Vital Issues 2016

A Community Report for Norfolk

A report undertaken by Norfolk Community Foundation to inform our Vital Signs project – to help to build a picture of life in Norfolk and identify areas of social need
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About this Report: Introduction and Methodology

About Norfolk Community Foundation

Norfolk Community Foundation (NCF) is an independent charitable trust connecting local philanthropy with community needs by investing and distributing funds on behalf of a wide range of donors to improve the quality of life for Norfolk people. Our mission is to inspire philanthropy and charitable giving – matching people, ideas, resources and needs, to make a lasting difference. Since inception in 2005 our donors have invested over £19 million of charitable funding in local voluntary and community organisations that are working in Norfolk and its close neighbouring counties making it a great place to live, work, learn and grow.

As one of the UK’s leading, accredited community foundations we have the expertise and local knowledge to help individuals, families, companies and public agencies to support the local causes and charities they care about and make an impact through their giving.

In 2016, NCF will publish its first Vital Signs report, to further support our work to facilitate and connect organisations and individuals across the county to tackle pressing needs with innovative and lasting solutions.

About Vital Signs

Vital Signs is an international initiative originally conceived by The Toronto Community Foundation, Canada in 2001. Vital Signs is a community philanthropy tool, conducted by community foundations, that measures the vitality and aspirations of local communities, identifies significant trends and social priorities critical to quality of life. Vital Signs is designed to inform current and future community philanthropy. There are 49 community foundations in Canada participating in Vital Signs and their activities are coordinated by Community Foundations of Canada. Internationally reports are published in Australia, Bosnia, Brazil, Ireland, New Zealand and the USA, which all follow the original Canadian model. In the UK the initiative has now been taken up by an increasing number of community foundations that appreciate the enormous value it offers to our work. Seventeen UK Foundations will publish their Vital Signs report in October 2016.

What is Norfolk Vital Signs?

Norfolk Vital Signs brings together existing research from a variety of sources with the opinion and experience of people who live and work in the county. This year NCF publishes two reports: Vital Issues – this report – a substantive document which presents existing research and follows a more academic format. Vital Issues provides a sound basis from which to produce the easy to read, higher level, second report - Vital Signs. In bringing together government statistics and the experience of local people, Vital Signs attempts to act as a snapshot of life in the county and as a discussion point and guide for NCF’s key stakeholders by challenging myth and perception.

Methodology

This report is not based on new, primary research. Rather it brings together key statistics from existing data and other information that is publicly available about life in Norfolk and offers some interpretation of this information. We then combine this with the views and perspectives of local
people, and sector stakeholders. This approach is the international recognised model for producing Vital Signs.

The core data currently used to produce Vital Signs by UK community foundations is generated through Grant Thornton Place Analytics. Where other data has been referenced, sources are provided throughout as footnotes.

**Core themes**

Participating UK community foundations have access to a set of nationally agreed indicators across 10 core themes. In addition, each community foundation is able to select up to three extra themes which are relevant to their area. In Norfolk, we have included Rural Living as an additional theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National themes</th>
<th>Additional themes for Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Local Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Living</td>
<td>Strong Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Homelessness</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community survey**

A key aspect distinguishing Vital Signs from other reports is the inclusion of the perspectives of the local people who live and work in Norfolk. NCF conducted an online survey using a mixture of closed ended and multiple choice questions and a limited number of open ended questions. The survey also sought demographic information, although this was not mandatory. Recipients were selected from NCF’s database and included a mixture of grant applicants and donors. The survey was also sent to infrastructure organisations such as Voluntary Norfolk and Community Action Norfolk. NCF made it available on their website and promoted it through social media. Just over 200 responses were received between June-July 2016.
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**We want to use Vital Signs 2016 to help raise questions and initiate conversations about what we can do together to support people living in Norfolk.**

**If you would like to have a conversation about these or similar issues, please contact us at:**

Norfolk Community Foundation, St James Mill, Whitefriars, Norwich NR3 1TN. T: 01603 623958

info@norfolkfoundation.com  
www.norfolkfoundation.com
Vital Issues Report

1. **Education and Employment**

Education is the primary route to employment in the UK. It is through good quality education and schooling that people develop the skills and qualifications they need in order to join the labour market. In turn, the jobs market is dependent on a highly skilled and qualified workforce to ensure long term sustainable economic growth. Unfortunately, too many young people grow up in situations which prevent them from taking full advantage of the opportunities on offer. Whether due to poverty, a disruptive family life or poorly performing local schools, those who fall behind in the early stages of education rarely catch up. This gap only widens as people grow up and can seriously impinge on young people’s ability to achieve their aspirations.

Youth unemployment is estimated to cost the exchequer £2.9 billion per year, plus an additional £6.3 billion to the economy in lost output. If the country is to make a full recovery from the 2008 recession, interventions need to focus on the root of the problem by reducing the structural barriers which limit young people from succeeding in education and employment.

1.1. **Skills and Qualifications**

A skills and qualifications score is a composite measure of how qualified residents are in a given area. A higher score indicates a higher level of local area qualifications in the labour market. The skills and qualifications score for Norfolk (92.37) shows that the county is performing poorly in comparison to the country as a whole (100). In fact, it ranks in the bottom 3 of all the counties in Great Britain. Skills and qualifications are particularly low in Great Yarmouth (81.71), King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (88.98), North Norfolk (83.82), and Breckland (87.12) which are amongst the lowest scoring local authority areas nationally, with Great Yarmouth and North Norfolk in the bottom 12 of 379 districts.

Norfolk’s low score for skills and qualifications correlates with the low proportion of students achieving 5+ GCSEs grades A* to C. In the county only 61.49% of students achieve a good set of GCSEs against an average of 63.8% in England, making Norfolk the 4th lowest ranking county in the country. Attainment at GCSE is particularly poor in Great Yarmouth, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and Norwich, where only around 50% of students achieve grades A*-C in at least 5 subjects. In all the seven districts there is also a significant gender gap between the proportion of male and female students achieving 5 good GCSEs. This reflects a wider trend of higher female attainment at key stage 4 across the country.

GCSEs are one of the critical points for social mobility, which is much harder to achieve in certain parts of England. Strong attainment at GCSEs is required in order for students to enter higher education and high skilled employment. Those who do not manage to achieve 5 good GCSEs at 16 tend to be much more limited in the options available to them for the future. In Norfolk, the impact of poor GCSE results generally is exemplified by the low proportion of residents who are educated to degree level or equivalent (NVQ level 4+) which stands well below the national average (28.46% against 37.08% in the

---

UK). Of the districts, the percentage of residents qualified to NVQ level 4+ is lowest in Great Yarmouth (16.98%) and highest in Norwich (39.44%), reflecting the high proportion of students in the city.

1.2. Employment

The most recent data on employment shows that the employment rate currently stands at 75.3% in Norfolk, up 2 percentage points from the previous year (see graph 1). To put this in context nationally, employment in Norfolk is higher than the UK average (72.4%) but lower than other sub regions in the East of England. Of the seven districts in the county, employment is highest in South Norfolk (79.1%), closely followed by Broadland (78.9%), Breckland (76.8%) and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (76.3%). At the other end of the spectrum Great Yarmouth has a very low employment rate of 66.6% and ranks 350th of 379 local authority areas nationally.

Graph 1: Changes to the employment rate between 2005 and 2015 in Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1 The link between employment and qualifications

In Great Britain, the rate of employment is higher amongst those who are more qualified. For example, people who are qualified up to NVQ level 4 have more than double the rate of employment of those qualified up to NVQ level 2 (4 or 5 GCSEs grade A to C or equivalent) or NVQ level 3 (A levels or equivalent). The rate of employment at NVQ level 4 is 42.55% compared to 19.51% and 19.57% for NVQ2 and NVQ3). Whilst data for Norfolk does seem to follow the same general trend, the proportion of people in employment who are qualified to the highest level is considerably lower than the national average (31.62%). This may indicate that the skills profile of residents in Norfolk does not match what employers are looking for in the county.

At the other extreme, people with no formal qualifications tend to be the group most severely affected by unemployment. Both in the UK and in Norfolk, the employment rate amongst this group barely exceeds 5%. This is of greatest concern in areas with a high proportion of those with no qualifications. In Norfolk, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk and Breckland all have a resident population with no qualifications that stands well above the national and county averages of 8.56% and 8.91% respectively (see graph 2).

Whilst having a high proportion of people with no formal qualifications is concerning, the problem is most acute in areas where the employment rate for this group is comparatively low. The graph illustrates the local authority areas in Norfolk where this gap is largest, notably North Norfolk, Breckland, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and Norwich.
1.3. Unemployment

It is difficult to get an accurate measure of the unemployment rate in an area since data only incorporates those who register for Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) or National Insurance Credits. For this reason, the proportion of people classified as unemployed does not necessarily correlate with the proportion of working age people in employment (one is not the opposite of the other). This is in part due to the fact that there are members of the working age population who are ‘economically inactive’ – those without a job who are not seeking work, and/or are not available to work in the short term (this includes students, homemakers, early retirees and temporary and long term sick or disabled).

In Norfolk, data for the year ending March 2016 shows that of those who are economically active, unemployment in the county is lower than the average in Great Britain (3.5% compared to 5.1%) and slightly lower than the rate in the East of England (3.8%). However, drilling down to district level reveals significant disparities between the different local authority areas. Whilst unemployment in the majority of the districts is lower than the overall rate for Norfolk, Great Yarmouth stands out as having a particularly high proportion of the economically active, working age population out of work (5.2%).

To further illustrate the extremes in the county; in 2015 the Nelson ward of Great Yarmouth had a total of 368 JSA and National Insurance Credits claimants compared to just 3 in the Tasburgh ward of South Norfolk. There is a 6 percentage point difference in the unemployment rate between these two areas (0.2% against 6.3% in Nelson) highlighting inequalities across Norfolk.

---

4 ONS Labour Market Profile – Norfolk: [www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1941962835/report.aspx](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1941962835/report.aspx)

1.3.1 Youth Unemployment

Long term unemployment is harmful at any age, but for young people the adverse effects of unemployment can endure way into the future. Those unemployed between 16 and 24 are far more likely to earn less, experience more unemployment and suffer from ill health later in life. Youth unemployment also disproportionately affects the disadvantaged, widening the gap between rich and poor and creating more division within communities.

Graph 3: The impact of the recession on the number of unemployed and NEET young people in the UK

The 2008 recession and subsequent low levels of growth have had a particularly negative impact on young people, promoting an increase in the unemployed youth and the young NEET population across the UK (see graph 3).

Like the rest of the country, Norfolk is still suffering in the aftermath of this economic downturn. The most recent data on unemployment in the county reveal that youth unemployment levels are still rising; figures from 2012-13 show the unemployment rate for this group to be 20.8%, a 4.5% increase on the previous year. Of the 28,300 people classified as unemployed during this period, 13,100 were aged between 16 and 24. In other words, unemployed young people accounted for 46% of the total unemployed population in Norfolk between 2012 and 2013.

1.3.2 NEET Youth (Not in Employment, Education or Training)

Although high levels of unemployed youth in Norfolk are cause for concern, the unemployed are not necessarily those at greatest risk of deprivation and social exclusion. People are classed as unemployed if they do not have a job, are seeking work and are available to start work. The young unemployed therefore includes students who would like a job but cannot find work, yet excludes young people who are not in education or work and are not looking for employment.

By incorporating this latter group and excluding students, data on NEET youth can be seen as a more holistic reflection of the real challenges facing many young people in the UK.

6 ACEVO, Youth Unemployment: The Crisis we Cannot Afford
The term NEET refers to young people (usually between the ages of 16 and 24) not in education, employment or training. Despite being a temporary outcome for most young people, non-engagement in any of these key social activities puts young NEET people at an elevated risk of poor health, depression or early parenthood. Certain groups have a greater likelihood than others of becoming NEET. Those particularly at risk include young people with few or no qualifications and those with a health problem, disability or low aspirations. The proportion of young NEET people also tends to correlate with the levels of crime, deprivation, and social exclusion in an area.

Across the UK, there are currently an estimated 865,000 young people not in education, employment or training, representing 12% of the total group population and a decrease of 69,000 from a year earlier. This downward trend is also apparent in Norfolk (see graph 4) which has successfully managed to reduce its young NEET population by 2 percentage points since 2012. Such progress can be attributed to the 2010-2015 government policy to increase the age to which all young people are required to continue in education or training.

Despite slight variations in the figures due to the nature of calculating estimates, the majority of data which draw on Department for Education statistics estimate the number of NEETs in Norfolk to be slightly above the national average. In 2012, for example, 6.3% of young people between 16 and 18 were classified as NEET compared to 5.8% nationally.

---

8 Norfolk County Council, Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF) Summary: 16-18 year olds NEET (NCC: 2014)
9 Ibid
Of the seven districts in Norfolk, the largest % proportion of young people out of education, employment or training live in Norwich and Great Yarmouth (see table 1 below). This trend has not changed since 2011, suggesting that efforts to reach out to the NEET population should be centred on these parts of the county. It should be noted that the estimates for Norfolk below are based on data collected by the Norfolk County Council and therefore vary slightly from those provided by the Department for Education.

Table 1: Proportion of 16-18 year olds classified as NEET in local authority areas of Norfolk (estimated), November 2011 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Area</th>
<th>% November 2011</th>
<th>% November 2012</th>
<th>% November 2013</th>
<th>Number November 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Lynn &amp; West Norfolk</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Norfolk County Council Children’s Services, 2014

1.4. Apprenticeships

Apprenticeships offer people of all ages an opportunity to develop practical and professional skills whilst earning. For young people this may represent a way into the jobs market without following the traditional and more costly path to university. Across England as a whole, the number of apprenticeship starts has more than doubled since 2006/07. From 181,800 starts in 2006/07 there were 379,400 recorded in 2015/16, although not as many as the peak of 515,000 in 2011/12.

Of the apprenticeship starts recorded in England last year (see graph 5), 5,870 were from within Norfolk. Although this represents a 19.5% decrease from the previous year and follows a downward trend since 2011/12, the decline is not consistent - apprenticeship starts recorded in 2014/15 were 14% higher than those recorded in 2013/14.

At district level, Breckland and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk had the highest number of apprenticeship starts recorded in the county in 2015/16 (1,010 and 1,030 respectively). The lowest numbers were recorded in Great Yarmouth (680) and North Norfolk (670).
1.5. Youth Aspirations

Youth aspirations are the educational, career and life ambitions of young people. They depend partly on the individual characteristics and preferences of a young person, but are also heavily influenced by the social environment in which they grow up. Place, family and schools all shape young people’s ideas about their future options, which may or may not be out of step with the reality of employment opportunities in an area\(^\text{14}\).

Although young people’s aspirations are shaped by their upbringing, there is a tendency to assume that teenagers from poorer backgrounds will have lower aspirations than those who do not experience the same level of deprivation growing up. In more deprived areas, a high concentration of youth unemployment and low educational attainment are often perceived to be caused by a lack of youth ambition.

On the contrary, research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation found that poorer young people often aspire to go to university or to get professional and skilled jobs but are limited from doing so by a number of social and structural barriers\(^\text{15}\). Education, employment, housing and poverty can seriously impinge on young people’s ability to create sustainable and independent adult lives\(^\text{16}\). Children today face uncertainty; getting a degree no longer guarantees employment whilst having a job no longer guarantees home ownership. In light of such barriers, the real difficulty for young people is in knowing how to fulfil their ambitions\(^\text{17}\).

