastal passenger water transport; support activities to performing arts; take-away food shops and mobile food stands; taxi operation; tour operator activities; travel agency activities; unlicensed restaurants and cafes; youth hostels; coach services; live theatrical presentation; other entertainment activities n.e.c.; other self-catering holiday accommodation; other tourist assistance activities n.e.c.; other tourist or short-stay accommodation; other transport via railways; take-away food mobile stands; and take-away food shops.

(n.e.c – not elsewhere classified)

Source ONS, Annual Business Survey, data available on request: abs@ons.gov.uk.

Gross Value Added (GVA) per Workforce Job

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




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

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


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

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



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

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



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

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

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

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

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


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

Economic Activity

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

Employment Rate

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




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

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

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Less Sparse Urban	71.8	71.8	71.4	69.8	69.4	69.2
Sparse Urban	71.7	69.2	71.9	68.2	72.9	74.1
Less sparse rural town & fringe	76.5	76.3	76.0	75.2	74.2	74.5
Sparse rural town & fringe	74.0	75.5	75.2	73.9	70.9	72.6
Less sparse rural village & hamlets	76.4	76.0	76.5	75.2	75.6	75.0
Sparse rural village & hamlets	71.1	72.4	76.5	74.6	75.0	72.8
Urban	71.8	71.8	71.4	69.8	69.4	69.2
Rural	76.2	76.0	76.3	75.2	74.8	74.6
England	72.6	72.6	72.3	70.8	70.4	70.2

Full Time and Part Time Workers

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




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

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

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

FT= Full Time, PT = Part Time


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



- The split of full time and part time workers remained almost static from 2006 to 2011 in both urban and rural areas.
- The highest proportion of part time workers in 2011 were those living in *sparse rural town & fringe areas* (28%) and the lowest were those living in *less sparse urban areas* (25.3%).

Unemployment Rate

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




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

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

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Less sparse urban	6.0	5.7	6.4	8.5	8.3	8.8
Sparse urban	7.0	5.8	3.8	6.5	4.1	7.9
Less sparse rural town & fringe	4.0	4.0	4.2	5.9	6.2	5.8
Sparse rural town & fringe	3.9	4.6	4.4	6.1	8.9	4.8
Less sparse rural village & isolated dwellings	2.8	2.9	3.2	4.5	4.5	4.6
Sparse rural village & isolated dwellings	2.5	3.7	2.7	4.7	3.7	6.6
Urban	6.0	5.7	6.4	8.5	8.3	8.8
Rural	3.4	3.5	3.6	5.2	5.3	5.2
England	5.5	5.3	5.9	7.8	7.8	8.1

Economic Inactivity

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




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

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

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Less sparse urban	23.7	23.8	23.7	23.7	24.3	24.1
Sparse urban	22.9	26.5	25.3	27.1	23.9	19.5
Less sparse rural town & fringe	20.3	20.5	20.6	20.0	21.0	21.0
Sparse rural town & fringe	23.0	20.8	21.3	21.3	22.2	23.7
Less sparse rural village & hamlets	21.4	21.7	21.0	21.3	20.8	21.4
Sparse rural village and hamlets	27.1	24.8	21.4	21.7	22.1	22.0
Urban	23.7	23.9	23.7	23.7	24.3	24.1
Rural	21.1	21.2	20.8	20.7	21.0	21.3
England	23.2	23.4	23.2	23.2	23.6	23.6

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



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

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

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


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

Earnings

- **Average annual employee earnings** (based on the median value, or middle of the earnings distribution) give an indication of living standards people are able to enjoy through their disposable income (see Expenditure).
- **Workplace based annual earnings** (recorded where the employee works) and **residence based annual earnings** (recorded where the employee lives) are **consistently highest in major urban areas, and lowest in Rural-80 areas.**
- As people do not necessarily work in the same settlement as they live, workplace and residence based average earnings may differ.
- For example, **average residence based earnings are lower than workplace based earnings in major urban areas**, whilst **average residence based earnings in rural areas are higher than workplace earnings** because people living in rural areas may work in urban areas.
- Although average workplace based earnings remained the lowest in *Rural-80 areas*, they had seen the largest increase, of 27%, between 2002 and 2012, compared with 24% for workplaces in *major urban areas*.

