

Comparator Areas for Hull

Background

When comparing Hull to England, it is likely that the prevalence of risk factors and mortality will be higher due to increased deprivation in Hull relative to England. Therefore, it is useful to compare Hull with a similar geographical area to get a better idea of how Hull is doing with regard to a particular characteristic, so the comparison is comparison of like-with-like. For example, if the standardised mortality rate (SMR) for Hull is 130 (when compared to England) but a comparable area has an SMR of 140, it would appear that, as expected, Hull has a higher mortality rate in relation to England, but this will be of less concern as it is lower than another comparator area.

Changes following NHS reorganisation in 2013

Following the major reorganisation of the NHS in relation to commissioning, Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) will not exist beyond the 31st March 2013. However, prior to this, Hull PCT (NHS Hull) has used a number of other PCTs as comparators for benchmarking purposes. As the boundaries of the local authority and PCT match for Hull and most of these comparators, it is also possible to compare Hull local authority with the same group of comparator local authorities.

Hull City Council now use the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Nearest Neighbour comparator group for benchmarking purposes, which comprises of 15 other local authorities – these are listed below. Future releases of the JSNA and JSNA Toolkit will use this group where relevant.

Gateshead; Halton; Hartlepool; Knowsley; Middlesbrough*; Liverpool; Rochdale; Rotherham; Salford*; Sandwell*; South Tyneside; Stoke-on-Trent*; Sunderland*; Walsall; Wolverhampton*.

** currently used as a PCT comparator within these JSNA and JSNA Toolkit*

Comparator Areas

The Office for National Statistics (Office for National Statistics 2005; Office for National Statistics 2007) has classified each PCT as one of 12 groups (Regional Centres; Centres with Industry; Thriving London Periphery; London Suburbs; London Centre; London Cosmopolitan; Prospering Smaller Towns; New and Growing Towns; Prospering Southern England; Coastal and Countryside; Industrial Hinterlands; Manufacturing Towns). Hull, with 15 other PCTs, is classified as being within the Industrial Hinterlands group (group 7.11), however, Hull is the most unlike the average for this group, and it is

deemed as being most similar to North East Lincolnshire, which is actually in another ONS Area Classification group.

The characteristics of Hull make it quite unique and no other geographical area is 'extremely similar' or 'very similar' to Hull. Certain areas may have some characteristics that are similar such as a similar population age structure, etc, but there is no area that shares a number of characteristics of Hull in terms of Hull's population structure, ethnicity, deprivation, tight geographical boundaries, type of industry, type of housing, workforce, etc. An analysis of comparable areas has been undertaken by the Hull City Council (Hull City Council 2006) and Public Health Sciences team, and rather than rely on a single geographical area (which will not be all that similar to Hull anyway) and might have an unusual characteristic for the particular factor being compared, it is preferable to examine Hull in relation to a range of different geographical areas. For example, if comparing lung cancer mortality rates one comparator PCT might be similar in other characteristics but have a much lower prevalence of smoking. **Table 1** gives a list of local authorities/PCTs for which Hull has been classified as being the most similar by different organisations.

Table 1: Comparable areas to Hull

Local authority/ PCT	ONS	Audit Commission	OFSTED	Home Office	Institute of Public Finance	Major City
Wolverhampton		Y			Y	
Salford		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Derby		Y			Y	Y
Stoke-on-Trent				Y	Y	Y
Coventry		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Plymouth	Y			Y	Y	Y
Sandwell		Y	Y		Y	
Middlesbrough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Sunderland		Y	Y	Y		
Leicester		Y		Y	Y	Y
NE Lincolnshire	Y					
Knowsley	Y					

As a result of this analysis, ten areas were identified which could be taken as comparator areas for Hull, together with North East Lincolnshire which was deemed to be most similar by ONS (**Table 2**). It is often useful to compare Hull with England, East Riding of Yorkshire and North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust (PCT) as contrast areas in order to compare Hull nationally and more affluent local areas.

Table 2: Comparator and Contrast Areas

11 comparator areas	3 contrast areas
Wolverhampton	England
Salford	East Riding of Yorkshire local authority/PCT
Derby	North Yorkshire and York PCT
Stoke-on-Trent	
Coventry	
Plymouth	
Sandwell	
Middlesbrough	
Sunderland	
Leicester	
North East Lincolnshire	

References

- Hull City Council (2006). Hull Trends. Topic 13. Comparator Areas. www.hullcc.gov.uk. Hull, Hull City Council,.
- Office for National Statistics (2005). ONS Area Classification Groups. www.ons.gov.uk. London, Office for National Statistics.
- Office for National Statistics (2007). Area classification for health areas - corresponding health areas www.ons.gov.uk. London, Office for National Statistics.