---


\(^{17}\) Carter-Wall and Whitfield, *The Role of Aspirations, Attitudes and Behaviours in Closing the Educational Attainment Gap*
Norfolk is one of the most challenging counties for teenagers to grow up in when it comes to achieving their ambitions according to education specialists Ambitious Minds (see figure 1). By combining data on the four social barriers listed above, the report placed Great Yarmouth, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and North Norfolk in the bottom 20 of 324 local authority areas, with Great Yarmouth only second to Knowsley in Merseyside as the worse ranking district for limiting youth ambition. The picture is slightly less concerning in Broadland and South Norfolk, but even these districts are towards the lower end of the national ranking.

A survey of 14 to 25 year olds in North Norfolk discovered that young people from the county are very aware of the challenges which may prevent them from realising their aspirations. Teenagers in education were found to have high ambitions for the future, with between 80-90% hoping to continue studying regardless of their socioeconomic background/whether they were housing association tenants or not\(^\text{18}\). Whilst there was very little difference in students’ ambitions, the study found that students from a poorer background were much less confident that their future plans would work out. Money worries, transport issues and concerns about grades were more pronounced amongst the housing association tenants, suggesting that the challenges facing young people today are greater amongst lower income groups.

\(^{18}\) Victory Housing Trust, *Victory Housing survey of 14-25 year olds in North Norfolk* (2015)
This reflects the national picture of low confidence and low self-esteem amongst young people growing up in poverty; young people from poorer families are four times more likely to believe that ‘few’ or ‘none’ of their ambitions are achievable compared to those from wealthier backgrounds\textsuperscript{19}.

1.6. Migrant Workers

In the East of England, picking, packing and plucking industries in rural areas rely heavily on overseas labour to meet seasonal demands. Health, social care and construction sectors also attract migrant workers to the region. The employment of overseas workers is an important pillar of the local economy, contributing in excess of £360 million a year to the eastern region\textsuperscript{20}.

Whilst there are no reliable estimates of the number of migrant workers nationally or locally in Norfolk, official data is available for the number of National Insurance Number (NINo) registrations to adult overseas nationals coming to work in the UK. NINo is generally required by any overseas national looking to work or claim benefits or tax credits in the UK so therefore gives some indication of immigration (migrant worker inflow). NINo registrations do not account for emigration (outflow) nor do they record undocumented workers.

Following a steep decline between 2011 and 2012, when NINo registrations dropped from 6622 to 4865 in the county, the number of overseas workers in Norfolk seems almost to have returned to the level recorded in 2011. After a sharp rise between 2012 and 2013, NINo registrations appear to have stabilised; from 2013 to 2014 the number of migrant workers only increased slightly in the county (6528 to 6551).

Graph 6: Number of NINo registrations to adult overseas nationals entering Norfolk districts between 2010 and 2014\textsuperscript{21}

Across the seven districts in Norfolk the number of migrant worker registrations is highest in Norwich (see graph 6), possibly boosted by Norwich’s status as a dispersal centre for asylum seekers. High figures for Breckland and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk reflect the opportunities for migrant workers in local industries.

\textsuperscript{19} The Prince’s Trust, Broke, not broken: Tackling youth poverty and the aspiration gap (2011)
\textsuperscript{20} Norfolk County Council, ‘Migrant Workers in Norfolk’, JSNA Briefing Session, February 19, 2014
1.7. Vital Issues

**Identified Needs:**

**Skills and Qualifications** - The resident population in Norfolk has a lower skills and qualifications profile than on average in the UK, with a lower proportion of people gaining 5 good GCSEs. This is limiting the number of young people attending university in the county.

**Unemployment and Training** - Unemployment is slightly below the national rate, but almost half of the total unemployed population are young people. Whilst youth unemployment has decreased slightly in recent years, the number of NEET people in Norfolk is still higher than average. Action is needed to inspire young people to stay in education longer or enrol on a traineeship.

**Youth Ambition** - Norfolk is one of the most challenging areas of the country to grow up in in terms of achieving life goals; more needs to be done to ensure young people can achieve their ambitions.

**Vulnerable Areas:**

**Great Yarmouth** is a hotspot for unemployment (adults and young people), a large NEET population and is the second worst local authority area for limiting youth ambition in the country. The Nelson ward has a particularly high rate of JSA claimants.

**King’s Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk and Breckland** all have a resident population with no qualifications that stands well above the national and county averages. These three districts also fall within the bottom 20 of 324 local authority areas when it comes to preventing young people from creating sustainable adult lives.
2. Health and Wellbeing

Health and wellbeing are closely linked to poverty and inequality. Whilst some chronic health conditions are seen as unavoidable, health is mostly dictated by life style choices and the social environment in which people live and work. In deprived areas, people’s access to adequate housing, quality education, support and care services are often compromised. In absence of these basic services, people are more likely to suffer from stress or mental illness and are more prone to substance misuse. Such health conditions can make it harder for individuals to stay in education or employment. Poverty and ill-health are therefore both cause and consequence of the other.

2.1. Norfolk Health Profile

The spider chart below (figure 2) is a way of showing how health in Norfolk rates against the national median. Data for every sub region is converted into a percentile score, with the top ranking area scoring 100 and the national median represented by the 50th percentile. In terms of the overall health score and life expectancy, Norfolk scores above average. It has comparatively low levels of smoking and a low standardised mortality ratio, which accounts for the age structure of the population. Obesity rates, on the other hand, are higher than the national average.

Figure 2: Spider chart to show how key health indicators in Norfolk relate to the national median

In line with national trends, life expectancy is found to be lowest in the most deprived areas of the county (80.1 in Great Yarmouth compared to 83.2 in South Norfolk and 82 in Norfolk as a whole). Estimated obesity and the standardized mortality ratio are also comparatively higher in Great Yarmouth than in other districts, supporting the association between poverty/inequality and ill-health.

General population wellbeing is assessed based on how residents rate their life satisfaction, anxiety levels and their perception of whether their life is worthwhile out of 10. The resulting wellbeing score average (7.56) indicates that residents of Norfolk are happier and have a greater sense of life worth
than the East of England and the UK as a whole (7.45 and 7.42 respectively). Yet, despite higher than (national) average wellbeing levels in the majority of Norfolk’s seven local authority areas, Great Yarmouth, Norwich and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk have comparatively low levels of general wellbeing. The mean response to having felt anxiety yesterday was highest in Great Yarmouth, while life satisfaction was found to be lowest in Norwich.

In terms of GP services in the county, patient satisfaction in Norfolk is high. 87% of people report having ‘very good’ or ‘fairly good’ experiences of their GP surgery, compared to 85.7% in England and 85.9% in the East. In terms of appointment accessibility, 77.14% of patients report having ‘very good’ or ‘fairly good’ experiences of making an appointment against 74.6% and 75.5% regionally and nationally.

2.2. Mental health

Mental ill health is one of the main causes of the overall global disease burden. It cuts across age, gender and ethnicity, impacting on relationships, community participation, leisure pursuits, work and retirement. There are many different forms that mental illness can take, ranging in severity and duration and therefore the support and treatment required. In England, it is estimated that 1 in 4 people will experience mental ill health in any given year.

Although highly prevalent, mental health is not given the same priority status as physical health; mental illness accounts for one quarter of the UK disease burden but only receives 13% of NHS funding. The lack of parity between mental and physical health has been recognised and incorporated into the most recent NHS England Business Plan. Despite this, many people in England still struggle to access good quality mental health treatment. The stigma attached to mental disorders is unlikely to disappear overnight.

Mental ill health can affect anyone, but people exposed to certain risk environments are more susceptible than others. Generally speaking, incidences of mental illness tend to be higher amongst residents of deprived communities since these are also areas with higher levels of unemployment, a larger population of young people not in education, training or employment and an increased prevalence of substance misuse. Long term worklessness and non-participation in key social activities are strongly associated with poor mental health and wellbeing. There is also a growing recognition that people experience mental ill health as a result of being socially excluded or isolated.

2.2.1 Mental Health Statistics for Norfolk

In Norfolk, data collected from GP mental health prevalence registers of serious mental illness, dementia and depression reveal that the county is performing slightly below the regional average for all three mental health conditions. The prevalence of depression is particularly concerning, with Norfolk exceeding both the East of England and country-wide average (12.3% in Norfolk and Waveney

---
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against 10.9% regionally and 11.2% nationally). Of the five Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in Norfolk and Waveney, depression rates are highest in Great Yarmouth and Waveney CCG (14.8%), and lowest in Norwich CCG (9.7%)\textsuperscript{27}.

Common Mental Disorders (CMDs), which include different types of depression and anxiety found to cause significant emotional distress and interfere with daily function, also affect high numbers in the county. Estimations based on the 2009 Mental Health Psychiatric Morbidity Survey, which runs every seven years, indicate that there are 44,434 men and 70,477 women (between 16 and 74) who suffer from CMDs in Norfolk’s five CCGs. The estimations indicate that women in Norfolk and Waveney are more greatly affected by CMDs than men, but that residents of Great Yarmouth and Waveney are more likely to experience common mental disorders than those from other Norfolk CCGs regardless of their gender. 23.7% of all males and 23.1% of all females suffering from CMDs in Norfolk live in Great Yarmouth and Waveney compared to 16.1% and 16.5% in West Norfolk (see figure 3)\textsuperscript{28}.

Figure 3: The proportion of males and females with CMDs in Norfolk that live in each local authority area

![Circle charts showing the proportion of males and females with CMDs in Norfolk](image)

Whilst prevalence data for Norfolk provides an insight into mental health issues, it is unlikely that the statistics reflect the actual numbers affected by mental ill health in the county. Across the UK, few people present to primary care for mental health problems and a substantial proportion do not access any mental health support. The Mental Health Foundation estimates that around 75% of people in need receive no treatment at all\textsuperscript{29}.

\textbf{2.2.2 Dementia}

Dementia is a condition which disproportionally affects the elderly, although it is not a natural part of ageing. As is the case with other mental illnesses, dementia often scares people who do not know or understand how it affects those who suffer from the condition. Because of this fear, people with dementia may be stigmatised, making them increasingly reluctant to leave their homes and participate in their communities\textsuperscript{30}.

\textsuperscript{27} Alabady, Hillman and Rennie, \textit{Mental Health Needs Assessment}  
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{29} Mental Health Foundation, \textit{Fundamental Facts About Mental Health}  
Norfolk has a much older age profile than England as a whole. 21.7% of Norfolk’s population in 2011 were aged 65 and over and 10.4% were aged 75 and over, compared with 16.4% and 7.8% in England respectively. It is estimated that around 16,000 people are currently living with dementia in Norfolk, with 3,885 new cases emerging every year. However, of these 16,000 people, less than half have been medically diagnosed and recorded on GP registers (46.8%). This is concerning considering that receiving a timely diagnosis is fundamental to relieving uncertainty and allowing people with dementia and their carers to make informed decisions about their future.

Table 2: Prevalence (% and numbers) of dementia (all ages) according to the GP’s QOF registers by CCG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCG</th>
<th>Prevalence (%) of dementia (2012/13)</th>
<th>Prevalence (numbers) of dementia (2012/13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth and Waveney</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norfolk</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Norfolk and Waveney</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the five CCGs in Norfolk, North Norfolk has the highest proportion of people with dementia whilst Great Yarmouth and Waveney CCG has the highest number of people with dementia reflecting its larger population (see table 2). Dementia prevalence is lowest in Norwich, most likely associated with its younger age profile.

Sadly, inequalities exist between people’s access to services and the quality of care they receive. The same is true of people with dementia. In Norfolk, those from marginalised groups such as Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME), people with learning disabilities, and those who live alone are likely to find it difficult to access services. The Alzheimer’s Society estimate that the proportion of people with early onset dementia amongst BAME groups is 6.1% compared to 2.2% in the general population. With a rising BAME population and a significant number of older people who live alone in rural areas, such inequalities are likely to affect many residents in the county.

2.2.3. The costs associated with mental health problems

As well as the social costs to personal life and community involvement, mental health problems are associated with economic inactivity and increased government spending on welfare. Across the UK, it is estimated that 70 million days are lost from work annually due to mental ill health; the cost to UK employers who need to replace staff is believed to be around £2.4 billion per year. People experiencing mental health problems make up a high percentage of all incapacity benefit claimants i.e. those not able to work because of poor health or disability.

According to National Survey data, in 2011 there were 10,595 people claiming incapacity benefit across Norfolk and Waveney due to mental illness. This accounts for nearly half of all claimants.
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(44.7%) and amounts to 1.9% of all working age adults in Norfolk’s CCGs. At district level, Norwich has the highest proportion people being granted incapacity benefit on the grounds of mental health issues (57.5%), followed by South Norfolk (44.8%) and Broadland (43.7%)\(^{35}\).

### 2.2.4 Experiences of Mental Health Services

Graph 7: Respondent’s ratings out of 6 with 1 being very unhappy and 6 being very happy with a) how the service was organised and b) the service and treatment they received\(^{36}\)

A study carried out by Healthwatch Norfolk found that mental health services in Norfolk are not equally addressing the needs of all service users. Responses to a questionnaire sent to 156 service users revealed that levels of satisfaction in relation to waiting times, staffing and recruitment, organisation of services and quality of treatment were extremely varied.

Whilst 30.4% of the 110 respondents to this question claimed that waiting times were quicker than they had expected, a comparable proportion (31.3%) asserted that their situation had deteriorated because they had had to wait too long. Some service users (13%) even reported having to wait 7 months or more before they started receiving support from mental health and wellbeing services\(^{37}\).

Similarly mixed responses emerged from questions related to how the service was organised and patients’ perception of treatment received (see graph 7). Whilst a higher proportion of 119 service users (55%) scored the organisation of mental health services between 1 and 3 than between 4 and 6 (with 1 being very unhappy and 6 being very happy), 62% of 114 scored the treatment they received towards the more positive end of the ranking, suggesting that overall they were happy with quality of care. 17% more people were unhappy with the organisation of services than were unhappy with the treatment they received.

\(^{35}\) Alabady, Hillman and Rennie, *Mental Health Needs Assessment*

\(^{36}\) Ibid.

2.3. Disability

People living with impairment or a disabling health problem can face significant barriers to inclusion in community life. Whether the result of poor accessibility of public transport, or discriminatory attitudes in education and employment, people are disabled by the environments in which they live. A ‘disabling’ social context may cause people with disabilities to become socially isolated, exacerbating social difference and stigma. Issues of social isolation are particularly acute in rural areas where disabled people may rely solely on underserviced public transport to get from A to B.

Data captured by the Community Relations and Equality Board (CREB) in 2013 estimates that 20% of residents in Norfolk (172,431 people) are currently living with a disability or health problem. Comparing Norfolk’s seven districts, North Norfolk has the highest population of disabled people and South Norfolk has the lowest. The CREB’s disability profile also revealed figures obtained from Norfolk Constabulary into the number of disability related hate crimes and incidences. In 2011 and 2012 there were on average 119 hate crimes committed against disabled people. This highlights the need for a greater understanding and awareness of disability in the county.

Research conducted by Equal Lives (formerly the Norfolk Coalition of Disabled People) found that the majority of people living with a disability want the same things out of life as non-disabled people e.g. family, work, leisure and friendship. Those interviewed placed a high value on independence and on the ability to be socially active in community life.

The research also discovered that some ‘hard to reach’ groups such as homeless people, BAME people and those from the gypsy traveller community are disproportionately affected by disability. For example, if the prevalence of disability amongst homeless people was as high in Norfolk as it is in London, homeless people would have the highest incidence of disability (primarily mental health problems) of any groups surveyed.

Disabled people from different cultures and lifestyles may not seek help because of the (cultural) shame of not being able work or contribute to their families, or for fear of stigma and discrimination in their communities.

2.4. Excess Winter Deaths (EWD)

Excess winter deaths are an indication of deprivation and fuel poverty in an area. The EWD index calculates whether there are higher than expected deaths in winter months compared with the rest of the year.