Workplace Based Earnings

Workplace based median annual earnings, 2002 to 2012




- In 2012 the median workplace based earnings for England were £22,238.
- Median workplace based earnings were highest in *major urban areas* (£25,387) and lowest in *Rural-80 areas* (£19,162)
- Between 2002 and 2012 median workplace based earnings increased for all types of area. The rate of increase was greatest for workplaces in *rural-80 areas*, increasing by 27%, closely followed by *large urban areas*.
- The rate of increase was lowest in *major urban areas* where median earnings increased by just over 24% in the same period.

Median earnings of workplace based employees, (£), 2002 to 2012

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Major urban	20,510	20,360	22,470	22,820	23,390	24,390	25,260	25,030	24,970	25,090	25,390
Large urban	16,440	17,030	17,390	18,150	18,770	19,430	20,100	20,610	20,410	20,580	20,840
Other urban	16,970	17,760	18,110	18,860	19,360	19,870	20,900	21,290	21,040	21,190	21,200
Significant rural	16,970	17,520	18,230	18,810	19,100	19,640	20,460	21,030	20,870	20,870	21,050
Rural-50	16,010	16,380	16,870	17,680	18,180	18,440	18,980	19,510	19,510	19,590	19,940
Rural-80	15,090	16,110	16,520	17,170	17,710	18,220	18,900	19,310	19,260	19,180	19,160
Predominantly urban	18,750	18,990	20,300	20,800	21,360	22,190	23,050	23,150	23,010	23,160	23,390
Predominantly rural	15,620	16,260	16,720	17,460	17,980	18,350	18,940	19,420	19,400	19,470	19,580
England	17,270	17,850	18,520	19,290	19,810	20,350	21,170	22,080	22,000	22,080	22,240

Residence Based Earnings

Residence based median annual earnings, 2002 to 2012



- In England, median residence based earnings in 2012 were £22,455
- Median residence based earnings were highest in *major urban areas* (£24,434), followed by *significant rural areas* (£22,565).
- Median residence based earnings in England increased by approximately 27% between 2002 and 2012. The percentage increase was lowest in *Rural-80 areas*, an increase of 22% and highest in *major urban areas*, with an increase of 28%.

Median earnings of residence based employees, (£), 2002 to 2012

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Major urban	19,040	19,720	20,360	21,360	21,780	22,730	23,610	24,310	24,190	24,190	24,430
Large urban	16,600	16,870	17,530	18,350	18,810	19,310	20,000	20,520	20,470	20,450	20,900
Other urban	16,850	17,580	18,080	18,730	19,330	19,780	20,800	21,140	21,090	21,280	21,400
Significant rural	17,590	18,580	19,460	20,380	20,260	20,790	21,740	22,450	22,300	22,560	22,570
Rural-50	16,960	17,910	18,500	19,470	20,010	20,610	21,070	21,640	21,400	21,640	21,670
Rural-80	16,830	17,220	17,710	18,640	18,990	19,440	20,210	20,570	20,570	20,590	20,600
Predominantly urban	17,960	18,560	19,170	20,050	20,520	21,250	22,130	22,700	22,520	22,650	22,910
Predominantly rural	16,900	17,620	18,170	19,120	19,580	20,110	20,710	21,180	21,100	21,200	21,210
England	17,650	18,290	18,960	19,810	20,210	20,350	21,170	21,690	21,691	22,290	22,460

Source: Office for National Statistics, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, which is based on a one per cent sample of employee jobs taken from HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC) PAYE records. For more information see <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/ashe/annual-survey-of-hours-and-earnings/2012-provisional-results/stb-ashe-statistical-bulletin-2012.html> or contact earnings@ons.gov.uk

Skills

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


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

Residence Based Skills

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

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

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



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


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

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

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

Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey, NOMIS

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




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

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

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

Notes: In 2010 the classification of working age population changed to include females aged 60 – 64, who had previously been excluded; this change was incorporated in this data and backdated to 2004.
 This indicator has been amended from previously, and is now recorded for Working Age Population for consistency with other indicators.
 Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey, NOMIS.

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



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

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


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

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

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

Source data: ONS, Annual Population Survey, NOMIS

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



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

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

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


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

Source: ONS, Annual Population Survey, Nomis

Workplace Based Skills

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

Proportion of working age population with at least one qualification (workplace based), by Local Authority Classification in England, 2006 to 2011




- The proportion of people with at least one qualification has increased in all areas since 2006
- The gap between people working in *predominantly rural areas* and *predominantly urban areas* has increased in 2011.