Local authority versus Primary Care Trust

Some information, e.g. population estimates, hospital activity, mortality rate, quality and outcomes framework (QOF) GP data, etc are not always available at both local authority level and Primary Care Trust (PCT) level. The boundaries for Hull are equivalent for Hull local authority and Hull Teaching PCT (NHS Hull), and for most of the comparator areas this is also the case as illustrated in **Table 3**. The only local authority listed in **Table 2** that does not have boundaries co-terminous with the local PCT is Stoke-on-Trent. There are numerous local authorities which are combined to form North Yorkshire & York PCT. The local authorities are defined as Counties, County Districts (CDs), Metropolitan County Districts (MCDs), Unitary Authorities (UAs) or London Boroughs (LBs). Eight local authorities form North Yorkshire and York PCT.

Following the NHS re-organisation in 2013, NHS information may be provided for patients registered with Hull GPs rather than for residents living within Hull. This is not known.

Table 3: Local authority and PCT geographical areas

Area	Local authority	PCT
Hull	Kingston-upon-Hull, City of UA	Hull Teaching PCT (NHS Hull)
Comparator areas	Wolverhampton MCD	Wolverhampton City PCT
	Salford MCD	Salford PCT
	Derby UA	Derby City PCT
	Stoke-on-Trent UA	No exact equivalent PCT*
	No exact local authority*	Stoke-on-Trent PCT
	Coventry MCD	Coventry Teaching PCT
	Plymouth UA	Plymouth Teaching PCT
	Sandwell MCD	Sandwell PCT
	Middlesbrough UA	Middlesbrough PCT
	Sunderland MCD	Sunderland Teaching PCT
	Leicester UA	Leicester City PCT
	North East Lincolnshire	No exact equivalent PCT*
	No exact local authority*	North East Lincolnshire Care Plus
	Contrast areas	East Riding of Yorkshire UA
York UA		North Yorkshire & York PCT
Craven CD		
Hambleton CD		
Harrogate CD		
Richmondshire CD		
Ryedale CD		
Scarborough CD		
Selby CD		

*The boundaries do not match, but the population differences are not substantial and the mortality rates for Stoke-on-Trent local authority (238,278) and Stoke-on-Trent PCT (246,150) do not differ substantially (difference: 7,872 or 3.3%) and North East Lincolnshire (77,417) and North East Lincolnshire Care Trust Plus (78,137) do not differ substantially (difference: 720 or 0.9%). Therefore, it appears that the data for these PCTs can be used as a reasonable proxy for local authorities.

How similar are the comparators to Hull?

A number of different characteristics have been considered when assessing the degree of similarity among the local authorities. Different organisations will have examined different characteristics to compare local authorities. Two key characteristics are likely to have been the population and deprivation. However, there are many other characteristics that could be considered, such as population density, level of commuting, size of student population, proportion of single parent families, car ownership, educational attainment and qualifications, employment, type of industry, type of housing and home ownership, etc.

Note that these comments below do not include North East Lincolnshire, but that the summary table at the end has been updated and the way in which the areas are classified as 'similar' and 'dissimilar' to Hull has been tightened up slightly, although it is

slightly arbitrary in some cases where multiple percentages are being compared (e.g. comparison of age structure and examining percentage of residents within a number of different age groups).

Population

Table 4 gives the estimated resident population for mid-year 2005 from the Compendium.

In terms of absolute number of residents, Middlesbrough and Salford have fewer people (45% and 13% lower than Hull respectively), and Sunderland, Sandwell, Leicester and Coventry have more people (14%, 15%, 16% and 22% higher than Hull respectively). The local authorities most similar are Plymouth, Wolverhampton, Stoke-on-Trent and Derby (all within $\pm 10\%$).

In terms of the age structure of the population, Hull is most similar to Salford. There are similar percentages for specific age groups with Leicester, Coventry, Middlesbrough, Plymouth and Sandwell. The age structure of Hull is the more dissimilar for Wolverhampton, Derby, Stoke-on-Trent and Sunderland.

In relation to the 10 comparators, the following points are observed:

- Hull has the seventh largest population (at extremes: Middlesbrough 45% lower than Hull and Coventry 22% higher than Hull).
- Hull has the 3rd lowest percentage of children (5.7%) aged 0-4 years (at extremes: Sunderland 5.1% and Leicester 7.0%).
- Hull has the 4th highest percentage (20.0%) of children aged 5-19 years (at extremes: Plymouth 18.9% and Middlesbrough 20.9%).
- Hull had the 3rd highest percentage (29.7%) of people aged 20-39 years (at extremes: Middlesbrough 26.9% and Leicester 33.4%).
- Hull was ranked 6th out of 11 (25.7%) when the percentage of people aged 40-59 years was ranked lowest to highest (at extremes: Leicester 23.2% and Sunderland 27.7%).
- Hull had the second lowest percentage (8.3%) aged 60-69 years (at extremes: Leicester 7.1% and Sunderland 9.8%).
- Hull had the third lowest percentages (6.8%) aged 70-79 years (at extremes: Leicester 5.6% and Wolverhampton 7.1%).
- Hull had the fourth lowest percentage (3.9%) aged 80+ years (at extremes: Leicester 3.6% and Wolverhampton 4.6%).