Whilst EWDs are associated with cold weather, there is no obvious relationship between the average winter temperature and the number of deaths. A high EWD index is therefore the result of homes having a low thermal efficiency and low indoor temperatures which exacerbate certain conditions such as circulatory and respiratory diseases.
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Although excess winter deaths affect all ages, EWDs are most commonly seen in the elderly population. As people age they become more susceptible to cold exposure, yet are also those most likely to suffer from fuel poverty (see Fairness section). In Norfolk, the index for people under 65 is 10.5% compared to 23.9% for the over 85s. As a county with a large elderly population and a considerable proportion of non-decent housing, it follows that Norfolk has a high EWD index. With a score of 20.13, Norfolk has the highest number of excess winter deaths in the region and ranks 3rd nationally. At district level (see map 1), excess winter deaths are most common in Broadland (25.96), Norwich (23.34), Great Yarmouth (21.91) and South Norfolk (21.25). This correlates with the total number of dwellings failing the thermal comfort standard in these districts (see Housing section).

2.5. Substance misuse

Substance misuse is the regular excessive consumption or intoxication by psychoactive substances (both legal and illegal). It can lead to social, psychological, physical or legal problems for the individual experiencing drug and alcohol problems, as well as those around them.

In terms of prevalence, the majority of data for Norfolk are in line with national averages showing that Norfolk does not have a county-specific substance misuse problem. However, Norfolk’s growing elderly population and higher than average levels of deprivation do put certain groups at greater risk. In recent years there has been a steady increase in the amount of alcohol consumed by older people; it is estimated that 3% of UK adult males and 0.6% of adult females over 65 are now dependent on alcohol. Given that older people are one of the fastest growing population groups in the county, this issue is highly relevant in Norfolk. As people age their ability to break down alcohol slows and the effects of excessive consumption become more harmful. These harmful cognitive and physical effects can increase the risks of dementia and falls in older people with alcohol misuse problems.
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### Table 3: Comparative levels of substance use in young people aged 12-18 in Norfolk and in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Norfolk Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have experienced being drunk at least once</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking every day or every week</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smoking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tried smoking tobacco</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking every day or every week</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried cannabis</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried Class A</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young people are another group perceived to be particularly vulnerable to substance abuse due to their propensity to experimentation. Fortunately for Norfolk, this is not translating into more young people than average heavily consuming alcohol, tobacco or cannabis in the county (see table 3). The Norfolk figures actually compare favourably to the UK, where 80% of Year 11 pupils reported having been drunk at least once compared to 65% in Norfolk. Alcohol related hospital admissions of under 18s continue to fall, despite increases in the districts of Great Yarmouth and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk. Such disparities at district level correlate to the comparatively high proportion of young people that are Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET) in both districts (6% and 5.3% respectively). Young NEET people are more likely to experience problems with substance abuse which can have a major impact on their education, their health, and their long-term chances in life.

Young people are also adversely affected by parental substance abuse. Excessive alcohol and drug consumption can affect an individual’s ability to parent effectively, exposing children to sustained or intermittent hazards such as poverty, physical and emotional abuse, inadequate accommodation or neglect. Research shows that children living with parental alcoholism have an increased risk of being in trouble with the police or experiencing difficulties at school. Young people in this situation may also end up caring for their parents or other family members. It is estimated that 1.4% of children aged 5-15 are young carers in Norfolk, 8% of which are caring because of parental substance misuse. This amounts to around 510 children caring as a result of their parents’ substance misuse in the county.

### 2.6. Carers

Carers are non-professionals who provide help and support to family members or friends who are sick, infirm or disabled. They often work around the clock, seven days a week, 365 days a year with very little respite. Carers are a massively significant resource; the Norfolk County Council estimates that the value of unpaid care work equates to £1.6 billion pounds a year.
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Within the county, 94,691 people provide unpaid care to a relative, partner or friend. The largest proportion of Norfolk carers care for someone with mental ill health (54%), followed by a physical disability (26%) or illness (23%) according to a survey conducted by Healthwatch Norfolk. Two thirds of carers (64%) have caring commitments of more than 35 hours a week, yet less than half have had a carer’s assessment to allow them to receive formal support\(^{47}\).

At district level, statistics on the proportion of working age people who are claiming carers’ benefits provides an insight into where the majority of carers live within Norfolk (although obviously this excludes non-working age people i.e. young carers) (see graph 8). The Department for Work and Pensions calculates that the highest proportion of Norfolk’s carers in receipt of benefits live in Great Yarmouth (2.77% of the working age population), followed by King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (2.06%). The lowest proportion of carers claiming benefits is found in South Norfolk (1.31%).

### 2.6.1 Young Carers

For young carers, the responsibility associated with providing care, assistance or support to a family member is often seen as excessive and inappropriate at their age or stage of development. Carrying out caring tasks such as helping a family member get dressed, administering medication, household chores, looking after siblings and providing emotional support can have adverse effects on a young carer’s own outcomes. Children or young people in this situation may feel pressure to prioritise the person they are caring for at the expense of their own education, aspirations and life chances. Evidence suggests that young carers may struggle to make the transition from school to further education, training or employment and reports much higher truancy rates amongst this group\(^{48}\).

As is the case in England, nobody knows the exact number of young carers in Norfolk. The reasons for this are complex and multiple. Whilst some families may withhold their personal circumstances from professionals to avoid their children being taken into care, sometimes it is the young carer who keeps

---

\(^{47}\) Ibid.
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their caring role a secret for fear of stigma by association or bullying. In other situations, caring becomes such a normal part of family life that children and young people may not even realise they are carers. The best estimates on the numbers of young carers in Norfolk come from the University of Nottingham which suggests there may be as many as 10,000 in the county. According to The Norfolk Disabled Parents Alliance, this may equate to at least 1 young carer in every class at school\textsuperscript{49}.

2.6.2 Carers and Mental Health

Whilst unpaid care work is thought to save the UK government billions of pounds annually, it can carry serious implications for the mental health of the caregiver themselves. A survey of the mental health of carers found that 18% have significant neurotic symptoms. The likelihood of showing signs of neurosis was higher amongst female carers and was found to increase by 50% in those who spend more than 20 hours a week engaging in unpaid care work.

Across Norfolk and Waveney’s CCGs, an estimated 108,342 (11%) people provide unpaid care to friends, family or neighbours who suffer from long term physical or mental illness. Of these, 26,941 (2.8% of residents) provide care for 50 hours or more each week, exceeding the national average of 2.4%\textsuperscript{50}. Based on the estimate of 18%, as many as 19,502 carers in the county could have significant neurotic symptoms\textsuperscript{51}.

2.7. Vital Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Needs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Health</strong> - Prevalence of serious mental illness, dementia and depression in Norfolk is higher than in the East of England, with cases of depression exceeding both the national and regional average. Whilst patient satisfaction with GP services is generally high in Norfolk, this is not the case amongst mental health service users. 13% have to wait 7 months before receiving support. Nearly half of all incapacity benefit claimants are unable to work due to mental ill health in the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carers and Young Carers</strong> - Estimates suggest that Norfolk has a high number of young carers, possibly equating to 1 in every class at school. Adult carers in the county work very long hours – a larger proportion work more than 50 hours a week than in England as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Winter Deaths</strong> – Norfolk has the third highest prevalence of excess winter deaths in the country, and the highest within the East of England.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerable Areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Norfolk</strong> has the highest proportion of people with dementia and of people living with a disability of the seven local authority areas in Norfolk. The prevalence of CMDs is highest amongst residents of <strong>Great Yarmouth</strong>, but affects more women than men across all Norfolk districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the proportion of people claiming carers’ benefits, there are a higher number of carers in <strong>Great Yarmouth</strong> and <strong>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</strong> than other areas of the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess winter deaths are most common in <strong>Broadland</strong>, <strong>Norwich</strong>, <strong>Great Yarmouth</strong> and <strong>South Norfolk</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} Alabady, Hillman and Rennie, *Mental Health Needs Assessment* 
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
3. Fairness

Economic growth rarely occurs uniformly across societies. Even if the majority benefit from increased wealth, there are often entire communities who miss out on opportunities for greater social and economic mobility. Poverty and deprivation are cyclical; those who grow up in low-income households are more likely to perform badly at school, have poor health and face barriers to employment. All of these factors increase the likelihood that people from disadvantaged backgrounds will experience periods of poverty later in life. The following sections will evaluate how fair the distribution of wealth and resources is in Norfolk.

3.1. Poverty and Deprivation

3.1.1 Indices of Multiple Deprivations

Deprivation can be defined as the lack of material benefits required to ensure a certain standard of living. Whilst the term can be used as a synonym for poverty, deprivation is about more than just material wealth or income. People can be simultaneously deprived from a number of key social activities as a result of low employment opportunities, unsuitable housing or limited health care provision. By incorporating seven principal forms of deprivation, the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) holistically measure the layers of barriers people may face in accessing basic goods and services.

Figure 4: Spider chart to show how Norfolk compares to the national median (the 50th percentile) along a number of different IMD indicators.

One of the difficulties in accurately assessing disadvantage is that deprivation is more about people than places. However well the statistics may help to pinpoint areas of multiple deprivation down to the lowest output area level, a child growing up in a family without work or prospects will suffer from poverty and social exclusion regardless of whether they live in an identified ‘deprived area’ or not.
Therefore, even this composite measure of deprivation can sometimes fail to account for the true nature of poverty and social exclusion within households.\textsuperscript{52}

In terms of overall deprivation (IMD Deprivation Score comprised of Income Deprivation, Employment Deprivation, Education, Skills and Training Deprivation, Health Deprivation and Disability, Crime, Barriers to Housing and Services and Living Environment Deprivation) Norfolk ranks highest in the East of England. Norfolk’s IMD Score (24.4) also surpasses the national average of 21.54. Of the seven individual domains of deprivation, Norfolk performs particularly poorly on Education, Skills and Training; it scores 32.89 compared to just 21.46 nationally. Conversely, its IMD Crime Score is very low. These deprivation indices reflect the county-wide challenges of high unemployment, limited opportunities for young people and low average earnings.

At district level, the IMD Overall Score suggests that deprivation disproportionately affects residents of Great Yarmouth and Norwich. With a Score of 32.82 Great Yarmouth is amongst the top ten local authority districts with the highest proportion of Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOA) that are in the most deprived 1 per cent of areas in England.\textsuperscript{53} Great Yarmouth borough is also home to the most deprived ward in the county: the Nelson ward. To show the variation within Norfolk, the IMD Score in Nelson is 382.21 compared to just 27.76 in the Taverham ward of Broadland. However, if the Indices of Multiple Deprivation are disaggregated by domain, North Norfolk comes to the forefront as having a particularly high IMD Living Environment and Housing Score. Such high deprivation levels for these two domains are a likely consequence of high house prices and poor stock condition in the North of the county.

\textbf{3.1.2 Child Poverty}

Under the Child Poverty Act 2010 a child is considered to be in relative poverty if they live in a household with an income of less than 60 per cent of the national median. Poverty hurts at any age, but for children it can trigger a cycle of ill health, low attainment, and unemployment that can hold them back for the rest of their lives. Children living in poverty in the UK are more likely to be born small, be exposed to second hand smoke, struggle at school, become overweight, become a young parent and be less likely to work and live in a decent home than children who do not experience disadvantage in their early years of life. It is therefore the root cause of many other social issues that impact on how well different parts of the UK are performing.\textsuperscript{54}

Despite a wealth of available data on household incomes, it is difficult to gain an accurate picture of the true numbers of children living below the poverty line in the UK. Firstly, household income alone does not necessarily predict child poverty; expenses (notably housing costs) and whether the family is in receipt of certain benefits can significantly impact on living conditions. Secondly, the ‘poverty line’ officially accepted as separating those in poverty from those out of poverty is not fixed; this may explain recent reductions observed in UK poverty levels.\textsuperscript{55} Data sets therefore vary depending on how different organisations define and calculate child poverty.

\textsuperscript{52} Guy Palmer, \textit{Poverty and Social Exclusion in the Rural East of England} (New Policy Institute, 2001)

\textsuperscript{53} Department for Communities and Local Government, National Statistics, \textit{The English Indices of Deprivation} (2015)

\textsuperscript{54} Norfolk County Council, \textit{Norfolk’s Child Poverty Needs Assessment} (Norfolk Insight, 2015)

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
Across England, around one in five children live in low income families\textsuperscript{56}. One in six children (15.9\%) are estimated to be living below the poverty line, increasing to one in four (25.1\%) after housing costs have been deducted from their income\textsuperscript{57}. For all these different Fairness indicators, Norfolk performs slightly better (lower) than the national average. In terms of the proportion of children living in low income households, for example, the figure for Norfolk is 2 percentage points lower than in the country as a whole (16.3\% as opposed to 18.6\%). However, this still equates to 27,290 children and masks considerable disparities between local authority areas in the county.

Whether child poverty estimates deduct housing costs or look purely at the numbers living in low income families based on tax credits, the trend at district level is the same. Both Norwich and Great Yarmouth have a much higher proportion of children growing up in poverty than any other local authority area in the county; in Norwich almost a third of all children (31\%) are estimated to be living below the poverty line after housing costs have been deducted from their income\textsuperscript{58}. As for the rate of children living in low income families, the figure in Norwich is more than double the rate recorded in either Broadland or South Norfolk. This suggests that twice as many children in Norwich do not have the life chances of children who grow up in neighbouring districts\textsuperscript{59}.

### 3.2. Inequality

Whilst poverty and deprivation statistics provide an insight into the level of disadvantage in an area, they do not reveal how wealth is distributed. Even if a district has a low level of deprivation, there may

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{57} Donald Hirsch and Laura Valadez, Child Poverty Map of the UK (End Child Poverty, 2014)

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{59} Norfolk County Council, Norfolk’s Child Poverty Needs Assessment
be a number of deprived pockets where people struggle to meet their basic needs. Data on inequality illuminates the gap between the richest and poorest sections of society.

Inequality has a harmful effect on individuals, society and the economy. On an individual level, living in an unequal society causes stress and anxiety which negatively impacts on people’s health. At community level, those living in areas of high inequality are less likely to trust one another and engage in their communities; this may also fuel crime and antisocial behaviour. In terms of the economy, research by The Equality Trust calculates that the overall cost of inequality to the UK is around £39 billion per year as a result of reduced life expectancy, imprisonment costs, poor mental health and an increase in the number of murders. This equates to an annual loss of £622 worth of spending on every individual UK resident. The impacts of inequality are by no means limited to those at the lower end of the income range.

An inequality score measures the range between all the Super Output areas in each district indexed to the national average (100). The higher the score the more inequality there is in an area. In Norfolk as a whole the level of inequality is 8.67% below the level recorded in England and 16.2 percentage points lower than in the East of England, positioning Norfolk towards the lower (better) end of the national ranking. However, within the county inequality is more pronounced in some districts than in others. In line with data on overall deprivation, Great Yarmouth has the highest level of inequality of all the local authority areas in Norfolk. In comparison with Broadland (42.51), Great Yarmouth scores 154.85 ranking 25 of 325 districts in England. Inequality is similarly high in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and in Norwich (15.41% and 14.67% above the national average).

3.3. Debt

As the cost of living continues to rise at a pace out of step with wages, debt is becoming an increasingly common problem. Households across the UK are under strain, but those with dependent children face extra pressures. With additional lives to support, these families are much less resilient to sudden financial shocks such as redundancy, reduced hours or illness. Cuts to benefits and rising unemployment may mean that borrowing money is the only way for families to meet their member’s needs. However, in the long run this may compound the problem as credit repayments start to consume a larger proportion of income.