Proportion of working age population with at least one qualification (workplace based), by Local Authority Classification in England, 2006 to 2011

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

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

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




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

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

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

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

Proportion of working age population with NVQ4 (or equivalent) and above (workplace based), by Local Authority Classification in England, 2006 to 2011




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

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

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

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

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



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

¹Source: National Audit Office

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

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


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

Enterprise

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

Businesses per 10,000 Population

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



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

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

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


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

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

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

Business Start-Ups per 10,000 Population

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



— Predominantly Urban — Predominantly Rural — Significant Rural — England

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

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

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

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


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

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


Enterprise Composition

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

Number of enterprises per 10,000 population, 2011/12



Average turnover per employee, 2011/12



- There are more enterprises per 10,000 population in rural areas than in urban areas and the number of businesses per head of population increases as areas become “more rural”.
- However, the average turnover per employee is greatest in *less sparse urban areas* and lowest in *sparse rural town & fringe areas*.

Enterprise Composition, by settlement type in England, 2011/12


	Count of Enterprises	Number of Employees 000s	Total Turnover £m	Count of Enterprises per 10,000 population	Average Turnover per enterprise £000s	Average Turnover per employee £000s
Less Sparse Urban	1,325,675	20,083	3,528,495	335	2,662	176
Sparse Urban	3,530	25	1,895	342	537	76
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	150,350	968	113,920	355	758	118
Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	9,320	63	4,725	428	507	75
Less Sparse Rural Village	195,850	1,078	152,195	596	777	141
Sparse Rural Village	14,860	51	4,980	603	335	99
Less Sparse Rural Hamlet	128,070	843	121,460	928	948	144
Sparse Rural Hamlet	15,010	46	4,975	1,031	332	107
Less Sparse	1,799,945	22,972	3,916,070	372	2,176	170
Sparse	42,720	185	16,575	599	388	90
Urban	1,329,205	20,108	3,530,390	335	2,656	176
Rural	513,460	3,050	402,255	540	783	132
England	1,842,665	23,157	3,932,645	375	2,134	170

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

Source: ONS, Inter Departmental Business Register (IDBR), 2011/12

Enterprise by Industry Type

Percentage of Enterprises by Industry, 2011/12



- ‘Agriculture, forestry & fishing’ accounts for 5% of businesses in England, but in *sparse hamlets*, more than half the enterprises are in these industries, and they are also dominant in *less sparse hamlets* and *sparse villages*.
- Agriculture, forestry & fishing accounts for 15.9% of businesses in rural areas overall. Other dominant sectors in rural areas are: ‘Professional, scientific & technical services’ (14.7% of businesses), ‘Wholesale & retail trade, repair of motor vehicles’ (14.5%) and ‘All Other industries’ (14.5%).
- Since 2010/11, there has been an increase of 1.3% in the number of businesses in rural areas, compared with increases of 4.3% in urban areas and 3.5% in England. However, there has been a decrease of 0.5% in *sparse rural town and fringe*.
- An increase can be observed in most of the industry sectors in rural areas with the exception of: ‘Transport and storage’, ‘Construction’, ‘Agriculture, forestry & fishing’ and ‘Wholesale & retail trade, repair of motor vehicles’ where the number of businesses has decreased by 0.3 to 1.7%.

Numbers of Enterprises by Industry, and settlement type in England, 2011/12


	Less Sparse Urban	Sparse Urban	Less Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Less Sparse Village	Sparse Village	Less Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	England
Administrative and support services	92,715	175	10,065	450	13,715	790	8,820	795	127,525
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9,715	155	6,110	590	31,615	4,945	30,745	7,675	91,555
Arts, entertainment and recreation	36,360	115	3,495	250	5,515	420	3,865	315	50,335
Construction	158,390	445	21,710	1,160	25,245	1,715	15,070	1,155	224,890
Education, health and social work	83,475	220	8,510	535	7,900	510	4,150	310	105,605
Finance	33,560	40	2,585	130	2,575	75	1,795	70	40,825
Hotels & Catering	80,340	555	9,910	1,270	8,960	1,260	4,680	780	107,750
Information and communication	118,355	75	9,870	285	11,415	330	5,835	320	146,480
Manufacturing	78,990	205	9,185	515	11,345	685	8,020	590	109,535
Mining/quarrying and utilities	3,475	10	460	15	765	30	610	65	5,430
Professional, scientific & technical services	237,880	280	25,010	850	31,185	1,210	16,195	935	313,545
Property and business services	63,780	175	7,635	495	6,855	365	3,895	235	83,435
Public admin and defence; other services	52,365	125	4,420	305	6,250	265	4,375	275	68,380
Transport and storage	41,185	115	5,395	295	6,010	440	3,480	310	57,230
Wholesale, retail & repair of motor vehicles	235,090	840	25,990	2,180	26,495	1,830	16,540	1,180	310,140
Total	1,325,675	3,530	150,350	9,320	195,850	14,860	128,070	15,010	1,842,665