Table 4: Estimated resident population, mid-2005

Code	Area	Population	Percentage aged (years)						
			0-4	5-19	20-39	40-59	60-69	70-79	80+
ENG	England	50,431,654	5.7	18.8	27.5	26.8	9.6	7.1	4.4
00BR	Salford	216,428	5.8	18.8	29.6	25.4	9.1	6.9	4.3
00CM	Sunderland	283,689	5.1	18.9	27.2	27.7	9.8	7.6	3.7
00CQ	Coventry	304,236	6.0	20.1	30.4	23.9	8.8	6.5	4.4
00CS	Sandwell	286,305	6.6	19.9	27.6	24.9	9.5	7.2	4.4
00CW	Wolverhampton	239,610	6.0	19.3	28.1	24.9	9.4	7.7	4.6
00EC	Middlesbrough	137,571	6.1	20.9	26.9	26.4	8.7	7.1	3.8
00FA	Hull	249,097	5.7	20.0	29.7	25.7	8.3	6.8	3.9
00FB	ERoY	327,378	4.8	18.2	21.5	29.7	12.2	8.6	5.0
00FK	Derby	233,748	6.1	19.4	29.1	24.6	9.0	7.2	4.5
00FN	Leicester	288,016	7.0	20.0	33.4	23.3	7.1	5.6	3.6
00GL	Stoke (LA)	238,278	5.9	18.9	27.4	26.4	9.7	7.3	4.4
00HG	Plymouth	246,130	5.3	18.8	28.8	26.0	9.5	7.0	4.5
5AN	NE Lincs	77,281	5.9	21.8	24.0	27.9	10.3	7.1	3.2
5NV	N Yorks & York	768,721	4.9	18.4	23.9	28.5	11.0	8.1	5.2
5PJ	Stoke PCT	246,150	5.8	18.8	27.1	26.6	9.9	7.4	4.4

Deprivation

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004¹ score is a measure of deprivation derived for lower layer Super Output Area (SOA). These geographical areas have a minimum population size of 1,000 and a mean population size of 1,500. The IMD 2004 index is based on seven domains which are weighted according to their relative importance in relation to the overall score (weights in brackets): (i) income deprivation (22.5%); (ii) employment deprivation (22.5%); (iii) health deprivation and disability (13.5%); (iv) education, skills and training deprivation (13.5%); (v) barriers to housing and services (9.3%); (vi) living environment deprivation (9.3%); and (vii) crime (9.3%). The IMD 2004 score measures deprivation, but is not such a good measure of affluence.

The SOAs can be grouped and the population-weighted mean IMD score calculated for each local authority. **Table 5** gives the scores and ranks (out of 354) for the comparator and contrast local authorities.

Hull is the most deprived local authority in relation to its 10 comparator local authorities, and the ninth most deprived local authority in the country (out of 354). However, Middlesbrough and Salford have similar national ranks (10th and 12th respectively). All of the comparator local authorities are in the bottom 25% of the most deprived local authorities, with Plymouth, Derby and Coventry being in the bottom 21%, 19% and 18% of most deprived local authorities and all remaining seven comparators are within the bottom 10% of most deprived local authorities in England. Therefore, Plymouth, Derby and Coventry are the most dissimilar to Hull in terms of deprivation.

¹ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1128442>

Table 5: Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004

Code	Local authority	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004		
		Score	Rank	Percentile
00FB	East Riding of Yorkshire UA	15.34	208	59
00HG	Plymouth UA	26.16	76	21
00FK	Derby UA	27.68	69	19
00CQ	Coventry MCD	28.15	64	18
00FC	NE Lincolnshire UA	29.36	52	15
00CW	Wolverhampton MCD	32.19	35	10
00FN	Leicester UA	32.80	31	9
00CM	Sunderland MCD	34.24	22	6
00GL	Stoke-on-Trent UA	35.29	18	5
00CS	Sandwell MCD	35.39	16	5
00BR	Salford MCD	38.19	12	3
00EC	Middlesbrough UA	40.73	10	3
00FA	Kingston upon Hull UA	41.13	9	3

Housing and occupancy rating

Table 6 gives the percentage of people in different types of accommodation for the 2001 Census. More than half of people live in terraced housing in Hull and this is higher than any other comparator; Hull has also the lowest percentage of people living in detached or semi-detached housing. Coventry is the most like Hull in terms of accommodation type. The other nine comparators have quite different accommodation types in relation to Hull, and this is especially so for Wolverhampton and Derby.

Table 6: Percentage of people in different types of housing, 2001

Area	All People	Percentage of people by accommodation type					
		Unshared accommodation					Shared
		Detached	Semi-detached	Terrace	Flat	Temporary	
Hull	239,957	7.2	29.0	56.1	7.5	0.11	0.09
Wolverhampton	233,067	18.4	50.9	19.6	10.9	0.10	0.15
Salford	210,415	10.9	43.4	33.0	12.5	0.12	0.09
Derby	217,341	26.1	43.8	23.2	6.7	0.14	0.06
Stoke-on-Trent	237,071	15.1	49.2	30.4	5.2	0.10	0.10
Coventry	293,382	10.9	29.5	49.7	9.6	0.14	0.16
Plymouth	234,356	11.9	34.1	37.7	15.9	0.21	0.20
Sandwell	280,763	12.2	49.0	28.6	10.0	0.07	0.07
Middlesbrough	132,949	14.9	42.0	37.0	6.0	0.04	0.07
Sunderland	275,590	12.1	46.9	34.1	6.8	0.11	0.05
Leicester	273,394	11.7	41.0	36.9	10.1	0.08	0.18
NE Lincs	155,990	21.3	35.5	36.1	7.0	0.09	0.04
ERoY	306,881	36.6	38.7	19.4	5.0	0.26	0.03