A report from The Children’s Society and StepChange Debt Charity reveals the particularly harmful effects of debt on children. In the UK, two and a half million children live in families with problem debt, with a further five million in families struggling to keep up with payments. The report highlights the manifold ways in which family debt can increase incidences of bullying, worry and family arguments. More than half of children (58%) living in families with problem debt say they worry about their family’s financial situation. Moreover, 90% report having to sometimes go without essentials such as food, heating and clothing.
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Table 4: Families in problem debt by parliamentary constituency in Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parliamentary Constituency</th>
<th>No. of families in problem debt</th>
<th>% of families in problem debt</th>
<th>No. of children in problem debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Norfolk</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Norfolk</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Norfolk</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norwich</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norwich</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the East of England, 130,364 (18%) families are thought to be in problem debt which is directly affecting 227,143 children. Compared against the regional average, some areas of Norfolk have a concerning proportion of families in an extremely precarious position. In Great Yarmouth, North Norfolk, South West Norfolk and Mid Norfolk over a quarter of families are in problem debt (in Great Yarmouth this is almost 1 in every 3 families). Whilst it is difficult to know why problem debt is such a big problem in these areas (especially since the low figures for Norwich constituencies raise questions about the association with deprivation), it is likely that rising housing costs, energy and fuel costs and low wages all fuel the debt crises.

### 3.4. Foodbanks

Across the UK, there is growing evidence that more people every year are struggling to afford food (see graph 9). For people in food poverty, foodbanks can be a lifeline. Low pay, benefit sanctions, administration delays to benefit payments and mental health issues are among some of the driving forces of foodbank use. These driving forces are likely to intensify over the coming years, especially given cuts to benefits and the rolling out of Universal Credit throughout the UK which is expected to reduce the frequency of payments. Of the groups affected by benefit cuts, delays and sanctions, young people are considered to be at greatest risk of experiencing food poverty. This is because young people tend to lack essential financial skills and may not have been in work long enough to have enough savings to fall back on in the case of delays to benefit payments.

---
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65 Niall Cooper and Sarah Dumpleton, *Walking the Breadline: the scandal of food poverty in 21st century Britain* (Oxfam; Church Action on Poverty, 2013)
According to research by Oxfam, over 500,000 people in the UK are now reliant on food aid (either via food banks or in receipt of food parcels). This figure is substantially higher than the estimate of 350,000 put forward by the Trussell Trust, the biggest provider of foodbanks in the UK, but may still fail to capture the reality of foodbank usage. A lack of data collected by foodbanks at district level and stigmatizing attitudes towards poverty, which discourage people from seeking help, may mask the true extent of food poverty in the country.

Although it is difficult to pinpoint an exact figure on foodbank usage, the statistics do suggest that there is a worrying gap emerging between supply and demand. Trend data collected by the Trussell Trust shows a virtually exponential increase in the number turning to foodbanks from 68,486 to 128,697 between 2010/11 and 2011/12 and up to 350,000 in 2012/13 (see graph 10). The Trust now runs 400 food banks across the UK, and reports that the numbers in need of and receiving emergency food is increasing disproportionately to the amount of new foodbanks opening. In Norfolk, an absence of trend data at county level makes it difficult to know whether there is evidence of an emergency supply and demand gap. According to Norwich foodbank demand decreased slightly between 2013/14 and 2014/15, yet the first five months of this year already show an increase on the same period last year.

Within Norfolk, the number of emergency food supplies distributed to children and adults from Norwich foodbank was more than double the amount from any other Trussell Trust foodbank in Norfolk (8,730) (see graph 11). Whilst Norwich does have the highest proportion of children living in families below the poverty line, child poverty is only 1 percentage point lower in Great Yarmouth for which the nearest Trussell Trust East Suffolk foodbank distributed 3,516 supplies in 2015/16. The difference in population size between the two districts (137,472 against 98,172) is not substantial enough to explain such a huge gap in emergency food supply provision, suggesting there may be a high level of unmet need outside of Norwich. Foodbanks are, however, just one example of community projects supporting vulnerable people with food or meals.
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3.5. Car Ownership

The ability to travel dictates how much access people have to important local services and community events or activities. Not being able to travel is therefore intrinsically linked to social isolation and exclusion. Research has shown that people in households without a car make half the amount of journeys as those with a vehicle, seriously limiting some people’s ability to access essential services. For example, those without a car are twice as likely to have trouble accessing hospitals as those with a car (40% compared to 20%).

Access to a car is affected by both household income and household type. Although nearly all households with above average incomes have a car, around half of low-income households do not. Similarly, single people (both with and without children) who do not benefit from a joint income are much less likely than those in a couple to have a car.

Within Norfolk, it is the more urban districts of Norwich and Great Yarmouth which have the highest proportion of no car ownership (27.2% and 33.4% respectively). Conversely, only 11.4 and 11.7 per cent of households are not recorded as owning a car in Broadland and South Norfolk (see table 5). While no car ownership in Norwich and Great Yarmouth may be a result of a stronger public transport system and proximity to local services in these districts, it could equally be linked to poverty; especially considering that car ownership is highest in the two least deprived areas of the county, and that Broadland is 51% urban (see Rural Living section).
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### Table 5: Car ownership rates and no. by local authority area in Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Area</th>
<th>% of households with a car/van (2011)</th>
<th>% of no car ownership households (2011)</th>
<th>Cars/vans per 1000 people (2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6. Vital Issues

#### Identified Needs:

**Deprivation** - Norfolk is the most deprived county in the East of England according to its IMD score, which is also higher than the national average. Of the seven domains of deprivation, Norfolk performs particularly poorly on Education, Skills and Training.

#### Vulnerable Areas:

Deprivation and child poverty is most acute in **Great Yarmouth** and **Norwich**. In **Norwich**, a third of children are living below the poverty line.

**Great Yarmouth** has the highest level of inequality which is having adverse effects on crime, anti-social behaviour, community cohesion and population health. Inequality is also above the national average in **King’s Lynn and West Norfolk** and **Norwich**.

Problem debt and rates of no car ownership are also highest amongst residents of **Great Yarmouth** and **Norwich**. A considerable number of families are at risk of poor health, unemployment, poverty and homelessness in these two districts with limited means to access help and support.
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4. **Housing and Homelessness**

Housing and the quality of housing are closely linked to many other aspects of people’s lives. An unsuitable or unsafe living environment has the power to adversely affect individual health and wellbeing, aspirations and employment prospects, as well as wider issues such as social isolation and community cohesion. It is government policy that everyone should have the opportunity to live in a decent home, but many people still face considerable barriers in accessing a minimum standard of housing on the private market. For those who cannot afford a decent home, the support is not always there to access social housing. Homelessness, fuel poverty and a high proportion of people living in non-decent accommodation are all symptomatic of a growing affordability crisis. Staggeringly high house prices are driving young people from areas where they grew up, to be replaced by an increasing number of second home owners in a number of towns and villages across the UK.

4.1. **Affordability of Housing**

An affordability score measures average house prices against mean weekly earnings to establish within which areas properties are most affordable to local people. With a score of 98.53, homes in Norfolk are 1.47% less affordable than they are on average in England and Wales; the county ranks 30th of 49 sub districts in the country. Across Norfolk as a whole, house prices have gone up 20.37% over the last 10 years (2005-2015). According to the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICA) this trend is set to continue, with prices in East Anglia predicted to rise faster than anywhere else in the country within the next year (8% compared to a 6% UK wide average)\(^\text{73}\).

The problem is compounded as the gap widens between the cost of housing and weekly earnings. In East Anglia, where property prices have increased 42 times since 1969, incomes have only increased 26 times\(^\text{74}\). Rising property prices combined with below average weekly earnings in all of Norfolk’s seven districts pose a considerable barrier for first time buyers looking to get onto the property ladder. Recent research from Post Office Mortgages reveals that the average age of a first time buyer is now 35 years\(^\text{75}\). In Norfolk this reality is reflected by the clustering of young people between 25 and 29 in Norwich, where average property prices are cheaper than the country-wide average (£202,561 compared to £240,919.25 for England and Wales). For young people, Norwich is actually the second best performing local authority area for housing in England when the affordability of lower quintile house prices, annual mortgage possession claims and the number of young people living at home is taken into consideration\(^\text{76}\).

Based on affordability alone, Great Yarmouth scores highest in Norfolk (see graph 12); over the period from July to September 2015 the price of the average property was £165,338. At the other end of the spectrum, with Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) dotted along its coastline, North Norfolk has the county’s least affordable homes (£242,504 on average). The desirability of homes on the Norfolk Coastline AONBs has been seen to drive up house prices making them unaffordable to many local residents. This also increases the number of second and vacant homes (see section 4.4) which
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\(^{74}\) Shelter, *Housing affordability for first time buyers* (2015)


can have a detrimental impact on community cohesion and belonging since temporary residents tend to be less engaged with local issues.

**Graph 12: Affordability score of housing by Local Authority Area in Norfolk (2015)**

![Bar chart showing affordability score by Local Authority Area in Norfolk]  
*Score (with 100 as England and Wales average)*

**Local Authority Area**
- North Norfolk
- Breckland
- Broadland
- Great Yarmouth
- King’s Lynn and West Norfolk
- Norwich
- South Norfolk

Low housing affordability affects people differently depending on whether they are in ‘housing demand’ or ‘housing need’. Whilst the former refers to people who can meet their own housing requirements in the private housing market, the latter refers to those who are unable to independently attain housing of at least a minimum standard[^77]. A housing market assessment carried out in Great Yarmouth identified groups who are most likely to be in housing need. Of these groups, lone parents were least likely to be able to afford market housing if they were to move at the time of the survey (78.5% would be unable to meet their own housing needs without some form of assistance). In contrast, a multi-adult group with no children was most able to afford housing in the private sector (unaffordable to just 11.4%)[^78].

### 4.2. The Condition of Homes

#### 4.2.1 Unsuitable and Non-Decent Housing

When the cost of housing is out of step with average earnings, people may be forced to live in unsuitable homes. An unsuitable home refers to any housing situation which does not adequately meet the basic housing needs of its residents. There are nine different criteria for unsuitable housing ranging from overcrowded households, households with tenure under notice, households lacking appropriate facilities, those in a state of disrepair or considered too difficult to maintain (e.g. too

[^77]: Norwich City Council, Broadland District Council and South Norfolk District Council, *Greater Norwich Sub-Region Evidence Base for a Housing Market Assessment: A Study of Housing Need and Stock Condition* (Swansea: Opinion Research Services, 2006)

[^78]: Great Yarmouth Borough Council, *Strategic Housing Market Assessment* (Cumbria: HDH Planning and Development, 2011)
large) to homeless households. In Great Yarmouth, for example, there are currently 1,929 unsuitably housed households in the borough, 62.9% of which are unable to afford market housing.

Of the many forms of unsuitable housing, non-decent homes are among those that pose the biggest risk to health (including mental health). In line with the Decent Homes Standard, housing should meet certain criteria regarding the condition of the building and its facilities. Homes may be classified as non-decent if they are in a state of disrepair, hazardous, fail to provide thermal comfort, have poor facilities or are unfit for living. In areas with a high proportion of non-decent housing, certain groups are more likely to find themselves unsuitably housed in homes which fail to meet this minimum standard.

Graph 13: Causes of non-decency as a proportion of all properties by Local Authority

There are 42,900 dwellings (29.7%) which can be classified as non-decent in the Greater Norwich sub region (comprised of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk). This figure is slightly lower in these districts than in England as a whole (30.1%), although differences between local authority areas show non-decency rates in South Norfolk to be slightly above average (31.2%) with a total of 15,450 non-decent homes. The higher rates of non-decent housing observed in South Norfolk correlates with the data trend for unfit stock across the seven local authority areas in the county. In South Norfolk, 6.32% of dwellings are considered unfit for living; almost double the regional average. Unfit stock is much less of a problem around the commuter belt of Norwich where greater demand and higher average earnings have contributed towards significantly better housing conditions.
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Drilling down to ward level reveals much higher levels of non-decency in the rural areas surrounding market towns (see figure 5). This is due to a lower provision of mains gas and a higher number of older properties in rural areas which result in a greater proportion of dwellings failing on thermal comfort. In the Greater Norwich sub region thermal comfort failures are the leading cause of non-decency (see graph 10). Those living in rural areas are therefore most at risk from the associated health problems of poorly heated accommodation (see section 4.2.3).

4.2.2 People Living in Non-Decent or Unsuitable Dwellings

Vulnerability and living in non-decent housing are closely interlinked. On one hand, people on a low income (economically vulnerable) may be forced to live in unsuitable or non-decent dwellings due to unaffordable market housing. On the other hand, the fact of living in a home in disrepair or one with low thermal efficiency renders people much more vulnerable to ill health, anxiety, depression, substance misuse and disability (socially vulnerable)\(^{86}\).

Given the limited earning potential of the youngest and oldest sections of society, vulnerability is often determined by people’s age. In Norfolk, the association between vulnerability and people in non-decent dwellings is evidenced by the higher proportion of heads of household who are under 25 and 75 or over living in homes which fail to meet the Decent Homes Standard (33.2% and 32.1% compared to an average of 29.1% across all age groups\(^{87}\)). For the oldest heads of households, limited mobility is also a key factor which can impinge on their ability to carry out necessary repairs and home improvements. They are also the group most severely impacted by non-decent housing; as people age they become more susceptible to certain respiratory conditions associated with poorly heated homes as well as more likely to fall as a result of hazardous living environments.
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\(^{85}\) Ibid.

\(^{86}\) Barnes et al., *People living in bad housing: Numbers and health impacts*

\(^{87}\) Norwich City Council, *Greater Norwich Sub-Region Evidence Base for a Housing Market Assessment*
Certain types of household and people living with a disability have also been found to have a higher proportion of their population living in non-decent housing. Single person households are almost three times as likely as a group of adults with dependent children to live in a non-decent dwelling (36.2% compared to 13.2%). Similarly, homes where a person with a disability lives are more likely to be classified as non-decent.

4.2.3 Fuel Poverty

The condition of being in fuel poverty is determined by three interlinking elements: income, fuel prices and fuel consumption. A household is considered to be fuel poor if their required fuel costs are above average and if, in spending the required amount, they would be living below the poverty line. Being ‘fuel poor’ is not, therefore, unique to people on a low income. Even those on a high income can experience fuel poverty if their dwelling is difficult to heat due to thermal comfort failures, or if fuel prices are too high.

As is shown by the graph below, fuel poverty is exacerbated amongst those on a basic, as opposed to a full income. People experiencing fuel poverty are much more susceptible to a number of adverse health conditions, including circulatory and respiratory conditions. There is also a strong correlation between high levels of fuel poverty and an increased number of excess winter deaths (see Health and Wellbeing section). At population level, fuel poverty imposes considerable costs on the wider community in terms of general population health, deprivation and social exclusion.

The most recent data on fuel poverty in Norfolk estimates that 41,200 (11%) households cannot afford to adequately heat their homes. Despite a decrease from the previous year, these estimates place Norfolk slightly above the national and regional averages of 10.9% and 10.2%, suggesting that fuel poverty is a still a big problem in the county. At district level, Great Yarmouth (12.3%), Norwich (12.3%) and North Norfolk (12.2%) stand out as having high levels of fuel poverty comparative to the county average. These figures correlate with the proportion of homes with no central heating which is also greatest in these three local authority areas.

Graph 14: Comparison of proportion of people in fuel poverty on a basic and full income (2008)
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4.3. Housing Need

4.3.1 Homelessness

Homelessness is the condition of not having a home. Contrary to popular belief, it does not mean that people are without a place to stay or that they lack access to any form of shelter. In reality, very few homeless people live on the streets. The majority of people who experience statutory homelessness do so because their homes may be unsuitable, they may have been excluded from family or friends homes, as a result of relationship breakups or because they do not have the right to stay where they live\(^9^9\).