Percentage of Enterprises by Industry, and settlement type in England, 2011/12

	Less Sparse Urban	Sparse Urban	Less Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Sparse Rural Town & Fringe	Less Sparse Village	Sparse Village	Less Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	Sparse Hamlet & Isolated Dwellings	England
Administrative and support services	7.0	5.0	6.7	4.8	7.0	5.3	6.9	5.3	6.9
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.7	4.4	4.1	6.3	16.1	33.3	24.0	51.1	5.0
Arts, entertainment and recreation	2.7	3.3	2.3	2.7	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.1	2.7
Construction	11.9	12.6	14.4	12.4	12.9	11.5	11.8	7.7	12.2
Education, health and social work	6.3	6.2	5.7	5.7	4.0	3.4	3.2	2.1	5.7
Finance	2.5	1.1	1.7	1.4	1.3	0.5	1.4	0.5	2.2
Hotels & Catering	6.1	15.7	6.6	13.6	4.6	8.5	3.7	5.2	5.8
Information and communication	8.9	2.1	6.6	3.1	5.8	2.2	4.6	2.1	7.9
Manufacturing	6.0	5.8	6.1	5.5	5.8	4.6	6.3	3.9	5.9
Mining/quarrying and utilities	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3
Professional, scientific & technical services	17.9	7.9	16.6	9.1	15.9	8.1	12.6	6.2	17.0
Property and business services	4.8	5.0	5.1	5.3	3.5	2.5	3.0	1.6	4.5
Public admin and defence; other services	4.0	3.5	2.9	3.3	3.2	1.8	3.4	1.8	3.7
Transport and storage	3.1	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.7	2.1	3.1
Wholesale, retail & repair of motor vehicles	17.7	23.8	17.3	23.4	13.5	12.3	12.9	7.9	16.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Enterprise by Size Band

Percentage of employees within businesses of various size bands, 2011/12



- In Urban areas around 60% of employees in businesses are employed in large businesses (those with over 250 employees), while only around 12% of employees are employed in micro businesses. In *sparse rural* areas, more people are employed in micro and small businesses than in large businesses.

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

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

Source: ONS, IDBR 2011/12.

Enterprise Count and Percentage by Size, by settlement type in England, 2011/12

Detailed Breakdown	Micro (1 – 9 employees)		Small (10 – 49 employees)		Medium (50 – 249 employees)		Large (250 or more employees)		Sole Trader		Other Enterprises and Partnerships		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Urban	997,995	75.1%	126,735	9.5%	24,350	1.8%	6,615	0.5%	121,745	9.2%	51,760	3.9%	1,329,205	100.0%
Rural	351,650	68.5%	36,685	7.1%	5,485	1.1%	1,010	0.2%	70,710	13.8%	47,920	9.3%	513,460	100.0%
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	110,635	73.6%	11,675	7.8%	1,665	1.1%	315	0.2%	17,520	11.7%	8,535	5.7%	150,350	100.0%
Less Sparse Village	134,755	68.8%	13,145	6.7%	1,900	1.0%	370	0.2%	27,530	14.1%	18,150	9.3%	195,850	100.0%
Less Sparse Dispersed	83,170	64.9%	9,315	7.3%	1,620	1.3%	285	0.2%	18,940	14.8%	14,740	11.5%	128,070	100.0%
Sparse Rural	23,090	58.9%	2,545	6.5%	305	0.8%	40	0.1%	6,720	17.1%	6,500	16.6%	39,195	100.0%
England	1,349,645	73.2%	163,415	8.9%	29,840	1.6%	7,630	0.4%	192,455	10.4%	99,680	5.4%	1,842,665	100.0%

*Employee Count and Percentage by Size Band *, by settlement type in England, 2011/12*