In terms of amenities, Hull has the lowest percentage of accommodation with central heating (79%) at the time of the 2001 Census (**Table 7**). Sandwell had the next lowest percentage (82%) followed by Plymouth (85%). Occupied households in Hull tended to have fewer rooms than other comparator areas (**Table 8**), with 41% having four or fewer rooms compared to 37% for Sunderland, 36% for Plymouth and 35% for Salford. The percentage was less than 30% for Derby, Coventry, Sandwell and Middlesbrough.

Table 7: Amenities, 2001

Area	Occupied households	Percentage of households					
		With central heating			Without central heating		
		All	Bath/shower & toilet		All	Bath/shower & toilet	
		Sole use	Shared		Sole use	Shared	
Hull	104,288	78.7	78.4	0.28	21.3	21.2	0.11
Wolverhampton	97,122	86.6	86.3	0.30	13.4	13.2	0.17
Salford	94,238	92.9	92.7	0.21	7.1	7.0	0.09
Derby	92,405	88.5	88.3	0.17	11.5	11.4	0.12
Stoke-on-Trent	103,196	90.7	90.5	0.18	9.3	9.2	0.10
Coventry	122,353	88.0	87.6	0.38	12.0	11.8	0.15
Plymouth	102,540	84.5	84.3	0.25	15.5	15.2	0.24
Sandwell	115,426	81.9	81.7	0.19	18.1	18.0	0.07
Middlesbrough	55,164	93.0	92.8	0.21	7.0	6.9	0.09
Sunderland	116,356	97.4	97.2	0.18	2.6	2.5	0.05
Leicester	111,148	91.7	91.4	0.39	8.3	8.1	0.12
NE Lincs	66,054	87.2	87.0	0.15	12.8	12.8	0.07
ERoY	131,084	91.8	91.7	0.10	8.2	8.1	0.07

Table 8: Number of rooms in occupied household, 2001

Area	Percentage of occupied households by number of rooms							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8+
Hull	0.6	2.2	9.5	28.8	32.9	17.1	5.3	3.6
Wolverhampton	0.8	1.9	10.3	17.4	29.7	25.7	8.4	5.8
Salford	0.6	2.1	10.1	22.1	30.2	22.4	6.9	5.6
Derby	0.5	1.7	8.1	18.2	31.1	24.4	8.4	7.6
Stoke-on-Trent	0.4	1.4	7.2	24.7	37.6	19.5	5.3	3.9
Coventry	0.9	2.4	7.8	18.7	36.6	22.6	6.3	4.8
Plymouth	0.7	2.6	10.8	21.6	26.4	21.8	8.9	7.2
Sandwell	0.4	1.7	9.6	18.1	36.5	24.7	5.9	3.1
Middlesbrough	0.5	1.5	7.8	18.2	34.5	22.9	8.6	6.0
Sunderland	0.5	1.8	9.4	25.0	29.5	20.8	7.8	5.3
Leicester	1.0	3.6	11.4	16.1	32.4	23.8	6.4	5.2
NE Lincs	0.4	1.5	6.9	13.9	31.5	28.4	9.7	7.7
ERoY	0.2	1.0	5.1	20.0	26.2	21.3	11.4	14.7

An occupancy rating has been calculated in the analysis of the Census data for each household². “The Occupancy Rating provides a measure of under-occupancy and overcrowding. For example, a value of –1 implies that there is one room too few and that there is overcrowding in the household. It relates to the actual number of rooms to the number of rooms ‘required’ by the members of the household (based on an assessment of the relationship between household members, their ages and gender).

Hull had the fewest occupied households with 2 or more rooms extra to that required by the household members, but had one of the highest rates with one room extra to that required. Overall, 6.4% of occupied households in Hull had too few rooms than that required by the household members, and the local authorities with the nearest percentage to this was Plymouth (6.2%), Sandwell (6.6%), Middlesbrough and Salford (both 5.9%) and Wolverhampton (6.8%). In terms of a negative occupancy rating, Hull was the least similar to Derby (5.0%), Stoke-on-Trent (5.1%), Coventry (8.1%) and Leicester (10.6%).