Just like the many reasons which cause homelessness, there are many different forms that homelessness can take. Rough sleeping is the starkest and most harmful of these forms, but thankfully also the least common\(^9^0\). More often than not, homeless people tend to move from one accommodation to another without a settled home. This disruptive lifestyle can have a markedly negative effect on people’s mental health and wellbeing. Over time this is likely to impact on people’s long-term life chances. In a survey of 700 homeless people in England, more than half reported long term physical health complications compared to 29% of the general population\(^9^1\). The harmful impact of unsuitable housing on children is also well documented, increasing the risk of severe ill-health or disability by up to 25% during the early years of childhood and adulthood\(^9^2\).

Table 6: Total number of homeless households, households in temporary accommodation and the rate of homelessness per 1000 of the population in Local Authorities of Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>5796</td>
<td>4129</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>4370</td>
<td>58410</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across England, the number of people becoming homeless (currently estimated at 185,000 per year) is predicted to rise due to welfare benefit cuts, unmet housing need and increased levels of unemployment\(^9^3\). However, in Norfolk evidence of this rising trend is somewhat patchy. According to
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\(^9^9\) The Borough Council of King’s Lynn & West Norfolk, *Homelessness Strategy 2015-19*

\(^9^0\) Ibid.

\(^9^1\) Ibid.

\(^9^2\) Norfolk County Council, *Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF) Summary: Homelessness* (Norfolk Insight, 2014)

\(^9^3\) Ibid.
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the Shelter England data bank, there has been an increase of 46 households now accepted as homeless but not in priority need since 2010, yet the count of those ‘in priority need’ has stabilised over the last few years. This may suggest that whilst homelessness is affecting a greater number of households in Norfolk, the individual circumstances of each of these households is not as dire. In terms of the numbers of people sleeping rough, most areas of Norfolk have less than 1 per 1000 of the population (see table 6).

Drilling down to district level shows considerable disparity between the seven local authority areas. Of these, homelessness is highest in Great Yarmouth (155 homeless households recorded in 2014) and lowest in Breckland, where just 31 households were accepted as homeless that year. Similarly high homelessness counts have been recorded in Broadland (101) and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (99), although this final figure may be reflective of its larger population. When compared to the regional and national average, the rate of homelessness in Great Yarmouth is significantly higher; for every 1000 people in the population, 1.58 belong to a homeless household against 0.96 and 0.97 in the East of England and in England as a whole (see table). The top reason for homelessness in Great Yarmouth for the years 2006-7 was parents no longer willing to accommodate. This finding is commensurate with the crisis of youth and the high proportion of young people without the means to fund independent lives in the borough and elsewhere in the county.

4.3.2 Gypsy and Traveller Communities

Despite their nomadic lifestyles, Gypsy and Travelling Communities have accommodation needs just like any other social group. These needs are primarily centred on the provision of authorised sites (either private or socially rented) to pitch caravans, but also encompass other requirements such as having adequate access to local facilities and services. Interviews with stakeholders from South Norfolk identified proximity to health services, shops and schools as important, as well as access to water, sanitation, electricity and rubbish collection.

Historically, the needs of Gypsy and Travelling Communities have been obscured by a failure to accurately assess the true numbers and requirements of this community. For one, registered social landlords and other service providers have only recently started to monitor Gypsy/Traveller applicants accessing their services. For another, anticipation of discrimination can deter many Gypsy/Traveller groups from making accommodation demands.
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Table 7: Distribution of GT caravans on authorised and unauthorised sites across Norfolk Local Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Authorised Sites</th>
<th>Unauthorised Sites</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socially Rented</td>
<td>&quot;Tolerated&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not Tolerated&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL and West Norfolk</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative to the size of its population, the East of England has the largest GT community in the country, with 75 caravans per 100,000 of the population compared to just 38 in England. Within the region, Norfolk is around average, but still has a larger caravan count adjusted for population size than in England as a whole (59 per 100,000)\(^{98}\). Of the 504 caravans pitched on sites in Norfolk, the majority (261) are found in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk, followed by South Norfolk (98) and Breckland (74). Whilst most caravans across the seven local authority areas are pitched on authorised sites, in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk there are a high number of unauthorised caravans (46) pitched on unauthorised, gypsy owned land. None of these caravans are classified as “tolerated” by others in the borough, indicating that more than 20% of caravans in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk are bothering local residents. Sites which are ‘not tolerated’ are likely to fuel anti-social behaviour and hate crimes enacted by and against GT communities\(^{99}\).

A high proportion of caravans pitched on unauthorised sites tends to be the result of high unmet accommodation need; if authorised sites are full GT communities will generally move on to unauthorised sites rather than wait for pitches to become available. This can lead to many being unsuitably accommodated in areas too close to other residential areas or too far from the services and facilities they require. In the three districts with the highest number of GT peoples, the local authorities estimate the need for 16 new pitches in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk, 35 new pitches in South Norfolk and 33 in Breckland between 2013 and 2031\(^{100}\)\(^{101}\)\(^102\). Ensuring the housing requirements of these communities are met is an important step towards strengthening community cohesion and improving the health and wellbeing of this minority group.
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\(^{97}\) Ibid.
\(^{98}\) Ibid.
\(^{99}\) Ibid.
\(^{100}\) Trevor Baker, *King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Gipsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment* (Cambridge Research Group, 2014)
\(^{101}\) Jarman et al., *South Norfolk Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment* (CRG; Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit, 2013)
\(^{102}\) Breckland Council, *Gipsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment* (CRG; Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit, 2013)
4.4. **Second Homes**

Second homes are properties which are furnished but not a principal place of residence. They can be used in a variety of different ways: as a weekend home for those who work elsewhere during the week, as holiday accommodation or as a home to retire in away from built up areas\(^\text{103}\). Second home ownership impacts on local economies, environments and on communities, bringing both positive and negative changes to affected areas. Yet, without greater collaboration between second home owners and local residents, the negatives tend to outweigh the positives.

A high rate of second home ownership in an area is often blamed for driving up house prices to a level unaffordable to local residents, forcing younger buyers to move out of an area. Given the temporary and mostly seasonal nature of occupancy of second homes, it also tends to have a negative impact on local services, facilities and community spirit. Shops may close due to a lack of custom, and local schools often suffer because there are fewer children. On the other positive side, second homes used for holiday accommodation and business can increase employment opportunities in an area; whilst properties which would otherwise be left empty may be renovated\(^\text{104}\).

Within the UK context, Norfolk has a very high number of second homes; just over 3% of homes are second-owned compared to just over 1% in England. The majority of these homes are clustered in the AONB, spanning North Norfolk and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk. In 2013 there were slightly over 3,000 such homes in the AONB which, as a proportion of all properties, represented almost a quarter (24%)\(^\text{105}\).

**Graph 15: Proportion of second homes in Norfolk local authority areas (2014)**

In some North Norfolk parishes, second home ownership is an even bigger issue. Weybourne, in the High Heath ward, has attracted a considerable number of people looking to invest in a second, third or fourth property and is now in a situation where 52% of homes are second owned. To illustrate the
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\(^{103}\) Norfolk Coast Partnership, *Raising awareness for second homeowners of how they can help to sustain local communities* (2013)

\(^{104}\) Ibid.

\(^{105}\) Ibid.
variation in the county, the coastal High Heath Ward is 25% second homes whereas Spixworth with St Faiths in Broadland has less than 1% of its total property owned by second homes owners.

4.5. Vital Issues

Identified Needs:

**Affordability** - homes in Norfolk are less affordable than the country average, with house prices in East Anglia set to rise at a faster rate than anywhere else in England and Wales in the next year. Property prices are rising at a disproportionate rate to incomes, preventing young people getting onto the property ladder.

**Fuel poverty** – More households in Norfolk are fuel poor than the average in England; 11% cannot afford to adequately heat their homes.

**Second homes** – Just over 3% of homes are second owned in Norfolk compared to 1% in England. This is impacting on community cohesion and provision of services in the areas affected.

Vulnerable Areas:

**North Norfolk** has the county’s least affordable homes, out of step with average earnings in the area. Second home ownership is also highest in this district, particularly in the High Heath ward where 25% of properties are not a primary place of residence.

**South Norfolk** has the highest proportion of non-decent and unfit dwellings (almost double the regional average).

Homelessness is highest in **Great Yarmouth**, but is also a problem in **Broadland** and King’s Lynn and **West Norfolk**. In **Great Yarmouth**, the most common reason for homeless is parents no longer willing to accommodate.

**King’s Lynn and West Norfolk** has the largest Gypsy/ Traveller community in Norfolk living on ‘not tolerated’ caravan sites. More needs to be done in this authority area to provide authorised caravan sites so as to appease both local residents and the GT community.
5. **Safer and Stronger Communities**

Communities in which residents feel a strong sense of belonging are also those where people feel safe and secure in their immediate neighbourhood. In areas with a high crime rate, people are less inclined to leave their homes and engage in social activities. This tends to have adverse effects on the presence and provision of community groups and events which contribute positively to forming a cohesive society.

Although the prevalence of crime provides an insight into safety and cohesion in an area, high crime rates alone do not necessarily indicate that community spirit is lacking. Volunteering, participation in the democratic process and attitudes to diversity can be equally telling in terms of measuring how strong a community is.

5.1. **Crime**

Crime and the fear of crime are some of the leading barriers to achieving a strong cohesive society. A crime score is an index of the total number of offences (theft, burglaries, robberies and violent offences) per 1000 of the resident population relative to the average for England and Wales (100). With a crime score of 89.68, Norfolk ranks lowest for crime regionally and is in the lowest quartile nationally. In terms of total recorded crimes, the number of reported criminal offences actually dropped in the majority of Norfolk’s seven districts between 2013 and 2014 (see table 8). The crime score for each district is significantly lower than the UK average, with the exception of Great Yarmouth (113.24) and Norwich (159.95) for which crime levels are much higher for all types of offences (see figure 6).

A more in depth analysis of the prevalence of different forms of criminal activity in the county reveals that violent crimes (including violence against the person, sexual offences and robberies) occur more frequently than instances of burglary or vehicle crimes. Of the 47.63 total offences committed per 1000 residents in the locality in 2013/14, 11.98 were classified as violent crimes compared to just 1.57 burglaries and 2.87 vehicle crimes (incorporating theft and the number of offences resulting from interference with a vehicle). To put this into context nationally, Norfolk ranks in the top 20 for incidences of violent crime per 1000 residents but is the fourth lowest scoring sub region for both vehicle crimes and burglaries.

In Great Yarmouth and Norwich a large proportion of the population believe anti-social behaviour is a problem in their local area. Almost a third of people in Great Yarmouth perceive there to be a high level of anti-social behaviour, compared to just 7% and 11% of the population in Broadland and South Norfolk. Between January and December 2005 there were 46 anti-social behaviour orders issued by the courts in Norfolk. The majority of these were issued to residents of King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (13) and Norwich (12). Fewer orders (9) were issued in Great Yarmouth, suggesting that residents in this part of Norfolk may perceive anti-social behaviour to be a greater problem than it actually is.
### Table 8: Total recorded crime, by number and rate per 1000 residents in Norfolk local authority areas (2012-13 and 2013/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Area</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>Change to 2013/14</th>
<th>Recorded crime rate per 1,000 population 2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>5,069</td>
<td>4,865</td>
<td>-204</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>5,721</td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>5,953</td>
<td>5,986</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>11,927</td>
<td>11,891</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>38,191</td>
<td>38,060</td>
<td>-131</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1 Fear of crime

Fear of crime in the UK tends to be disproportionately high compared to the reality of recorded crime rates across different areas of the county. A 2011 Home Office survey into crime in England and Wales found that 13 per cent of respondents thought that they were likely to be a victim of violent crime in
the next 12 months, when only three per cent reported having been a victim of such a crime in the year before interview.106

Fear of crime is an important determinant of quality of life and community well-being. Whether or not this fear is substantiated, perceived likelihood of victimisation can be a debilitating issue. Everyday worry can cause people to change their habits and force them to stay at home. The likelihood of such fears adversely impacting on people’s social lives has been found to be much higher amongst females and those from certain ethnic groups107.

Having confidence in the police has been found to positively impact people’s perception of crime and safety108. In Norfolk, a 2008 place survey revealed that a higher percentage of residents agree that the police are successfully dealing with antisocial behaviour and crime in their local area than people in England as a whole (27.17% against 26.3%). However, confidence in the police does seem to vary between districts. Whilst in Broadland 32% of people agree that the police are effectively dealing with crime, in Breckland and Great Yarmouth confidence is low (22% and 23.7% respectively). Considering that recorded crime rates in Breckland are by no means highest in the county, actions to improve public confidence in law enforcement may be equally as important as reducing real crime rates for strengthening local communities in the district.

5.1.2 Domestic Violence and Abuse (DVA)

Domestic violence and abuse encompasses any incident of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between intimate partners or family members. The abuse can be psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional. Although DVA affects both men and women, the majority of victims are female; Norfolk Constabulary estimates that 1 in 4 women will experience domestic abuse during their lifetime, with young women aged 16-19 at greatest risk109. The most severe incidences of DVA do not happen in isolation. Those affected by domestic abuse may also experience problems with substance abuse or mental ill health.

Following a period of increase in the number of reported DVA incidences, the trend in Norfolk is currently stable. There was only a 1% increase in reported incidences between 2011/12 and 2012/13, compared to a 7% increase in the previous year (see graph 13). Whilst the trend does seem to indicate positive change in the county, underreporting is still believed to be high. The national Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) estimates that the actual number of DVA incidences and victims are potentially five or six times higher than recorded figures.
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108 Ibid.
The damage caused by domestic violence and abuse reaches beyond those directly involved, yet the indirect impacts of DVA are often overlooked. Domestic abuse incidences typically occur within the family home, exposing children and young people to a harmful and often violent environment. This can have a significant impact on their emotional health and wellbeing, incurring serious confidence and behavioural problems. Research has shown that children witnessing DVA are three times more likely to develop conduct disorders.

Table 9: Number and rate (per 1,000 0-17 year olds) of DVA incidents (crime/non-crime) with a domestic child by local authority districts in Norfolk (2013/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of DVA incidents with a domestic child</th>
<th>Rate of DVA with a domestic child (per 1,000 0-17 year olds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>7030</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 13,128 domestic abuse incidents in the county in 2012/13 just under half (48%) involved at least one child. Moreover, the number of incidents involving children is on the rise; in 2010/11 there were 6050 such incidents but in 2013/14 there were 7030. Across Norfolk’s districts, there is considerable variation in reported incidences of DVA affecting young people and children with a higher number of cases recorded in Norwich and Great Yarmouth (see table 9). Drilling down to ward level, 300 incidences per 1,000 children took place in the Mancroft area of Norwich.

110 Stuart Keeble, *Domestic Violence and Abuse Needs Assessment for Children and Young People in Norfolk* (Norfolk County Council, 2014)
111 Ibid.
5.2. Road Traffic Accidents

Recorded incidences of road traffic accidents where people have been killed or seriously injured (KSI accidents) are slightly higher than average in Norfolk. In 2013, 45 KSI road accidents per 100,000 of the population were recorded against an average of 38 per 100,000 in England. Moreover, where KSI casualties in the East of England and in England as a whole appear to be decreasing, the trend in Norfolk suggests that KSI accidents are on the rise (see graph 17). This higher rate of KSI casualties by population is a likely result of increased road use in Norfolk because of its rural nature; road traffic estimates from the Department for Transport report traffic stagnation on major roads in the county. Of the seven districts, Breckland (54 per 100,000), South Norfolk (49), King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (45) and Broadland (43) all have higher recorded rates of road casualties than England and the East of England based on data collected between 2011 and 2013.