Detailed Breakdown	Micro (1 – 9 employees)		Small (10 – 49 employees)		Medium (50 – 249 employees)		Large (250 or more employees)		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Urban	2,476,500	12.3%	2,449,405	12.2%	2,456,735	12.2%	12,725,090	63.3%	20,107,730	100.0%
Rural	862,520	28.3%	687,065	22.5%	529,980	17.4%	969,950	31.8%	3,049,515	100.0%
Less Sparse Rural Town and Fringe	274,450	28.3%	220,275	22.7%	159,455	16.5%	314,095	32.4%	968,275	100.0%
Less Sparse Village	321,705	29.8%	244,705	22.7%	185,740	17.2%	326,165	30.2%	1,078,315	100.0%
Less Sparse Dispersed	206,865	24.5%	175,535	20.8%	156,780	18.6%	303,710	36.0%	842,885	100.0%
Sparse Rural	59,505	37.2%	46,545	29.1%	28,000	17.5%	25,985	16.2%	160,035	100.0%
England	3,339,020	14.4%	3,136,470	13.5%	2,986,715	12.9%	13,695,040	59.1%	23,157,245	100.0%


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

Innovation

- Between 2008 and 2010, around 42% of both urban and rural businesses surveyed were involved in broader innovation activities (for example new or significantly improved products, processes, structures, or concepts, specific innovation projects, research and development etc.)
- This suggests that innovation is not affected directly by whether the business is located in an urban or rural settlement.
- However, businesses located in rural village and hamlets within sparsely populated areas were less likely to be involved in innovation activities than businesses in equivalent settlements but within less sparse areas.

Businesses Engaged in Innovation

Proportion of businesses in England engaged in broader innovation related activities, 2008-2010



- Overall, the proportion of businesses involved in innovation activities were the same for urban and rural areas, with around 42 per cent of businesses surveyed.
- The lowest proportion of businesses involved in innovation activities was for those in rural village and hamlets within a sparse area, with around 29 per cent of businesses surveyed.

Proportion of businesses engaged in broader innovation related activities, 2008 to 2010

	% Engaged in innovation	
	Yes	No
Less sparse urban	42%	58%
Sparse urban	36%	64%
Less sparse rural town & fringe	42%	58%
Sparse rural town & fringe	45%	55%
Less sparse rural village & hamlet	43%	57%
Sparse rural village & hamlet	29%	71%
Rural	42%	58%
Urban	42%	58%
England	42%	58%

Notes: Data source: BIS UK Innovation Survey 2011 covering innovation activity during 2008 to 2010.

These results are based on the un-weighted sample of businesses surveyed for England only (therefore the England % totals may not match the weighted results published by BIS). The sample mainly includes Enterprise units (i.e. headquarters of businesses) but also has a small number of Local Units. BIS sampling methodology is described in their report and accompanying statistics: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-innovation-survey-2011-first-findings>. The BIS sample was stratified according to region, 25 SIC code divisions and 4 business sizes. Owing to the small sample sizes achieved after application of the rural urban definition, this analysis has been presented as the un-weighted results from the sample surveyed. The sample sizes for less sparse rural town and fringe and sparse rural village and hamlet were under-represented so these results should be treated with caution. Furthermore, England % totals may not match those published by BIS due to minor discrepancies with post code data.

The description of innovation activity in the chart and table above includes businesses which were engaged in any of the following:

1. Introduction of a new or significantly improved product (good or service) or process;
2. Engagement in innovation projects not yet complete or abandoned;
3. New and significantly improved forms of organisation, business structures or practices and marketing concepts or strategies
4. Activities in areas such as internal research and development, training, acquisition of external knowledge or machinery and equipment linked to innovation activities

A business that has engaged in any of the activities 1 to 4 is defined as a 'broader innovator'.


Data from the 2011 survey are not directly comparable with the 2009 survey due to the survey mode, changes in the methodology including the move to SIC 2007, plus changes in sampling approach and questionnaire design. Furthermore, the 2011 sample was based on 4 rather than 3 business size classes. An additional change was due to the rotation of bringing in new businesses into the survey which had a negative impact on response rate.

Investment

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

Capital Investment per Employee

Capital investment per employee (at current prices) (£000), by Local Authority Classification, in England, 1999 to 2010



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

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

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

Notes: Total net capital investment is calculated as total proceeds from disposals subtracted from the total cost of acquisitions. The data is at current prices so the effect of inflation has not been removed. Caution should be taken when interpreting this measure as capital investment is difficult to attribute at Local Authority District level. The estimates are produced by taking data at a higher geographical level and apportioning it at local authority level based on employment levels. As ONS are not wholly confident that there is a sufficient correlation between investment and employment, they do not release the data as a National Statistic below National level. London has been separated out to allow a fair comparison of Major urban against all other area classifications. Source data: Bespoke data request from Annual Business Inquiry, ONS.