Table 9: Occupancy rating for households, 2001

Area	Occupancy rating for household				
	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Hull	35.8	34.2	23.6	5.0	1.4
Wolverhampton	46.3	26.6	20.3	4.6	2.1
Salford	44.5	29.2	20.5	4.6	1.3
Derby	51.0	26.5	17.5	3.7	1.3
Stoke-on-Trent	43.0	32.2	19.6	4.0	1.2
Coventry	44.7	28.0	19.3	5.7	2.4
Plymouth	46.0	26.8	21.0	4.9	1.4
Sandwell	43.2	29.0	21.2	4.8	1.8
Middlesbrough	46.4	28.0	19.7	4.4	1.6
Sunderland	41.3	31.3	21.7	4.3	1.3
Leicester	41.9	25.8	21.7	7.2	3.5
NE Lincs	56.2	25.2	14.9	2.9	0.8
ERoY	58.9	26.3	12.2	2.1	0.5

² “A household is defined as one person living alone, or a group of people (not necessarily related) living at the same address with common housekeeping - that is, sharing either a living room or sitting room or at least one meal a day. “

Ethnicity

Ethnic group is also available from the 2001 Census and it has been estimated by ONS for mid-year 2006. In many places, including Hull, ethnicity has changed considerably since the Census so the mid-year 2006 estimates are more appropriate even though they are estimates (**Table 10**).

Table 10: Ethnicity, estimated 2006

Area	Percentage of residents by ethnic group					
	White	Mixed	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Chinese	Other
Hull	94.4	1.05	1.99	1.09	0.94	0.55
Wolverhampton	76.2	2.96	14.75	4.82	0.72	0.46
Salford	92.7	1.33	2.66	1.38	1.15	0.78
Derby	85.3	2.07	9.23	2.20	0.68	0.55
Stoke-on-Trent	92.9	1.25	4.21	0.88	0.38	0.42
Coventry	80.5	2.09	11.94	3.10	1.53	0.88
Plymouth	96.0	1.01	1.05	0.69	0.73	0.56
Sandwell	77.4	2.43	15.02	4.28	0.38	0.45
Middlesbrough	91.7	1.23	5.35	1.01	0.36	0.43
Sunderland	96.5	0.61	1.67	0.50	0.46	0.29
Leicester	62.0	2.59	29.31	4.59	0.90	0.55
NE Lincs	97.0	0.76	1.20	0.57	0.19	0.19
ERoY	97.2	0.70	1.21	0.42	0.27	0.21

Marital status and single parent families

At the time of the 2001 Census, Hull tended to have one of the lowest percentages of the population aged 16 and over who are married, and was most similar to Salford and Middlesbrough, and least similar to Sandwell (**Table 11**).

Table 11: Marital status, 2001

Area	Percentage of population aged 16 and over					
	Single (never married)	Married	Re-married	Separated (but still legally married)	Divorced	Widowed
Hull	34.2	37.3	6.9	2.8	9.9	8.9
Wolverhampton	31.3	43.4	5.6	2.4	7.7	9.6
Salford	35.4	36.8	5.9	2.9	9.2	9.8
Derby	30.7	42.7	7.2	2.6	8.2	8.7
Stoke-on-Trent	30.2	41.6	7.3	2.4	8.8	9.7
Coventry	34.3	40.5	5.8	2.3	8.3	8.7
Plymouth	30.2	39.8	8.6	2.8	10.0	8.6
Sandwell	29.6	44.9	5.4	2.7	7.3	10.1
Middlesbrough	33.2	41.1	5.7	2.6	8.3	9.1
Sunderland	30.9	43.9	5.9	2.2	8.2	8.9
Leicester	36.8	39.9	4.9	2.6	7.5	8.3
NE Lincs	26.6	42.3	9.5	2.0	10.5	9.1
ERoY	23.1	48.8	9.3	2.1	7.8	8.9

The total number of single parent families is given in **Table 12** together with the percentages who are in full-time and part-time employment at the time of the 2001 Census.

Table 12: Single parent families, 2001

Area	Households	Number of single parent households and percentage of those employed						Single parent households	
		Males			Females			Total	%
		All	% F/T	% P/T	All	% F/T	% P/T		
Hull	104,288	808	43.3	5.7	8,502	11.8	26.5	9,310	8.9
Wolverhampton	97,122	625	49.4	6.1	6,926	16.8	25.5	7,551	7.8
Salford	94,238	728	52.6	5.9	7,427	19.3	24.5	8,155	8.7
Derby	92,405	610	50.5	6.2	6,144	18.0	26.6	6,754	7.3
Stoke-on-Trent	103,196	807	46.3	5.2	7,099	20.7	22.7	7,906	7.7
Coventry	122,353	1,031	51.5	5.3	9,122	20.3	24.3	10,153	8.3
Plymouth	102,540	657	47.2	11.4	6,968	17.5	31.7	7,625	7.4
Sandwell	115,426	723	47.3	4.7	8,547	18.1	20.9	9,270	8.0
Middlesbrough	55,164	330	37.9	8.5	5,142	11.4	26.6	5,472	9.9
Sunderland	116,356	795	52.3	5.9	8,547	18.2	26.7	9,342	8.0
Leicester	111,148	837	48.0	6.7	8,832	17.1	23.6	9,669	8.7
NE Lincs	66,054	480	53.5	6.0	5,279	12.3	31.2	5,759	8.7
ERoY	131,084	722	66.5	6.1	5,753	24.0	34.7	6,475	4.9

Health

The census asked if people had a limiting long-term illness or disability, and if their health was 'good', 'fairly good' or 'not good'. The percentages are given in **Table 13**. Hull was ranked in the middle when the local authorities were sorted by percentage reporting a limiting long-term illness or disability or by the percentage reporting 'not good' health (for both: four comparators better and six worse). In terms of limiting long-term illness or disability, Hull was most similar to Plymouth, Wolverhampton and Sandwell and least similar to Coventry, Leicester, Stoke-on-Trent and Sunderland. In terms of 'not good' health, Hull was most similar to Leicester, Middlesbrough, Wolverhampton and Sandwell, and least similar to Derby, Stoke-on-Trent and Sunderland.