Graph 17: Killed or seriously injured road casualties per 100,000 of the population

A 2014 report by the Road Casualty Reduction Partnership identified ‘vulnerable’ groups of people most likely to be involved in road casualties. Younger and older drivers are two groups which are disproportionately represented in accidents. Of all the collisions with KSI casualties in 2013, 22% involved young drivers or riders (a total of 131, of which 96 were male and 35 were female). The largest number of these incidents occurred in Breckland, with the leading cause recorded as ‘failed to look properly’. Other contributory factors included ‘loss of control’, ‘slippery road due to weather’, ‘careless/reckless’ and ‘too fast for the conditions’, which were all twice as likely to be assigned to younger car drivers involved in KSI accidents as drivers aged 26 and above. In contrast to the increasing trend in Norfolk, the number of KSI casualties in young driver related accidents is actually declining. In 2013, for example, the number was 8% lower than the 2007-11 average (fatalities 62% less).
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112 Josh Robotham, Road Casualties in Norfolk (Norwich: Road Casualty Reduction Partnership Board, 2014)
lower), possibly as a result of the Casualty Reduction Team’s targeted campaigns to encourage positive driver attitudes, behaviour and knowledge.\textsuperscript{113}

Older drivers have a similarly heightened risk of involvement in road traffic accidents. Of the 336 KSI accidents in 2013, 14\% (46) involved at least one older car driver. The top contributory factor behind these accidents was ‘failed to look properly’, attributed to 33\% of accidents involving a driver aged 70+, compared to just 13.9\% of accidents which involved a driver aged 17-69. Other contributory factors which were much more prevalent in cases involving older drivers were ‘failed to judge other persons path or speed’, ‘poor turn or manoeuvre’ and ‘loss of control’. Unlike the trend for younger drivers, KSI accidents involving older people have not decreased significantly since 2000; in 2013 there were 57 KSI casualties compared with 58 in 2000.\textsuperscript{114}

5.3. Migration and Integration

The ethnic composition of Norfolk has changed significantly in the last decade due to increasing internal and international migration. In 2013, for example, there was a net inflow of 2,700 people from outside the UK and 3,100 from other local authorities within the country.\textsuperscript{115} Ethnic diversity within an area is often determined by the size of its Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) population, a ‘catch all’ term covering all those who live in the UK but have a different ethnic background to the ‘White British’ population. From just 3.8\% in 2001, the BAME population in the county is now estimated to be around 7.6\% of the total population. The levels of diversity vary considerably across the seven districts with Norwich ranking in top position with a BAME population of 15.3\%\textsuperscript{116} - likely to reflect its status as an asylum seeker dispersal centre. Of the seven districts, it is however King’s Lynn and West Norfolk which has had the largest proportional increase of residents from BAME communities, according to ONS estimates.\textsuperscript{117}

BAME groups come from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds with different traditions and languages. For those with a low proficiency of English, community integration can sometimes be difficult, especially within the first year of residing in the UK. The 2011 census revealed that there are almost 8,000 households in Norfolk where no one resident speaks English as their first language. Drilling down to district level, Breckland, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and Norwich all have a comparatively high number of residents whose main language is not English and who cannot speak English very well (1,565, 1,479 and 1,472 respectively). Where English language proficiency is low, BAME populations are likely to become socially isolated. This can have severe implications for their mental health and wellbeing, as well as community cohesion more generally.

The voluntary sector plays an important role in supporting the integration of minority groups by bringing people from a variety of different backgrounds together. Whilst there are many of these groups in Norfolk, the majority are located in urban areas; of the 49 voluntary and community organisations in the county, 34.4\% carry out work in Norwich and 17.6\% are based in Great Yarmouth.
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\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{115} Norfolk Insight, \textit{JSNA Demography Topic Summary} (2015)
\textsuperscript{116} Equality Cohesion Norfolk, \textit{A Profile of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) People in Norfolk Today} (2013)
\textsuperscript{117} Ewan Kennedy, \textit{BME Communities Inclusion Project}, (Norwich: Norwich and Norfolk Racial Equality Council, 2006)
\textsuperscript{118} Equality Cohesion Norfolk, \textit{A Profile of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) People in Norfolk Today}
Moreover, the 11 groups (8.8%) running activities in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk are unlikely to have the capacity to support the 1,479 BAME residents who are at risk of social isolation.

5.4. **Community Cohesion**

Generally speaking, a strong cohesive community is one where residents from different backgrounds get along regardless of ethnic and racial differences. The number of race or religion related incidences or hate crime can therefore be an indication of community fragmentation. Whilst the crime rate is low in Norfolk as a whole, recorded incidences of racially motivated crimes do vary between the seven districts. In Norwich, 148 race-related incidences and 125 race hate crimes were committed against BAME people in 2012\(^\text{119}\). These figures are least 3 times higher than those of other districts in Norfolk suggesting an association between racially motivated crime and the proportion of residents from BAME groups (see graphs 18 and 19).

An insight into community cohesion in Norfolk can also be gained from people’s responses to a 2008 ONS survey on deprivation and inequality in the county. According to the survey, the majority of people in Norfolk feel a strong sense of belonging in their immediate neighbourhood (61% of people on average compared to 58.7% nationally). Of the seven districts, residents’ sense of belonging is lowest in Norwich, correlating with picture of low cohesion painted by a high number of racially motivated crimes in and around the city.
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\(^{119}\) Ibid.
Table 10: Community cohesion by local authority area in Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Cohesion: belong in immediate neighbourhood (%)</th>
<th>Cohesion: different backgrounds get on (%)</th>
<th>Cohesion: influence decisions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>61.05</td>
<td>74.92</td>
<td>32.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, three quarters of Norfolk residents believe that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area (although this is lower than the national average of 76.4%). The sense of community cohesion is particularly high in Broadland, where 84.5% believed that people get on, but lowest in Great Yarmouth (64.8%). A similar trend emerges for community members’ perception of being able to influence decisions which is lowest in Great Yarmouth, but generally high in Norfolk compared to England as a whole (see table 10).

5.5. Civic Engagement

Communities are stronger when a higher proportion of people actively engage in local issues. Participation in the democratic process is a key indication of civic engagement, but activities such as volunteering and involvement in community organisations are equally valid measures of a good positive community spirit.

Based on data from the May 2015 local council elections, Norfolk performs well in terms of turnout. Where average turnout in England was 65.15%, 66.84% of Norfolk residents had their say in the electoral process. Turnout was highest in Broadland at 74.96% and lowest in Norwich, Breckland and Great Yarmouth (61.81%, 62.91% and 62.98%) indicating that residents from Broadland, North Norfolk and South Norfolk are more engaged with local issues. The particularly low turnout recorded for Norwich is likely to be linked to Norwich’s large population of young people, including students who may not be registered to vote locally.

In terms of volunteering, Norfolk ranks in the top ten of UK counties and has a higher than average proportion of over 55s engaging in voluntary work. The proportion of people who volunteer in Norfolk is the second highest in the East of England (see graph 19). However, looking at the profile of those who engage in voluntary activities, there appears to be a significant gender gap. In Norfolk, men are more than twice as likely to volunteer as women; 8.04% of men were involved in voluntary activities in
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121 Alex Stutz and Louise Atkin, Re-engaging Young People in Voting (London: Local Government Group, 2011)
2007/08 compared to just 3.79% of women. The trend is apparent across all the districts with the exception of Norwich where the proportion is roughly equal.

Within Norfolk, participation in volunteering is above the national average in both South Norfolk and Broadland. For people aged 55 and over, the statistics are even more positive; five out of seven districts in the county have a higher proportion of 55s+ engaged in voluntary work that the average recorded in England (see graph 20).

**Graph 20: % of the population (all and 55+) involved in volunteering by district in Norfolk against the national and average. Source: Active People’s Survey**

5.6. **Vital Issues**

**Identified Needs:**

**Crime** – Whilst the crime rate is generally low in the county, Norfolk ranks in the top 20 UK counties for incidences of violent crime. Confidence in the police could be improved - less than a third of people agree that the police are successfully dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime locally.

**DVA** – The number of DVA incidences are decreasing but due to underreporting it is estimated that the figures may be 5-6 times higher. DVA incidences involving a domestic child are increasing – around half of all incidences involve at least one child.

**Road Casualties** – There is a higher rate of road traffic accidents in Norfolk than in England and the Eastern region. The rate does not appear to be decreasing (particularly amongst older drivers).

**Integration of BAME groups** – Voluntary and community organisations supporting the integration of BAME groups tend to be clustered in urban areas – this may mean that the growing number of people in Breckland and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk who do not have English language proficiency might become socially isolated.
Vulnerable Areas:

**Norwich** and **Great Yarmouth** have a higher crime rate and higher recorded levels of DVA affecting young people and children than the five other districts in the county. The **Mancroft** ward of **Norwich** is particularly vulnerable, with 300 per 1,000 children affected by DVA.

**Norwich** also has 3 times the number of race related hate crimes than any other district in Norfolk. This may affect residents’ sense of belonging which is lowest in the district.

There is a lack of community cohesion (whether people from different backgrounds get on well and whether local people feel they can influence decisions) in **Great Yarmouth**; the district also has the lowest number of people engaged in volunteering.

Based on turnout to local elections, people in **Norwich**, **Great Yarmouth** and **Breckland** are least engaged in local politics.
6. **The Local Economy**

A strong economy is critical to the success of an area. Economic prosperity creates quality employment opportunities and enables national and local governments to channel resources into parts of the country where it is most needed. For economies to grow, local areas need a labour market supply with the skills profile which matches the available job opportunities. In areas with a lower skills and qualifications profile the cost to the economy can be substantial. For example, a report by the Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion revealed that the cost of drop-out and non-achievement from AS and A levels in education was £316m in 2012.

In general, the economy and the labour market in Norfolk are in a relatively good position, with New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) looking to create 10,000 more businesses and 95,000 more jobs by 2026. However, with several local authority areas struggling to raise their skills profile, economic development is not occurring at a uniform rate across the county.

6.1. **Structure of the local economy**

In the eastern region, Norfolk arguably has the most self-contained labour market due to its peripheral location, distance from major UK cities and limited transport links. As a large rural county, almost two thirds of enterprises in Norfolk are located in rural locations compared to a third nationally. Location, rurality and infrastructure all play a part in shaping the structure of employment and enterprises in Norfolk.

6.1.1 **Structure of enterprises**

A breakdown of sectors shows that Norfolk has the highest proportion of its enterprises falling within the Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing Sector, the Construction Sector and Professional, Scientific and Technology Sector (see figure 7). The county has developed a particular specialism in Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing, with this sector encompassing almost twice the proportion of all enterprises as it does in the UK (10.6% compared to 5.4% nationally). A relatively large proportion of enterprises are also clustered within Retail, Production and the Hotel and Restaurant sector, more than are found on average in these sectors in Great Britain.
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6.1.2 Structure of Employment

In terms of employment across the sectors, a high proportion of people in Norfolk still work in the public sector (27.9%) in line with a national trend of high public sector employment (27.2% on average in Great Britain). Yet, whilst employment in public services is on the decline (3.78% down on previous years), a growing number are pursuing careers in the knowledge-driven sectors (7.54% up compared to an increase of just 1.88% in the UK). As it stands, 18.8% of people are employed in knowledge-driven sectors in Norfolk against a national average of 22%.

This move towards a knowledge-based economy is dependent on an educated and skilled workforce with specialist knowledge of any area from high tech manufacturing and ICT through to the creative industries such as publishing and recorded media. An Industrial Structure score gives an indication of the level of knowledge sector employment indexed to the national average (100). A score of 85.23 for Norfolk suggests that the county is lagging behind the majority of other UK counties in terms of the education and skills profile of its population. Within Norfolk, North Norfolk and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk score particularly poorly (49.66 and 60.28), reflecting the low level of skills and qualifications amongst residents in these districts (see Education section).

With its growing tourism sector, tourism related industries are becoming an increasingly important employment sector. In Norfolk, 9.01% of the workforce works in tourism, compared to an average of 7.36% in Great Britain. The county ranks number 8 of 53 counties in terms of the proportion employed in this industry. In 2009, East of England tourism estimated the tourism sector to be worth over £2.5bn
to the Norfolk economy\textsuperscript{125}. With almost half (49\%) of Norfolk’s tourism businesses reporting an increase in visitor numbers compared to the same period last year, it is likely that the value of tourism to the local economy will continue to increase over the next few years.\textsuperscript{126}

6.2. Labour Market

6.1.3 Self-employment

Self-employment comes with advantages and challenges. On one hand it gives people more flexibility in their work but, on the other hand, often means lower incomes and less job security. For the economy, growth in the number of self-employed workers can also have implications for tax revenues and the welfare bill as more people become eligible for tax credits and there are fewer additional tax revenues generated from rising employment\textsuperscript{127}.

The current rate of self-employment in the UK is higher now than at any point over the last 40 years. In 2014, around 4.6 million people were self-employed in their main job, equating to 15\% of those in work\textsuperscript{128}. According to the most recent ONS data from January-December 2015 the figure is now just over 10\% (10.16). In Norfolk, self-employment stands at around 11\%, slightly exceeding the proportion recorded in England. Of the seven districts in the county, the proportion of the workforce that is self-employed is highest in North Norfolk and South Norfolk (16.55\% and 16.82\% respectively). By contrast, only 6.62\% and 6.64\% are in Breckland and Great Yarmouth.

6.1.4 Benefits claimants

The proportion of a given population claiming benefits tends to fluctuate over time depending on the state of the economy and position of the labour market. Reflecting the national and regional trend the number of people claiming benefits (JSA and other key benefits) in Norfolk is decreasing, suggesting the employment opportunities and average incomes are on the rise. From March 2014 when around 13,600 (2.6\%) working age people were claiming JSA in the county, the most recent data from May 2016 shows the current figure to be 5,577 (around 1.1\% of the working age population based on population estimates from 2014).

\textsuperscript{125} Norfolk County Council, \textit{Norfolk’s Story}
\textsuperscript{126} Norfolk County Council, \textit{Norfolk Economic Intelligence Report} (2014)
\textsuperscript{128} ONS, \textit{Self-employed workers in the UK} (2014)
Looking beyond JSA claimants alone, the Department for Work and Pensions calculates that 11.26% of the working age population in Norfolk are in receipt of at least one key benefit. This estimate is comparable to the percentage recorded for Great Britain as a whole (11.8%), but is slightly higher than the average in the East of England. Across Norfolk, the proportion of working age people claiming key benefits is highest in Great Yarmouth (18.2%) and Norwich (13.3%) in line with recorded levels of deprivation in the county. At the other end of the spectrum, there are fewest benefit claimants in South Norfolk (7.9%) and in Broadland (8.1%). This concentration of claimants within the urban districts of Norfolk has followed the same pattern since 2003 (see graph 21).

6.3. Economic Competitiveness

6.3.1 Productivity

Productivity measures the productive capacity of an area by combining Gross Value Added (GVA) per head with average earnings. A productivity score of 101.6 indicates that Norfolk is 1.6% more productive than Great Britain but 3.4% less productive than the East of England as a whole. Within Norfolk the most productive areas are Great Yarmouth (113.58) and Broadland (11.26), which score very highly along both indicators for the size of their populations. By contrast, Breckland (91.39) and North Norfolk (97.53) both score below the county average indicating that they have a weaker productive capacity (GVA in North Norfolk is more than 1000 million GBP (British pound sterling) lower than in the highest scoring local authority areas).

6.3.2 Earnings

In 2015, mean weekly earnings for all Norfolk employees were £422.08. This figure is lower than both the regional average of £476.40 and the national average of £510.20. While the average yearly income
reached £31,362.95 in the UK and £32,700 in the East of England in 2013/14, the average income in Norfolk was significantly lower at £26,303.60. The gap in pay between Norfolk and other counties in the East of England has not reduced since 2001 and may even be widening (see graph 22). At district level, average weekly pay is lowest Breckland (£370.60) and North Norfolk (£395.50).

Graph 22: Gap between mean average total income in Norfolk and in the East of England

![Graph showing income gap between Norfolk and the East of England from 2000 to 2014]

6.3.3 Rates of business start-ups and closures

High and growing incomes are a principal driver of business formation in a local area: a high number of residents with disposable income stimulates demand for local services and provides finance or the ability to borrow for business start-ups. Generally speaking, thriving economies encourage business formation.

Since the 2008 downturn and subsequent period of economy recovery, the rate of business formation in Norfolk has increased dramatically, only dropping slightly between 2013 and 2014. From 7.76% in 2010, the rate has now risen to 10.86% (although it is still 3 percentage points lower than the national average). Of the seven local authority areas in Norfolk, businesses are springing up at a greater rate in Norwich, where 12.9% of businesses registered for VAT within the last year. According to a report compiled by Tech Nation, the urban district is an excellent location for business start-ups within the digital sector. Second to Norwich in terms of business formation is Great Yarmouth with a rate of 11.75%. By contrast, the rate of new business start-ups in North Norfolk is 11th lowest in the country.

The opposite process, business closures, can be evidence of a struggling local economy. Even if an area has a high rate of business formation, a similarly high rate of closure indicates that businesses are not sustainable in the long-term. A larger gap between the rate of start-ups and closures therefore suggests a stronger, more stable local economy.

In comparison to the UK average, Norfolk has a lower percentage of businesses that have deregistered for VAT within the last year (8.66% against 9.67%). The county is among the ten UK counties with the

129 Norfolk County Council, *Norfolk Economic Intelligence Report*
lowest rate of business closure. At district level, business closures are most common in Norwich and Great Yarmouth (9.8% and 9.3% respectively) and least likely in North Norfolk (7.54%).

6.3.4 Survival rate of businesses

Rather than looking at the gap between business start-up and closures, the survival rate of businesses is a better indication of whether new businesses are thriving in an area. Calculated as the proportion of businesses still registered for VAT 24 months after their initial registration, the survival rate in Norfolk is higher than the rate recorded on average in Great Britain (76.46% compared to 73.92%). Across the districts, businesses seem to have a greater chance of surviving in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (78.48%), Broadland (78.38%) and Breckland (78.21%) than they do in more urban areas of the county. At the other end of the spectrum, new business survival is lowest in Great Yarmouth (73.44%) and Norwich (72.92%).

6.4. Vital Issues

Identified Needs:

**Earnings** – Mean weekly earnings for Norfolk employees are lower than the regional and national average (£422.08 compared to £476.40 and £510.20)

**Benefit Claimants** – A higher proportion of the population are claiming JSA in Norfolk than in the East of England suggesting that there are not enough job opportunities for people or that the skills profile of the population does not match what employers are looking for.

Vulnerable Areas:

**Breckland** and **North Norfolk** are the least productive local authority areas in the county, partly due to very low average weekly earnings for employees in these areas (lowest in Norfolk).

**North Norfolk** has the lowest rate of new business formation, ranking 11th lowest in the country.

The proportion of the working age population claiming benefits is highest in **Great Yarmouth** and **Norwich** suggesting more needs to be done to help people find/stay in employment in these areas.
7. Culture and Leisure

Arts, culture and heritage opportunities are important attributes to an area which can have a range of local impacts on health, education and wellbeing. A colourful and varied cultural events calendar plays a role in attracting tourists from around the world, carrying with it associated benefits to the local economy. At community level, participation in creative activities brings people together and helps remove social barriers between different sections of society. In terms of education, research shows how engagement in heritage and the arts can inspire young people to explore their interests and talents, indirectly boosting academic performance across other subject areas.\textsuperscript{130}

Recently, recognition of the value in promoting arts and culture has prompted the UK government to launch the first strategy for the creative sector in more than 50 years. The Culture White Paper, introduced in March this year, aims to make arts, culture and heritage more accessible to young people from disadvantaged backgrounds up and down the country in a move to improve social mobility and increase life chances.\textsuperscript{131}

7.1. Local Amenities in Norfolk

The spider chart (figure 8) shows how Norfolk performs along several culture and leisure indicators in relation to the national median (represented by the 50\textsuperscript{th} percentile marker). For all the indicators, with the exception of heritage sites, the county is performing well below the national median.

An amenities score measures the level of amenities provided in an area, taking into consideration cultural amenities such as cinemas, major event venues, Visit England attractions and Michelin starred restaurants; as well as national heritage sites, retail floor space and employment in amenities provision. The local amenities score for Norfolk (56.26) indicates that provision of amenities is around 44\% lower than it is in England as a whole (100). The cultural amenities score for the county, excluding national heritage sites, retail floor space and employment in amenities provision, is slightly higher (better) but is still 32 percentage points behind the national score.

This picture of poor amenities provision is not reflected universally across all local authority areas within Norfolk. Whilst 5 out of 7 districts score well below the national average, Norwich and Great Yarmouth both outperform England and the East of England. Norwich scores particularly highly (1,802.29), ranking 1\textsuperscript{st} out of the 354 local authority areas in England. The clustering of amenities in urban areas of Norfolk reflects a national trend of more culture and leisure opportunities for people living in cities. Given the association between the arts and health, education and the economy, such uneven provision of local amenities may disadvantage people living outside of urban areas. In terms of the economy, however, revenue and jobs generated from a vibrant arts and cultural scene in one area tend to have county-wide benefits: in an evaluation by The Audience Agency in 2013, the annual Norfolk and Norwich Festival generated £2,400,000 worth of economic activity across Norfolk whilst creating 20 full time and 85 part time jobs, most of which went to local people. In 2015, this figure increased significantly with the Festival generating £4,100,000 worth of economic activity across Norfolk.\textsuperscript{132}
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As a city with a large number of arts and cultural amenities, logically Norwich has a higher proportion of people employed in the creative industries (3.39% compared to 1.69% in Norfolk and 2.16% in the East of England). The number of heritage sites, libraries and listed buildings in the city are also well above the county and regional average. At the other end of the spectrum Breckland, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk, South Norfolk and, to some extent, Broadland have very few amenities and attractions for local people.

Table 11: Distribution of amenities by local authority area in Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Name</th>
<th>Amenities score</th>
<th>Amenities (cultural) score</th>
<th>Heritage Sites (2007) per 000 sq m</th>
<th>Libraries (2012) per 000 sq m</th>
<th>Listed Buildings (2007) per 000 sq m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>158.87</td>
<td>296.96</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL and West Norfolk</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>39.17</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>58.01</td>
<td>111.67</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norwich</strong></td>
<td><strong>1802.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>1656.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>128.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.1 Public Engagement in the Arts

Even if an area has a high provision of amenities, this does not necessarily mean that local people are engaging with the arts. Poor health, lack of transport and lack of time can all be barriers to attending arts events\textsuperscript{133}. In Great Yarmouth, for example, only 35.9% of people claim to have attended or

participated in an arts event in the past 12 months despite the district having the second highest score on cultural amenities provision. It is hard to pinpoint the exact reasons for such low engagement in the arts in Great Yarmouth, but it does suggest that those organising arts and cultural events need to do more to reach out to a wider range of people. Across Norfolk, arts engagement is highest in Norwich and South Norfolk and lowest in Great Yarmouth and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk. As a county, the proportion of people who engage in the arts (45.22%) is slightly above the national average (44.65) but marginally lower than the regional average (46%).

### 7.1.2 Satisfaction with Local Amenities

In general, people in Norfolk seem to be more satisfied with culture and leisure amenities than they are on average in the country. In reference to the provision and standard of theatres and concert halls for example, 47.81% were ‘very satisfied’ or ‘fairly satisfied’ in Norfolk, against only 36.43% in England. Whilst this is positive for Norfolk, it still leaves over 50% of people who are dissatisfied with these particular cultural amenities.

**Graph 23: Comparison between the proportion of people who are ‘very satisfied’ or ‘fairly satisfied’ with different amenities in Norfolk and England (2008)**

At district level, satisfaction in relation to museums and galleries, theatres and concert halls and parks and open spaces is highest amongst residents of Norwich and lowest amongst residents of Breckland for all three indicators (although dissatisfaction towards museums and galleries is similarly low in Broadland, North Norfolk and South Norfolk). According to the public, sport and leisure facilities are of a good standard in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and least able to satisfy local needs in Great Yarmouth. Library facilities are meeting residents’ expectations across all local authority areas, with the proportion of people who are very or fairly satisfied exceeding the national average by at least 10 percentage points in all districts.
### 7.2. Vital Issues

#### Identified Needs:

**Lack of Local Amenities** - Provision of amenities in Norfolk is 44% worse than it is in England – Norfolk performs below the national average when it comes to number of libraries, listed buildings and people employed in creative industries etc. Whilst resident satisfaction with local amenities such as museums/galleries, sports/leisure and theatres/concert halls is higher in Norfolk than in England as a whole, over 50% remain dissatisfied.

#### Vulnerable Areas:

**Breckland, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk, South Norfolk** and, to some extent, **Broadland** have very few amenities and attractions for local people.

Engagement in the arts is lowest in **Great Yarmouth** and **King’s Lynn and West Norfolk** – there is a gap between high amenities provision and low arts engagement in **Great Yarmouth**.
8. The Environment

Environmental issues are often put on the back burner out of a preference to resolve more tangible problems such as unemployment or homelessness in the short-term. Whilst the majority of people are aware of the threats posed by climate change and global warming, these threats can seem a long way off for many of us. It has only been in the last few decades that there has been an observable increase in the frequency of flooding events or incidences of coastal erosion. If communities are unprepared, these environmental phenomena have the power to dramatically impact on people’s lives and their ability to make a living. In a similar vein, the quality of the natural environment can also affect income and health. Areas with high air quality where people have good access to green spaces and waterways are also those which attract residents and businesses. Environmental matters cannot and should not be separated from other key social and economic elements of people’s lives.

8.1. Natural Environment Score

A natural environment score measures the quality of an area’s natural environment. It is a composite indicator which takes into consideration housing density, road density, air quality, tranquillity, natural beauty, green space and water. A greater score indicates that an area has a higher quality natural environment. With a score of 156.83, Norfolk’s natural environment is of a higher quality than the national and regional average (56.83% higher than the average score for England). Within the county, the natural environment receives the highest score in North Norfolk, featuring in the top 30 of 352 local authority areas in England. Conversely, the natural environment is perceived to be of lowest quality in Norwich which scores around 40% lower than the national average (58.71). In Norfolk, as in other UK sub regions, it is the more densely populated urban areas which score lowest on natural environment; the Norfolk Districts encompassing coastal Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) have superior natural environment scores.

8.8.1 Air Quality

Air pollution can adversely impact on a number of different elements of people’s lives. As well as the direct damage caused to local ecosystems and vegetation, poor air quality can bring on health conditions such as upper respiratory infections and lung disease and can even lower economic productivity as a result of increased absenteeism.

An air quality deprivation score measures the levels of air pollution in an area based on the concentration of four pollutants: nitrogen dioxide, benzene, sulphur dioxide and particulates. A score higher than 1 indicates a poorer air quality and figures below 1 suggest that air pollution is minimal. According to these markers, air pollution in Norfolk is low (0.79 compared to an average of 0.94 in the East and 0.97 in England as a whole). Air pollution is equally low across the majority of Norfolk’s local authority areas. Even in Norwich, where an air quality score of 0.93 indicates that air pollution is highest, the figure does not go above 1 as is common in many UK cities.

---

8.2. CO₂ Emissions and Carbon Footprint

A carbon footprint is a measure of the total amount of CO₂ emitted as a result of human activity. It is therefore an indication of the damage caused to the environment by a combination of transport, industry, land management and domestic energy use. Releasing high quantities of CO₂ into the atmosphere is likely to have irreversible damaging consequences in all local areas up and down the country. However, certain communities are at greater immediate risk than others. As a low-lying county with an extensive coastline and large agricultural sector Norfolk is particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. More frequent flooding events and changes in the viability of different types of agriculture are likely to severely impact on the livelihoods of many in the county (see section 8.4)\textsuperscript{135}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{graph24.png}
\caption{CO₂ emissions per capita by local authority area in Norfolk (2012)\textsuperscript{136}}
\end{figure}

With 7.7 tonnes emitted per capita, Norfolk’s carbon footprint is slightly above the national average (7.0). Of the seven Norfolk Districts, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk emits the largest quantity of CO₂ in the county (12.6 tonnes per capita), followed by South Norfolk (8.0 tonnes per capita). At the other end of the spectrum, CO₂ emissions are below the national average in both Norwich and Great Yarmouth\textsuperscript{137}. This variation within the county can be attributed in part to the differential needs of those living in rural and urban locations. Given the difficulties people in rural areas face in accessing essential services with limited opportunities to travel by public transport, residents in South Norfolk, North Norfolk, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and Broadland rely more heavily on cars than those from Norwich or Great Yarmouth. King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and South Norfolk are also home to Norfolk’s major trunk roads where a large amount of daily traffic (including highly polluting HGVs) significantly boosts CO₂ emissions\textsuperscript{138}.

\textsuperscript{135} Norfolk Climate Change Partnership, \textit{Tomorrow’s Norfolk, Today’s Challenge: A Climate Change Strategy for Norfolk}
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{138} Norfolk Climate Change Partnership, \textit{Tomorrow’s Norfolk, Today’s Challenge}
8.3. Waste and Recycling

Waste is a by-product of human activity. As populations grow and economic activity increases, more waste is produced. Waste generated by households and businesses requires effective management from national and local governments to ensure that it does not pose a disproportionate risk to people or the environment. Although the past decade saw tonnes of waste materials being channelled into landfill sites, there has been a subsequent recognition of the economic, environmental and social costs of this. Since 2000/2001 the percentage of household waste ending up in landfill has reduced from 79% to 37%\(^{139}\).

**Figure 9: Percentage of household waste sent for recycling, reuse or composting in 2014/15\(^{140}\)**

Recycling collections have become the norm for the majority of households across England, with over 40% of household waste now being sent by the authorities for reuse, recycling, composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion (see figure 9). In Norfolk, recycling has almost doubled since 2005/06 from 402,000 tonnes to 759,000 tonnes recycled or composted in 2014.15. However the proportion of waste recycled in the county is still below the national and regional average. Only 37.77% of waste is recycled compared to 45.52% in the East of England and 41.59% in the country as a whole. At district level, the amount of waste recycled is highest in Broadland and North Norfolk (45.41% and 43.01 respectively) and lowest in Great Yarmouth at 26.84%\(^{141}\).

Since the data only represents the quantity of waste sent by the local authorities for recycling, it is difficult to assess whether the low levels of recycling recorded in Great Yarmouth are a result of low engagement in recycling at household level or a limited collection service on behalf of the Local Authority. Satisfaction data on the provision of local tips and household recycling centres may help to illuminate the root causes of low recycling rates. According to a 2008 survey, only 55.94% of residents in Great Yarmouth were very or fairly satisfied with local recycling services compared to 73.84% in North Norfolk; the same goes for satisfaction with doorstep recycling which was only 59.59% against 70.9% in the North of the county. This suggests that more resources need to be channelled into service provision as well as behaviour change in the Borough.