Table 13: Limiting long-term illness or disability, and self-rated general health

Area	Percentage reporting limiting long-term illness or disability	Percentage by general health		
		Good	Fairly	Not good
Hull	20.7	65.2	23.6	11.2
Wolverhampton	21.2	63.6	24.8	11.7
Salford	22.8	64.7	22.8	12.5
Derby	19.3	66.5	23.6	9.9
Stoke-on-Trent	23.9	63.1	24.1	12.8
Coventry	18.6	67.4	22.6	10.0
Plymouth	20.6	66.8	23.2	10.1
Sandwell	21.7	62.6	25.4	11.9
Middlesbrough	22.3	65.2	23.1	11.7
Sunderland	24.0	63.9	23.2	12.9
Leicester	18.8	65.5	24.2	10.2
NE Lincs	19.0	67.6	23.1	9.3
ERoY	18.1	68.8	22.4	8.7

Economic activity

Table 14 give the employment status at the time of the 2001 Census. Part-time work was classified as working 30 hours or less per week, and students were classified by whether or not they were economically active (working or looking for work) or not. There are no local authorities that are similar to Hull in terms of all aspects of employment status. Middlesbrough is quite similar but has a lower full-time employment rate and a higher rate of people who are permanently sick or disabled. Sandwell has similar percentages who are self-employed, looking after the home or family, and permanently sick or disabled, but slightly lower percentages of students and a higher full-time employment rate.

Table 14: Employment status, 2001

Area	Percentage aged 16-74 by employment status									
	Economically active					Economically inactive				
	P/T	F/T	Self employed	Unemployed	Student	Retired	Student	Looking after home/family	Permanently sick/disabled	Other
Hull	13.0	36.0	4.2	6.2	2.5	13.3	5.6	7.8	7.4	4.0
Wolverhampton	11.3	37.5	5.4	5.3	2.6	14.4	5.1	7.1	6.9	4.3
Salford	10.6	39.3	5.4	3.8	3.0	13.5	5.1	5.9	9.5	3.9
Derby	12.5	39.7	5.4	4.0	3.2	14.4	5.1	6.6	5.8	3.3
Stoke-on-Trent	10.4	39.0	5.1	4.0	2.7	14.0	5.1	6.3	9.6	3.9
Coventry	10.9	39.4	5.2	4.0	3.7	12.6	8.7	5.9	6.1	3.6
Plymouth	13.0	39.1	5.7	3.2	3.5	13.9	5.8	6.4	6.7	2.9
Sandwell	10.9	39.9	4.5	5.3	2.0	14.1	3.8	7.7	7.4	4.4
Middlesbrough	13.2	31.8	3.9	6.2	3.0	14.1	6.1	8.2	9.2	4.4
Sunderland	11.6	37.4	4.3	4.8	2.5	14.3	4.6	6.7	10.4	3.4
Leicester	10.5	37.4	5.2	4.9	3.9	10.8	8.8	7.5	6.5	4.7
NE Lincs	15.2	36.8	5.8	5.5	2.0	15.1	3.1	7.8	5.7	3.2
ERoY	13.7	38.4	9.4	3.0	2.2	16.9	3.6	5.9	4.5	2.5

The number and percentage of full-time students aged 16 to 74 years is given in **Table 15** from the 2001 Census. In terms of the percentage of full-time students, Hull is most similar to Salford, Stoke-on-Trent, Derby and Wolverhampton, and the least similar to Sandwell, Coventry and Leicester.

Table 15: Full-time students, 2001

Area	Population aged 16-74 years		
	All	Full-time students, N	Full-time students, %
Hull	173,804	13,649	7.9
Wolverhampton	168,606	12,544	7.4
Salford	155,376	12,122	7.8
Derby	158,156	12,818	8.1
Stoke-on-Trent	174,247	13,276	7.6
Coventry	214,833	25,806	12.0
Plymouth	175,134	15,960	9.1
Sandwell	199,635	11,151	5.6
Middlesbrough	96,112	8,492	8.8
Sunderland	206,228	14,367	7.0
Leicester	198,922	24,523	12.3
NE Lincs	110,925	5,443	4.9
ERoY	228,524	12,733	5.6

Qualifications

Table 16 gives the highest educational qualification recorded from the 2001 Census. Hull has the third lowest rates of qualifications with 41% having no formal qualifications and only 10% having a degree or higher degree (or equivalent). In terms of qualifications, Hull is most similar to Stoke-on-Trent, and least similar to Derby, Plymouth and Coventry,