\(^{141}\) Place Analytics (2012/13)
8.3.1 Fly-tipping

Fly-tipping is the illegal dumping of waste on land contrary to the 1990 Environmental Protection Act. As well as being detrimental to the local environment, the financial resources needed to clear fly-tips has to be taken out of already-stretched local council budgets. In 2014/15, for example, there were 900,000 incidences of fly-tipping, costing local authorities across England nearly £50 million\textsuperscript{142}. Fly-tipping can also indirectly affect business by deterring visitors and reduce house prices as a result of diminished environment quality\textsuperscript{143}.

Table 12: Fly-tipping incidences and actions taken by local councils by Local Authority Area in Norfolk\textsuperscript{144}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>5493</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL and West Norfolk</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>3064</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on data from 2009/10, the number of fly-tipping incidences per square kilometre in Norfolk is lower than the national average (3.76 compared to 6.71 in England). However, this low rate at county level masks considerable variations between the seven local authority areas in Norfolk. More recent statistics from 2014/15 show Great Yarmouth to have the highest number of fly-tipping incidences, followed by Norwich and then King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (see table 12). The pattern of illegal dumping incidences correlates with statistics on deprivation and community cohesion; financial gain or financial saving and irresponsible attitudes to waste management are among some of the more common causes of fly-tipping\textsuperscript{145}.

Over the same period, fly-tipping actions taken by local authorities were most frequent in North Norfolk and Great Yarmouth. These data may vary from those on illegal dumping incidences because of difficulties in investigating, locating and convicting individuals responsible for fly-tips.

8.4. Flooding

Norfolk is very low-lying; some parts of the county are lower even than surrounding water levels. Despite having some of the lowest rainfall in the UK, Norfolk’s topography exposes certain areas to a heightened risk from flooding. The Norfolk Community Risk Register categorizes the threat of flooding as “High and Very High”, with some 42,200 properties in the many river or tidal floodplains considered to be at risk. In addition to this, surface water flooding is believed to pose a threat to around 36,000 homes in the county\textsuperscript{146}. With global temperatures steadily increasing, the future of many of Norfolk’s


\textsuperscript{143} National Fly-Tipping Prevention Group, “About Fly Tipping”, \url{http://www.tacklingflytipping.com/aboutfly-tipping/1474}

\textsuperscript{144} DEFRA, \textit{Fly-tipping statistics for England, 2014-15}

\textsuperscript{145} National Fly-Tipping Prevention Group, “About Fly Tipping”

\textsuperscript{146} Norfolk Resilience Forum, \textit{Norfolk Strategic Flood Plan} (NCC, 2015)
coastal communities is uncertain; it is possible that sea levels around the UK coastline may rise by up to 2m by the year 2080\textsuperscript{147}.

Flooding negatively impacts on all sections of society, incurring huge social and economic costs for everyone involved. Whether due to the financial costs involved in making structural changes to properties at high risk, or the social costs to mental health as a result of post-flooding event trauma, people rarely escape unscathed. The consequences of coastal flooding can be particularly destructive in communities which lack the means to adequately mitigate some of the risks. People from deprived communities are least likely to be able to afford to make the necessary changes to their homes or to move away from an area where the risk is particularly high. Coastal local authorities in areas of high deprivation may also have limited funding to prioritise adaption and resilience activities. Flood risk mitigation tends to be much lower on peoples’ priorities when other aspects of their lives are more precarious / uncertain\textsuperscript{148}.

In Norfolk, the risk from flooding varies across the seven local authority areas (see figure 10). According to the Norfolk County Council Flood Risk Management Strategy, urban areas and coastal towns are particularly susceptible to flooding events. In Norwich city, for example, 6500 properties are estimated to be at risk from surface water flooding due to a high number of impermeable surfaces, the city’s reliance on piped drainage systems and combined sewer systems. Comparative to the size of its population, the flooding risk to properties is similarly high in Great Yarmouth (1300 properties at risk). In the borough, the threat posed by the tides and large river catchment areas, combined with drainage and surface water issues, result in frequent flood events. Given the concentration of deprived pockets both within Norwich and Great Yarmouth, the social and economic costs of flooding are likely to be highest in these two Norfolk Districts\textsuperscript{149}.

\textbf{Figure 10: Map to show areas above flood risk thresholds in Norfolk}\textsuperscript{150}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map.png}
\caption{Map to show areas above flood risk thresholds in Norfolk}
\end{figure}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{1km grid squares} & \textbf{defined by EA as being above flood risk thresholds} \\
\hline
\textbf{180-199 residents per grid square} & \textbf{200+ residents per grid square} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{147} Mary Zsamboky, Amalia Fernández-Bilbao, David Smith, Jasper Knight and James Allan, \textit{Impacts of climate change on disadvantaged UK coastal communities} (York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2011)

\textsuperscript{148} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{149} Flood and Water Management Team, Norfolk County Council, \textit{Norfolk Local Flood Risk Management Strategy} (Norwich: NCC, 2015)

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid.
8.5. Coastal Erosion

Coastal erosion is a natural process; 3000km (17%) of the UK coastline is currently eroding independent from climate change. However, with sea levels predicted to rise as a result of global warming, coastal erosion is likely to increase anywhere between 100% and 400% in the years to come\(^{151}\).

The potential social and economic impacts of coastal erosion are substantial. Retreating coastlines may force businesses to relocate further inland and can deter tourists from visiting an area for safety reasons or reduced visual amenity. The agricultural industry is also at risk, with farmers set to lose around 6,500 to 10,000 hectares of land by the 2080s. In terms of social impacts, the resettlement of people living in high-risk areas can be disruptive and traumatic. The physical and mental consequences of losing property or moving away from an area are felt disproportionately by vulnerable groups such as older people, the long-term sick and the economically disadvantaged who may have limited resettlement options\(^{152}\).

As a county with a large agricultural community and significant number of deprived pockets dotted along its coastlines, Norfolk is likely to feel the impact of coastal erosion more than other UK sub regions. Within Norfolk, the coastal communities of Happisburgh, Trimingham and Cromer in North Norfolk have been identified as particularly at risk. Located on soft sand and clay cliffs and exposed to the full force of north-easterly gales, these communities have little protection from the effects of global warming. Whilst the District Council has received Pathfinder funding to facilitate community adaptation and strengthen infrastructure, in future more funding will need to be channelled into coastal protection and resilience if communities are to respond to the full force of climate change. Manor Caravan Park in Happisburgh is one risk-asset in receipt of funding in an effort not to lose the economic benefits that the site brings to the local community\(^{153}\).

8.6. Vital Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Needs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO(^2) emissions</strong> – Norfolk’s carbon footprint is slightly above the national average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling</strong> – The proportion of waste recycled in the county is below the national and regional average: only 38% of waste is recycled compared to around 46% in the East of England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flooding and Coastal Erosion</strong> – The threat of flooding is categorized as “High and Very High”, with some 42,200 properties considered to be at risk. More communities are likely to be affected by coastal erosion over the next few decades as global temperatures continue to rise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerable Areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Yarmouth</strong> has the lowest recorded rates of recycling in the county, with correspondingly low levels of resident satisfaction with local recycling services and doorstep recycling. Fly tipping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{152}\) Ibid.  
incidences are also more common in Great Yarmouth, reflecting low levels of community cohesion and high deprivation in the district.

Norwich and Great Yarmouth have the largest number of properties at risk of flooding. Deprivation recorded in the two districts suggests that communities there may be more vulnerable to the social and economic impact of flooding events.

Coastal erosion is a particular threat to the communities of Happisburgh, Trimingham and Cromer in North Norfolk.
9. Rural living

The stunning natural environment of rural parts of the UK is a draw for many people looking to pursue a more tranquil life away from the bustle of large towns and cities. With great expanses of green open space, internationally famed waterways and outstanding coastline, rural Norfolk is no different. Yet, despite the benefits to lifestyle, health and wellbeing, rural living can be a challenge. The main source of difficulty tends to revolve around access and connectivity. Whilst urban areas have the resources and infrastructure to support regular and efficient public transport services and super-fast broadband, small towns, villages and hamlets may not even feature on a bus or train line. Increased reliance on cars in rural parts of the county raises the cost of living, whilst those without car access are severely disadvantaged. Limited broadband provision, transport, unsuitable housing and fewer employment opportunities are amongst some of the challenges which make people in rural areas much more susceptible to poverty and social isolation.

9.1. Rural-Urban Population

According to the 2011 Rural-Urban Classification for Local Authority Districts (RUCLAD) in England, four out of the seven districts in Norfolk are predominantly rural with at least half of the resident population living in rural areas (see figure 11). Of these four, North Norfolk, Breckland and South Norfolk are largely rural and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk is classified as mainly rural (where at least 80% of people live in rural areas or rural-related hub towns with a population of less than 10,000). In contrast, only Norwich district is categorized as predominantly urban, since at least 74% of its population reside in urban areas.

Figure 11: Rural urban classification of Norfolk (2011)

Figure 12: Deprivation within Norfolk (IMD score)

While most of Norfolk is therefore categorized as rural, the RUCLAD may mask disparities within the seven districts. Table 13 shows how all the districts, excluding North Norfolk have at least a third of their population living in urban areas. Moreover, none of Norfolk’s local authority areas are entirely

---
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Disaggregating the population by district like this reveals that almost half of Norfolk’s residents (47.5%) actually live in an environment than can be classified as urban. This is not to suggest that people in the county do not face a number of challenges associated with rural living.

Table 13: Norfolk urban and rural population, ONS mid-2010 population estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Area</th>
<th>Rural Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Urban Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>130,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland</td>
<td>60,200</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>123,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>71,700</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>99,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Lynn &amp; West Norfolk</td>
<td>93,800</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>47,100</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>140,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>89,100</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>143,500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>143,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk</td>
<td>94,600</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>121,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>452,500</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>409,800</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>862,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2. Rural Deprivation

Deprivation is often associated with urban areas. Of the seven Norfolk districts, the more urban areas of Norwich and Great Yarmouth score highest on the Index of Multiple Deprivations (see figure 12). Yet, in Norfolk as a whole, 45% of deprivation is found in rural areas.

According to research undertaken by the Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion (OCSI) which analysed the rural share of deprivation down to output area level, the most deprived areas of rural Norfolk are Cromer Town (North Norfolk), Spellowfields (King’s Lynn and West Norfolk), Upwell and Delph (King’s Lynn and West Norfolk), Swaffham (Breckland) and Hunstanton (King’s Lynn and West Norfolk). Nationally, Cromer Town ranks within the most deprived 20% percentile.

Deprived rural areas in Norfolk are characterised by high unemployment levels, high levels of limiting long-term illness and a high proportion of adults with no qualifications. The OCSI report found that people living in the deprived rural hotspots of Norfolk are almost twice as likely to be unemployed as those living in non-deprived rural areas (4.3% compared to 2.3% of the population). 47.1% of adults in deprived rural areas have no qualifications; while 30.1% have a long term illness. Where deprivation and rurality exist in the same area, people are susceptible to poor health, education and employment but tend to have limited access to services and support.

Poverty in rural areas is compounded by costs associated with heating unsuitable homes, of which there are more in rural areas of Norfolk (see Housing section), and costs accrued from increased need to travel. Research conducted by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation found that people in rural areas typically spend 10-20% more on everyday requirements than those in urban areas. These additional costs are compounded by the long distances that have to be travelled to access services and support.
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costs are even greater in remote villages and hamlets: costs for pensioner couples in rural hamlets are 22% higher than those on a comparable budget in urban areas.\footnote{Noel Smith, Abigail Davis and Donald Hirsch, \textit{A minimum income standard for rural households} (York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2010)}.

9.3. Access to Services

With rural areas increasingly confronted with the closure of banks, shops and post offices in local communities, access to transport and broadband has never been so important. Where basic services used to be just walking distance away, many amenities have chosen to cut costs by relocating to the periphery or moving their services online. As a result, people have to travel greater distances or rely more heavily on the internet to access information and services.

9.3.1 Broadband

Households in rural areas with no broadband connection are disadvantaged in a number of ways. Digital exclusion can prevent people from accessing information and advice on finances and bills, from exploring learning and leisure opportunities, or from regularly communicating with family and friends. Those without broadband are therefore at greater risk from social isolation.

Whilst the large majority of homes in Norfolk have broadband access, some premises still lack this service. Compared to 0.9% in the East of England, 0.22% of premises have no broadband access in Norfolk (just over 2 homes lack broadband for every 1000 in the county). Of the seven districts, the proportion of homes without broadband is highest in Breckland and Broadland (0.71% and 0.36% respectively) and highest in Norwich (0). Given that around 66% of Breckland’s resident population live in rural areas, the impacts of limited broadband access are likely to be most acute in this district.

A broadband score is a composite measure of access and quality comprising the average sync speed of connections, the average distance from each UPC to the nearest exchange and the percentage of premises which have no access to broadband service indexed to the national average. Norfolk’s broadband score indicates that broadband access and quality is only 72% as good as it is across the UK as a whole. In line with the statistics on household access, the broadband score is lowest in Breckland and Broadland (54.43 and 57.09) and highest in Norwich where it is 33% better than the national average.

9.3.2 Transport

According to the National Highways & Transport Network Public Satisfaction Survey, a quarter of the population in rural areas of Norfolk are unable to access a market town or key employment destination by public transport.\footnote{Norfolk County Council, \textit{Connecting Norfolk: Implementation Plan for 2015-2021}} Given the correlation between no car ownership and deprivation (see Fairness section), this figure is likely to be even higher in deprived rural areas of the county. People from these areas stand the greatest risk of becoming socially isolated.

To reduce social isolation of residents living in rural areas, local councils across the UK are looking towards community transport groups as a more cost effective alternative to heavily subsidized and underused bus services.\footnote{Ibid.} In Norfolk, the County Council and charities such as the Norfolk Community Foundation…
Transport Association (NCTA) have introduced ‘Flexibus’ and car share schemes in order to help those in isolated communities access medical appointments or other essential services.\(^{162}\)

Whilst a step in the right direction, finding out about these schemes may depend on whether people are exposed to up to date information (either online or through word of mouth) on transport services in their community. Ironically, people who are socially isolated can be least aware of opportunities to improve their mobility and connectivity.

Of the seven local authority areas in Norfolk, the lowest proportion of people travel to work by public transport in Breckland (3.01%), King’s Lynn and West Norfolk (3.97%) and North Norfolk (3.45%). This compares to 5.89% of the population in South Norfolk, a similarly rural county, suggesting more needs to be done in these three districts to improve public transport.

### 9.4. Vital Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Needs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited broadband</strong> is more of a problem in Norfolk than in the East of England. <strong>Public transport</strong> is not meeting the needs of 25% of the population in the county. <strong>Rurality and deprivation</strong> are closely linked in Norfolk, with 45% of deprivation found in rural areas. <strong>Health, employment and education</strong> are significantly worse in deprived rural areas than in non-deprived rural areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerable Areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low connectivity is most acute in <strong>Breckland</strong> which has the highest proportion of residents without broadband access on their premises. As one of the more rural districts, social isolation is likely to be an issue this district. <strong>Breckland</strong> is also the lowest scoring county in terms of the number of people taking public transport to work. The combined impacts of deprivation and rurality (high unemployment, ill health etc) are likely to impact most severely on <strong>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</strong> and <strong>North Norfolk</strong> which score highly on both rurality and IMD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{162}\) Steve Nunn, “Transport in the Community”, *Community Action Norfolk*, December 30, 2015, [http://www.communityactionnorfolk.org.uk/sites/content/transport-community](http://www.communityactionnorfolk.org.uk/sites/content/transport-community)