Table 16: Qualifications, 2001

Area	Percentage of people	
	No qualifications	Degree or higher
Hull	41.2	9.9
Wolverhampton	40.7	13.6
Salford	35.5	14.4
Derby	31.4	17.7
Stoke-on-Trent	42.9	9.9
Coventry	31.4	16.7
Plymouth	29.0	13.5
Sandwell	45.6	9.7
Middlesbrough	36.8	12.8
Sunderland	36.9	12.0
Leicester	38.5	16.8
NE Lincs	37.1	10.5
ERoY	29.2	18.1

Type of area

The Office of National Statistics (ONS) have classified each local authority by the type of area. Hull, Sunderland and Middlesbrough are classified as “Industrial Hinterlands” (**Table 17**).

Land usage is also given in Neighbourhood Statistics. **Table 18** gives the land size in squared metres and the percentage of each type of land use. Hull is most similar to Wolverhampton, Leicester and Sandwell in terms of land use, and is least similar to Salford and Sunderland.

Table 17: ONS area classifications

Local authority	New ONS Area Classification Group (2001 Census based)	Old ONS Area Classification Group (1991 Census based)
Kingston upon Hull	Industrial Hinterlands	Coalfields
Middlesbrough	Industrial Hinterlands	Coalfields
Sunderland	Industrial Hinterlands	Ports and Industry
Salford	Regional Centres	Ports and Industry
Coventry	Centres with Industry	Manufacturing Centres
Sandwell	Centres with Industry	Manufacturing Centres
Wolverhampton	Centres with Industry	Manufacturing Centres
Leicester	Centres with Industry	Manufacturing Centres
Derby	Centres with Industry	Manufacturing Centres
Plymouth	Regional Centres	Established Service Centres
NE Lincs	Manufacturing Towns	Coalfields
East Riding of Yorkshire	Prospering Smaller Towns	Rural Amenity

Table 18: Land use, 2001

Area	All types (squared meters)	Percentage by land use								
		Domestic buildings	Non-domestic buildings	Roads	Paths	Railway	Domestic gardens	Greenspace	Water	Other
Hull	72,232	8.4	6.4	13.1	1.8	0.5	20.6	34.8	2.3	12.0
Wolverhampton	69,345	8.2	6.1	13.1	0.7	0.3	31.9	29.6	0.7	9.3
Salford	96,397	5.5	3.7	10.6	0.6	0.7	14.7	56.3	1.8	6.1
Derby	78,203	7.8	4.5	11.4	0.6	1.3	26.9	39.0	1.2	7.3
Stoke-on-Trent	92,832	6.4	5.0	10.6	0.8	0.7	19.1	48.6	1.0	7.6
Coventry	98,905	6.9	5.1	11.2	0.7	0.3	22.2	45.0	0.6	8.0
Plymouth	82,327	7.8	3.6	11.4	1.0	0.9	21.0	43.8	4.0	6.6
Sandwell	85,704	7.4	7.4	13.1	0.7	0.9	24.8	33.8	1.5	10.3
Middlesbrough	54,559	6.5	3.4	10.8	0.7	1.5	17.7	52.4	1.9	5.1
Sunderland	139,186	5.4	3.0	10.1	0.8	0.4	12.8	61.1	1.7	4.8
Leicester	73,543	8.9	6.0	14.0	0.8	0.5	25.0	37.1	0.8	7.0
NE Lincs	201,912	2.4	1.5	4.0	0.2	0.4	7.3	73.8	6.5	3.8
ERoY	2,456,923	0.5	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.1	1.9	92.0	2.9	1.0

Table 19 and **Table 20** summarise some of the statistics, and their similarity or dissimilarity.

Table 19: Summary Statistics

Characteristic (percentage unless otherwise stated)	Potential comparator area											
	Wolverhampton	Salford	Derby	Stoke-on-Trent+	Coventry	Plymouth	Sandwell	Middlesbrough	Sunderland	Leicester	NE Lincolnshire	HULL
Population (2005, 000s)	240	216	234	238	304	246	286	138	284	288	77	249
Aged 0-39 (2005)	53.5	54.2	54.6	52.2	56.4	52.9	54.0	54.0	51.3	60.4	51.6	55.3
Aged 40-69 (2005)	34.3	34.5	33.6	36.1	32.7	35.5	34.4	35.1	37.5	30.4	38.2	34.0
Aged 70+ (2005)	12.2	11.3	11.8	11.7	10.9	11.6	11.6	10.9	11.3	9.2	10.2	10.7
Deprivat'n score IMD04	32.2	38.2	27.7	35.3	28.2	26.2	35.4	40.7	34.3	32.8	29.4	41.1
Deprivat'n rank IMD04	35	12	69	18	64	76	16	10	22	31	52	9
Terraced housing	19.6	33.0	23.2	30.4	49.7	37.7	28.6	37.0	34.1	36.9	36.1	56.1
Detached	18.4	10.9	26.1	15.1	10.9	11.9	12.2	14.9	12.1	11.7	21.3	7.2
Flats	10.9	12.5	6.7	5.2	9.6	15.9	10.0	6.0	6.8	10.1	7.0	7.5
Central heating	86.6	92.9	88.5	90.7	88.0	84.5	81.9	93.0	97.4	91.7	87.2	78.7
Mean household rooms	5.2	5.1	5.3	5.0	5.1	5.1	5.0	5.2	5.1	5.0	5.4	4.9
Occupcy/overcrowding	1.10	1.11	1.22	1.12	1.07	1.11	1.07	1.13	1.07	0.96	1.33	0.97
Non White British 2006	26.6	11.4	18.1	8.8	25.1	6.4	24.9	10.2	5.0	41.7	4.5	8.2
Single	31.3	35.4	30.7	30.2	34.3	30.2	29.6	33.2	30.9	36.8	26.6	34.2
Married	43.4	36.8	42.7	41.6	40.5	39.8	44.9	41.1	43.9	39.9	42.3	37.3
Single parent househlds	7.8	8.7	7.3	7.7	8.3	7.4	8.0	9.9	8.0	8.7	8.7	8.9
Limit long-term ill/disabled	21.2	22.8	19.3	23.7	18.6	20.6	21.7	22.3	24.0	18.8	19.0	20.7
Not good health	11.7	12.5	9.9	12.8	10.0	10.1	11.9	11.7	12.9	10.2	9.3	11.2
Working	54.3	55.3	57.6	54.5	55.5	57.7	55.3	48.9	53.3	53.0	57.7	53.2
Unemployed	5.3	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.2	5.3	6.2	4.8	4.9	5.5	6.2
Student	7.7	8.1	8.3	7.8	12.4	9.3	5.8	9.1	7.2	12.7	5.1	8.1
Retired	14.4	13.5	14.4	14.0	12.6	13.9	14.1	14.1	14.3	10.8	15.1	13.3
Ill/disabled no work	6.9	9.5	5.8	9.6	6.1	6.7	7.4	9.2	10.4	6.5	5.7	7.4
No qualifications	40.7	35.5	31.4	42.9	31.4	29.0	45.6	36.8	36.9	38.5	37.1	41.2
Degree or higher	13.6	14.4	17.7	9.9	16.7	13.5	9.7	12.8	12.0	16.8	10.5	9.9
No cars/vans household	35.2	39.2	30.6	34.6	33.1	30.2	37.5	41.0	39.9	38.3	33.2	43.8
Mean vehicle/household	0.92	0.84	0.98	0.90	0.95	0.96	0.86	0.81	0.82	0.82	0.92	0.72
Land use: buildings	14.4	9.2	12.4	11.4	12.0	11.4	14.9	9.9	8.4	14.9	3.9	14.8
Land use: roads, rail, etc	14.1	11.9	13.2	12.2	12.3	13.3	14.7	13.0	11.2	15.3	4.6	15.4
Land use: domest gardn	31.9	14.7	26.9	19.1	22.2	21.0	24.8	17.7	12.8	25.0	7.3	20.6
Land use: greenspace	29.6	56.3	39.0	48.6	45.0	43.8	33.8	52.4	61.1	37.1	73.8	34.8
Land use: water	0.7	1.8	1.2	1.0	0.6	4.0	1.5	1.9	1.7	0.8	6.5	2.3

Table 20: Degree of similarity

Degree of similarity (√√ most similar; √ similar; × not similar; ×× least similar)

Area	Population (2005, 000s)	Age structure	Deprivation score (IMD2004)	Housing type	Central heating	Mean household rooms	Mean occupancy rating~	Non White British 2006	Marital status	Single parent households	Limiting long-term ill/disability	Not good health	Working	Unemployed	Students	Retired	Sick / disabled not working	No qualifications	Degree or higher	Cars/vans per household	Land use	ONS area classification (IndHint)
Wolverhampton	√√	×	××	××		√		××	×			√√	√√		√√	√	√	√√	××	××	√	
Salford	×	√√	××	××	×	√√		√√	√√	√√	××		√√	××	√√	√√	××		××		××	
Derby	√√	√	√	××		√	××			××			√	××	√√	√	××	××	××	××	××	
Stoke-on-Trent+	√√			××	×	√√		√√	×				√√	××	√√	√	××	√√	√√	××	××	
Coventry	××	√	××	×		√√	√	×	√√	√			√√	××	××	√	×	××	××	××	×	
Plymouth	√√		××	××	√	√		√√	√	××			√√			√		××	××	××	××	
Sandwell	×	×		××	√√	√√	√	×	××		×	√	√√		××	√	√√		√√	××	√√	
Middlesbrough	××	√√	√√	××	×	√	×	√√	√		√	√√	√	√√		√	××		××	√	××	√
Sunderland	×	×	×	××	××	√√	√	√√	×		√		√√	××		√	××		××	√	××	√
Leicester	××	××	××	××	×	√√	√√	××	√	√√	√√	√	√√	××	××	×		√	××		√	
NE Lincolnshire	××	×	××	××			××	√√	××	√√	√	×	√		××			√	√√	××	××	